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PRESIDENT'S CORNER / Cindy Hefner

A Tribute to NASIG's Volunteers
Although the evaluation forms from the 8th Annual NASIG Conference have not been completely tabulated as of this writing, I believe the results will show this was one of our best conferences ever. How could we have gone wrong? After all, we had:
-A fantastic venue in Brown University
-Thought-provoking, imagination-stretching plenary sessions
-Practical, down-to-earth workshops and discussion groups
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- Enough free time for folks to catch up with old friends and make new ones, meet the speakers, and network with each other
- Fun! A hilarious look at the architecture and history of Brown, a New England clambake -- complete with lobster, a warm night and calm waters for the cruise on Narragansett Bay, and nightly dancing at Josiah's
- Terrific hostesses and hosts
- Incredibly good weather

The conference came off so beautifully, bringing it all together almost looked easy. But believe me, it's NOT easy to throw a four-day long meeting/party for 570 friends and acquaintances! An event like this demands creativity, inspiration, a little luck, and lots of old-fashioned hard work, the bulk of which falls to two committees.

The Conference Planning Committee is comprised of anywhere from eight to twelve individuals from the locale where the conference is held. These much appreciated volunteers let themselves in for a full year of preconference preparation. They handle everything from housing and menus to meeting rooms, audiovisual equipment, photocopying, and signage, as well as the conference brochure, conference packets, registration, entertainment, publicity, and souvenirs. At the conference, they rarely get to attend any sessions, for they are busy making sure that meeting rooms are set up for speakers, that refreshments arrive on time for breaks, that the buses for the cruise meet us at the appointed time and place. After the conference, they help the treasurer and past president wrap up the conference finances.

The Program Planning Committee is composed of approximately eight to ten folks who work on two subcommittees. One subcommittee handles plenary programs and breakout sessions; the other manages the workshops and preconference workshops. Together the sub-committee members craft the conference schedule, select a theme, brainstorm for potential topics and speakers, review the proposals sent in response to the call for papers, select and line up speakers and then coordinate with them for several months in regard to presentations, audiovisual needs, registration and transportation, written papers for the proceedings or recorders, introducers, and so on.

It is a great credit to NASIG that all of the activities involved in conference and program planning have been and continue to be handled by volunteers. Some professional societies contract out conference planning; some have paid office staff who coordinate program details. NASIG has devoted members who invest enormous time and energy in the annual conference.

And that is not where the giving ends. NASIG has several other standing committees/groups: Bylaws, Continuing Education, Directory and Database, Electronic Communications, Finance, Newsletter, Nominations and Elections, Proceedings, Professional Liaisons, Regional Councils and Membership, and Student Grants. We also have short term committees/task forces such as those dealing with strategic planning, conference evaluation forms, awards and recognition, and site selection. The members of each of these groups contributes in some way to both the conference and the general success and well-being of NASIG.

The Board, which is composed of the president, past president, vice president/president-elect, secretary, treasurer, six members-at-large, and two ex-officio members (the newsletter editor and archivist), coordinates all NASIG activities, creates new initiatives, works with the standing committees, and keeps everything on track. We are also volunteers making a significant investment in an organization we believe is essential to our professional worklives. We meet in person three full days a year: at the conference site, on the day prior to the conference opening; in November, usually at a hotel that is affordably priced and as convenient as possible to all Board members (no small feat this year, since Board members hail from New York City; Buffalo; Burlington, Vermont; Boston; Ottawa; Akron, Ohio; Bowling Green, Kentucky; Chicago; Baton Rouge, Louisiana; and Los Angeles); and on Friday, at ALA Midwinter. We also meet continuously by telephone and e-mail, as consultation necessitates.

In the current economic climate, NASIG's library and corporate members alike are stretching to absorb increasing demands and workloads. We are all being asked to do more and more with less and less. Considering this trend, NASIG's role in the serials information chain is even more critical, since we offer both our librarians and corporate members an opportunity to talk and play together on equal footing. In NASIG, no one works the booth or foots the bill for dinner. We discuss common concerns and hopes from a vantage point of mutual respect.
In a few short years, NASIG has made a significant impact on the serials community. We owe this success to the vision of a few individuals and the volunteer labor of many, many more. If our members did not continue to volunteer for committee assignments and agree to serve in leadership positions, we would have to hire office staff to run the organization and conference coordinators to prepare the conference. To afford this, we would have to effect a steep increase both in dues and conference fees. NASIG has flourished in part because we have been able to keep conference affordable and membership a real bargain.

To all of our members who currently who donate time and talent, or who have helped us in the past, my sincerest thanks. YOU make the difference in NASIG!

NEWSLETTER TO APPEAR IN CSL / Ellen Finnie Duranceau

Beginning with this issue, the Newsletter will join publications such as Library Acquisitions: Practice and Theory and Serials Review in Marilyn Geller’s electronic table of contents service, Citations for Serial Literature. Subscribers to Marilyn’s LISTSERV will receive the full table of contents along with instructions for obtaining a copy of the Newsletter through membership in NASIG.

[To subscribe to Citations for Serial Literature, send a message to LISTSERV@MITVMA or LISTSERV@MITVMA.MIT.EDU that reads: subscribe sercites <your name>].

FORMAT CHOICE FOR NEWSLETTER

To Renewing Members:

Since the electronic version of the Newsletter will be made available on the NASIGNET gopher at approximately the same time the printed version is mailed out to the membership, we are now offering NASIG members a choice as to whether or not they wish to receive the Newsletter in its printed version, or to opt for retrieving the electronic version from NASIGNET. Newsletter availability will be announced on NASIG-L, along with the current issue’s table of contents, as each issue is mounted. Members may continue to receive the printed Newsletter and/or opt to retrieve the entire issue, or individual articles from the issue as they need them, from the NASIGNET gopher.

Instructions for retrieving the electronic newsletter files follow. Please note that it is still possible to both receive the printed Newsletter and retrieve the NASIGNET electronic files as needed. However, those who prefer the electronic version, wish to cut down on paper, and would like to help trim mailing costs, may now choose the option of not receiving the printed newsletter simply by checking the appropriate box on the membership form (see enclosed renewal form.)

If you have any questions about this new choice, please contact one of the following people: Marilyn Geller & Birdie MacLennan, Co-Chairs Electronic Communications Committee, or, Ellen Finnie Duranceau, Newsletter Editor

NASIGNET GOPHER INSTRUCTIONS
(for access to Bylaws, Proceedings, Newsletter, et al.)

To access the NASIGNET Gopher you need the Internet’s TELNET capability or local gopher client software. Please check with your local network systems experts if you are uncertain as to whether or not you have either or both of these capabilities.

Specific login instructions to NASIGNET’s Gopher are as follows:
Telnet to: e-math.ams.org
Login as: nasig-pr (lower case)
Password: nasig-pr (lower case --> will not appear on screen)
Select: VT100 (the terminal emulator default)

You may also use local gopher client software for access to the NASIG gopher. The server address is: gopher e-math.ams.org 8000.

Follow the opening menu (and subsequent menus) to access the full electronic text of NASIG’s Proceedings, Newsletter, Bylaws, and/or other Internet services. You may read the files while in the gopher, or “mail” them back to your e-mail address to store or print for personal use. Please observe and take note of the COPYRIGHT statements while you are in the gopher.
Another way for those who don’t have gopher or telnet access is to use the FTP (file transfer function):
1. ftp e-math.ams.org
2. Name: nasig-pr (lower case)
3. password: nasig-pr (lower case --> will not display)
At the "user nasig-pr logged in" acknowledgment, you will be ready to "cd" or change directories, to get to the newsletter files:
4. cd nasig.gopher/newsletters/93jun (all lower case)
5. get junenews.all (for example, will retrieve the full text of the June newsletter)
   get junenews.all | more (to view the file from the FTP site)
6. quit (to leave the FTP site)

The FTP instructions may provide an alternative way of getting at the NASIGNET gopher files for those NASIGNET users who don’t have telnet or gopher access.

PLEASE NOTE:
NASIG’s gopher is NOT registered with the University of Minnesota or any other public gopher site, and therefore, it will not appear as a menu option from other gophers. Likewise, NASIG gopher files are NOT indexed in Veronica.

Telnetting, via the nasig-pr login/pw, or the local client software approach, using the 8000 port number, are the only ways to get to the NASIGNET gopher. You may also use the FTP option (login/pw: nasig-pr) to get to the gopher files if you can’t telnet or gopher directly.

**************************************
Access to NASIGNET, the Proceedings, Newsletter, Bylaws, and other files, is a privilege of NASIG membership, covered through NASIG volunteer committees and through NASIG dues. The NASIG gopher port number and telnet/FTP login/passwords are private and not to be published outside of NASIG (on any lists, directories, etc.). NASIG’s gopher is NOT registered with Gopher or indexed in Veronica.
We greatly appreciate your adherence to the membership and privacy regulation, as neither the AMS’ or NASIG’s work force nor dues are set up to support wide access to a large national or international community.

**************************************

MINUTES OF THE NASIG EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
Date, Time & Place: June 9, 1993, 9:00AM-7:20PM, Brown University, Providence, RI

Attending:
T. Malinowski, President J. Gammon
C. Hepfer, Vice President B. Hurst
A. Okerson, Past President E. Rast
S. Davis, Secretary J. Tagler
A. Vidor, Treasurer D. Tonkery
E. Duranceau Excused: S. Martin
Guests: Incoming Board members C. Foster, O. Ivins, B. MacLennan, J. Mouw

MINUTES:

1. The minutes of the January 22, 1993 Board meeting were approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. Report on a financial strategy for NASIG was postponed until after completion of the Treasurer transition.

2. The AAP/FSP Journals Committee (Association of American Publishers/Professional Scholarly Publishing Committee) has not contacted M. Saxe about their next meeting. C. Hepfer will follow up with Janet Fisher of the AAP.

3. The Task Force to Draft a Vision Statement for NASIG will meet during the Brown conference. They expect to have a draft ready for Board review by the end of the summer.
   ACTION: Board discussion of the vision statement.
   DATE: November 1993 meeting.

4. AMIS will have an exhibit about the history of the ISSN and NSDP activities near the registration area. R. Reynolds will also speak briefly about AMIS at the Business Meeting on Thursday evening.

5. T. Malinowski reported for K. Kennedy on the Awards Task Force. They have been charged to: 1) put in place the annual awards given each year at the conference, and, 2) to investigate and recommend expansion of NASIG’s awards program (scholarships, conference grants, research
awards, etc.).

ACTION: The Task Force will review this year’s annual awards and make a recommendation for future years. They will also meet to discuss expansion of the awards program.

DATE: Recommendation and report on both points in charge due at the November 1993 meeting.

6. A. Okerson reported on behalf of the Ad hoc Committee on Conference Evaluation Forms. A new form was designed for the 1993 Conference. A separate form was developed for the preconferences. Last year 60% of the evaluation forms were returned. The Board discussed the need for purchasing survey software, but it was agreed to postpone that decision. Some issues and problems with the evaluation forms were raised, including: reducing the number of questions, the form’s real purpose, if there should be separate forms for each workshop, how to provide feedback to speakers. It was suggested that some additional members should be added to the Ad hoc Committee to examine the philosophical issues raised.

ACTION: Tabulation of data will occur over July and August. The Board approved hiring staff to input the data to meet the summer deadline. The Ad hoc Committee will provide an analysis and report according to the guidelines established at the Nov. 1992 Board meeting.

DATE: Report distributed in early Fall 1993.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. NASIG’s accountant has filed the necessary papers with the IRS to retain non-profit status, which the IRS has confirmed.

2. The 1993 tax forms were signed and filed. The IRS will be informed of the permanent address by incoming Treasurer, D. Tonkery.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Treasurer’s Report

A. Vidor distributed a financial statement for Jan.1-May 21, 1993. The report showed a balance of $210,166.95. A. Vidor noted that over $100,000 will be needed to pay for conference costs to Brown. The Board discussed the revised voucher form instructions and made several changes. The final copy will be attached to these minutes. The outgoing and incoming Treasurers will meet to discuss the details of the transition. If possible, the bank accounts will remain in Atlanta. The Board discussed the need for additional financial information.

ACTION: The Treasurer will develop budget guidelines for committee chairs and send committee chairs biannual reports on their budgets. Reports will be sent in the late summer/early fall 1993 to provide information needed to prepare the 1994 budget requests.

DATE: November 1993 meeting.

D. Tonkery requested clarification of the assignment given to J. Tagler and him at the November 1992 Board meeting to begin developing a financial strategy for NASIG. A. Okerson replied that he was to consult with a financial advisor and respond to the following questions: 1) what proportion of income can we invest as a not-for-profit organization? 2) are we making too much money? 3) what are appropriate investments for NASIG? 4) how much should NASIG reinvest in the organization to maintain not-for-profit status? and 5) how much cash reserve is appropriate?

ACTION: D. Tonkery and J. Tagler will consult with a financial advisor and report back to the Board. Funds already approved in November 1992 for this purpose.

DATE: Report at November 1993 meeting.

It was suggested that some changes be made in regards to the financial strategy for the UBC Conference due to both the complexities of convening a conference in Canada, and the increasing size of the conference. D. Tonkery was asked to work with K. McGrath and the UBC Conference Planning Committee to map out a workable financial strategy.

ACTION: The Treasurer will assist the UBC Conference Planning Committee with the complexities of handling the finances for the Vancouver conference, including providing advances for significant expenditures and preparing recommendations.

DATE: Report at November 1993 meeting.

The question was raised regarding whether membership dues should be refunded when a member withdraws from the organization. A motion was made and passed that no refund of
membership dues will be made. If a member does cancel his/her name will be removed from the database.

2. Secretary's Report

S. Davis reported that the call for papers for the 1994 conference has been distributed. Roster forms were passed around to obtain updated address information for the New Board. A new supply of stationery will be ordered. It will include pads of half-sheets and a supply of letterhead with a black and white outline of the NASIG logo for photocopying and faxing needs. Davis suggested sharing information about Board responsibilities with new Board members.

ACTION: S. Davis will prepare a chart of who does what for the Board.

DATE: Report distributed before the November 1993 Board meeting.

3. Conference Policy Issues

The Board discussed establishing a formal policy on meetings of other groups held in conjunction with the NASIG's annual conference. A motion was made and passed that NASIG adopt a policy that strongly discourages scheduling of other events which conflict with the NASIG conference, including preconference workshops and events.

ACTION: T. Malinowski and C. Hepfer will draft specific language for the policy, which will be included in the conference brochure and published in the Newsletter.

It was agreed that the Conference Planning Committee try to accommodate requests by affiliated groups for meeting space, provided such requests do not conflict with the conference schedule. Affiliated groups would be responsible for any costs related to room rental, AV equipment, food service, etc.

The Board discussed setting special fees for library school students and host site staff at the annual conference. The Board agreed that staff from the hosting campuses should be given special consideration. The issue regarding fees for library school students was referred to the Student Grant Committee.

ACTION: T. Malinowski will present the issue to the Student Grant Committee and ask them to prepare specific recommendations for the Board.

DATE: November 1993 meeting.

4. 1993 Conference Update

After lunch, Jean Callaghan and Pat Putney, co-chairs of the Conference Planning Committee, took the Board on a tour of the Brown Campus and asked for volunteers to assist the Conference Planning Committee.

5. Agenda for NASIG Business Meeting

The agenda was accepted as distributed.

6. 1994 Program Committee Report

J. Gammon and O. Ivins will be co-chairs of the 1994 Program Planning Committee. J. Gammon will coordinate workshop planning, O. Ivins will be responsible for the plenary sessions. Working with J. Gammon on workshops are: M. Crump, C. Magenau, R. Winjum and R. O'Neil. Assisting O. Ivins are: B. Carlson, A. Bloss and K. Darling. An AV coordinator has yet to be appointed. Deadline for the call for papers is August 1, 1993.

The Program Committee is planning to develop a manual. They are particularly interested in hearing feedback from the speakers about the liaison arrangements, communication, etc. with the Committee. This year individualized letters were sent to those whose proposals were not accepted for the conference. The Committee is also hoping for feedback on this approach.

7. Conference Site Selection for 1995 and Beyond

Preliminary reports were submitted by B. Sozansky for the Twin Cities area, and S. Striedieck for the Research Triangle (NC) area. The Board had a number of questions regarding sites in the Twin Cities, and T. Malinowski will request more information from B. Sozansky. The Board was very interested in the Research Triangle area for the 1995 Conference. C. Hepfer will be requesting a full site visit report on Duke, and for more information on the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Davidson and Guilford Colleges. Discussion of sites for 1996 will be delayed until the Board has a chance to review the data from the 1993 conference evaluations.

ACTION: Follow up reports on Twin Cities and Research Triangle areas to be prepared.
DATE: November 1993 meeting when final decision for 1995 site to be made.

8. Proceedings Update

J. Gammon developed a manual which has been sent to the current proceedings editors. This year, workshop reports will be expanded to 1500-2000 words. An index to the proceedings appears in the hardbound edition, not in the periodical issue. The Board agreed to continue this arrangement. The Board asked the Program Committee to add specific language to the manual and in its communication with speakers stating that NASIG reserves the right to request modifications to the papers and not publish those it deems unacceptable.

Haworth would like to make another special promotional effort, this time to libraries in Mexico, distributing NASIG proceedings to them free of charge. A similar marketing effort, made last year to libraries in Eastern Europe, was well received. The Board assented to Haworth's proposal. D. Tonkery agreed to provide assistance with preparing/translating a letter to accompany the proceedings. The Board agreed that an article discussing these efforts, including the responses from Eastern Europe, should be prepared for an upcoming issue of the Newsletter.

NASIG will ask Haworth for data on article royalties and will consider Haworth's inquiry regarding the payment of royalties to NASIG prior to negotiating the contract for the 1994 proceedings. ACTION: C. Hepfer will contact Haworth and share the Board’s responses. DATE: Summer 1993.

9. Bylaws Update

The Bylaws Committee has been asked to review sections of the bylaws relating to the nominations and elections process and the committee structure. The Board asked the committee to consider wording that would allow for the establishment of additional committees without requiring a bylaws change, and permit staggered terms for new committees. There has been some confusion over the wording of the nominations process, so some clarification of this clause has been requested. ACTION: B. Hurst and T. Malinowski will attend the Bylaws Committee meeting to share ideas and concerns. DATE: Bylaws Committee will meet Thursday, June 10 at 3:00 p.m.

10. Electronic Communications Committee Report

B. MacLennan reported that B. MacLennan and M. Geller will co-chair the committee for 1993/94. There are currently 730 subscribers to NASIG-L, and non-renewals are scheduled to be purged in August. It was suggested that NASIG documents be available online in various formats, such as ASCII, Word Perfect, Postscript, etc. The committee is investigating the feasibility of putting the membership directory online, using the AMS directory as a model. ACTION: The Committee will look into specific issues related to expanding the online offering and prepare a report with recommendations. DATE: November 1993 meeting.

There continue to be concerns about security for NASIGNET and the gopher. The gopher port is a private number for use by members only. The committee will discuss stronger language for the privacy statement on the gopher and where to publicize this policy. A. Okerson suggested an authorization statement be inserted at the front of every file. ACTION: Committee to draft privacy statement and recommendations for publishing it. DATE: Report at the November 1993 Board meeting.

B. MacLennan distributed copies of the handout from the NASIGNET preconference. The Board congratulated her on an outstanding document, and felt it should be made available to the membership. ACTION: After the NASIGNET preconference, the Committee will revise the handout used, and make it available for purchase. An order form will be included with the 1994 renewals. D. Tonkery agreed to handle the production and distribution of the booklet. The cost will be $10. DATE: Late Summer/early Fall 1993.

11. Newsletter

Discussion followed on the need to publish committee descriptions/charges along with the volunteer form in the Newsletter. Also, it was
suggested that position descriptions for the various offices appear with the Call for Nominations. It was suggested that both committee charges and officer position descriptions be added to the Directory and available on NASIGNET. The Board agreed that committee descriptions/charges and descriptions for NASIG offices should be widely distributed.

**ACTION:** C. Hepfer and T. Malinowski will contact committee chairs.

**DATE:** Summer 1993.

E. Duranceau reported that tables of contents from the NASIG Newsletter will appear in "Sercites" beginning with the September issue. "Sercites" will receive the tables of contents once all issues have been mailed to the membership.

E. Duranceau also reported that K. Schmidt, the Production Editor, will be experimenting with a desktop publishing package, "Publish It!" at her institution. The Board expressed interest and support. E. Duranceau was asked to consult with K. Schmidt and update the Board on the desirability of purchasing a desktop package.

**ACTION:** Report on experimentation with desktop publishing package.

**DATE:** February 1994 meeting.

12. NASIG Archives

A motion was made and passed to officially appoint E. Rast as NASIG Archivist for a one year term. During that year she will prepare an inventory list of the material collected so far. She will also prepare a position description, estimate of time commitment, and guidelines for materials to be incorporated into the archives.

**ACTION:** Report at June 1994 Board meeting.

Discussion continued and questions about archiving committee discussions on NASIGNET were raised.

**ACTION:** B. MacLennan will consult with committee chairs about electronic archives from NASIG-L and report back to C. Hepfer.

**DATE:** Summer/Fall 1993


A working group was established to develop a manual for both Conference Planning and Program Planning. C. Hepfer, J. Gammon, O. Ivins, S. Davis, T. Malinowski, and J. Mowu agreed to participate, and several other individuals who have worked on conference or program planning in the past will be asked to assist.

**ACTION:** Draft documents to be prepared ASAP.

**DATE:** Report at November 1993 meeting.

14. Committee Reports

Written reports were distributed at the beginning of the meeting.

**Continuing Education:** Report accepted without discussion. A. Alexander will chair the committee next year.

**Database and Directory:** Joan Luke will be stepping down as Chair. The Board expressed its thanks for her hard work and excellent contributions.

**Professional Liaisons:** This group will be reviewing its status as a committee and submit a report to the President after the Conference.

**Student Grant:** Harriet Kersey is completing her term as Chair. The Board expressed its thanks for the fine work this committee has accomplished. The committee would like to explore additional outlets for grant publicity and to follow up with the library schools.

15. Next meeting and Adjournment

The next meeting is scheduled for Saturday, November 13, 9 a.m.-6 p.m. in Toronto. B. Hurst volunteered to make the room arrangements.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

Mustard provided an overview of Mustard and his colleagues' investigations, including a NASA mission to Venus and flybys of the Galileo probe through the Earth-Moon system. Their work takes advantage of recent technological advances that have made it possible to examine large data sets dealing with complex problems and many variables. These advances in what is referred to as "scientific visualization" include computer graphics, interfaces with windowing capabilities, image processing, and high speed computing. Mustard referred to this tempting array of technological opportunities as a "playground of instant gratification," through which the use of color, perspective, image, and motion are combined to create an aesthetic as well as scientific product.

The examples Mustard showed proved his point, for he treated his audience to provocative and complex images that portrayed such effects as vegetation seen at several time periods in a single, compact image; a combination of color and texture data in a single topographic image; the display of three-dimensional convection in the Earth's mantle over both time and space; and data gathered by NASA's Jet Propulsion Lab that merges image data with topographic data to develop a better visual representation of the planet's surface than has been possible before.

Mustard played videotapes that demonstrated several of these new methods of scientific visualization, which made clear how limiting the print format can be. Mustard's video of "blob convection" on the Earth, for example, showed mantle convection over several million years, allowing researchers to compress time, revealing processes occurring on the surfaces of Earth and Venus over unimaginably vast time scales. Such an effect would not be possible to render fully in a print journal.

A videotape produced by the NASA Jet Propulsion Lab from the Magellan Mission and part of the Solar System Visualization Project also demonstrated this point. This tape simulated flight over Venus so that the viewers saw its texture and surface as if travelling in a spaceship over the planet. But, as Mustard concluded, even if these new images are the most compact and effective method of "convey[ing] concepts and results to peers and the lay public," none of these images "translate easily to the printed page." Mustard left the audience transfixed and awed by the visual impact of his work, and fully convinced that the paper journal is woefully inadequate as a vehicle for representing it.

Tom Banchoff, Professor of Mathematics, Brown University. "Higher Dimensions and Interactive Electronic Publication."

The problems of visualization are not new to Banchoff; he got stuck on the problem of visualizing flight through the fourth dimension when he was ten years old, and has spent his lifetime in a quest to use mathematics in spatial visualization in more than three dimensions. The mathematical challenge of the fourth dimension is leading, according to Banchoff, to entirely new methods of publication. His presentation consisted of a "scrapbook of images from the last twenty-five years" demonstrating the changes in technology during that time, and the choices he made at each stage to represent spatial images in his work.

Banchoff has been inspired in part by the work of Edwin Abbott, a nineteenth-century writer who in his book Flatland: A Romance of Many Dimensions, worked out the problems of visualizing a two-dimensional world. This early investigation was done by line drawings in print, which Banchoff has scanned into bit-mapped images so that he can annotate the text. He plans to create a hypertext version of Abbott's nineteenth-century work, which will allow readers to click onto quotations or annotations, for example, and find out more about them, or leave them unexplored, depending on the need and mood of the moment. His hypertext book will have the ability to follow Abbott's family tree and all of his associates, stemming from a photograph of the author and moving nonlinearly through every known element of Abbott's life. This hypertext system will truly represent multidimensional publishing.
Earlier in his career, however, before hypertext was available, Banchoff produced "Hypercube Projections and Slicing," a 1978 videotape that, inspired by the fancy computer graphics of major motion pictures, applied similar techniques to mathematics and simulated the experience of walking around a four-dimensional cube. This kind of image was far superior to the two-dimensional representation available on paper in a single picture, and, for Banchoff, viewing the ultimate product was "like visiting a house you'd only read about before."

By 1978, Banchoff was publishing images in color, on the covers of journals such as an IEEE Transactions journal. A single image took a half-an-hour to make at that time, but five years later a similar image could be produced in one-half of a second. Even at this stage, publishers wanted Banchoff to produce his images through overlays, but he convinced them to use computer graphics to create a better image.

In the present, along with his work on Abbott, Banchoff is developing a hypertext system or "electronic book," which deals with the geometry and calculus of surfaces in three- and four-dimensional space. In this system, the user can click icons and open windows on a Sun workstation and look, for instance, at a sequence of examples, and can then change the equations and see something entirely different. The interactive "book" allows students to acquire laboratory experience, and Banchoff believes that after seeing the possibilities of this kind of learning, "no one will want to teach Calculus again in the ordinary way," or "read articles in journals" without the same kind of access. Banchoff left the audience with the unanswered question of where the "books" he is now creating will be stored in the libraries of the future.


Renear admitted at the outset that his talk would be in some ways a "little bit of a sermon" about standards, and, specifically, about Standard Generalized Mark-up Language (SGML) and its ability to realize our visions about how data should be manipulated and shared. Renear believes W. Richard Ristow had his priorities right when he said "let me write a nation's data structures...and I care not who writes its code," for he agrees that the data structure is the key to efficient computing.

Renear, then, believes, like Alan Kay, that "using a computer in the future will be like flying a jet plane through information space," but he believes that there may be detours on the way to achieving this goal. He took the audience back in time to the systems he has used, beginning when he was a graduate student in Philosophy at Brown, concluding that we have not come as far technologically as we sometimes think we have. For example, in 1973 Brown developed a document-management hypertext system which was used until 1981. This text processing system had customized views, annotation, formatting, hypertext linking, and automatically sorted lists of theories and axioms. This system "knew" about the key editorial elements of a document, such as the title, paragraph, etc. Meanwhile, Brown's English Department was developing a system, which was also discipline-based. This system "knew" the MLA format, how to parse text, how to deal with parallel texts, how to format poems, and had an integrated bibliography manager.

Renear pointed out that very few tools for discipline-specific work, like these older tools, currently exist. ASCII, for example, is a "dead format," and electronic documents appear dead on the printed page as well as on the World Wide Web or in a Gopher. These examples demonstrate that it is not hardware and software alone that will help us realize our visions, for if you have not organized your information in a way that is practical for machine manipulation nothing else really matters. The structure of a document as well as its content must be reflected in the data structure that is created. When designing that structure, it is essential to ask "What are the intellectually salient features of a document? How are these features related?" if one is to achieve intelligent processing, such as formatting, retrieval, and analysis.

Renear's message, then, is to "accept no substitutes" in creating a data structure. Bitmapped images, ASCII text, and vector graphics such as PostScript and the like are "spurious solutions," detours on the road to the system that
will feel like flying a jet plane. None of these "solutions" treats a document like a database, the way it must if it is to be a truly workable system.

What, then, is the answer? According to Renear, the answer is SGML, a standard machine-readable way to specify the intellectual grammar of classes of documents, which allows you to describe the specific structure of particular documents. The SGML standard, a United States Federal Information Processing Standard (ISO 8879), is the most requested ISO standard. Many projects, including the American Mathematical Society's electronic journal projects, Renear's Women Writers Project, and the Online Journal of Current Clinical Trials, (which Renear believes is "the best and most correct of all the projects"), are already using SGML. SGML will provide the transition from the "current mish-mash of multiple protocols, incompatible distribution formats, and low-functionality software" to "the globally interlinked, intelligent, interactive, crystalline virtual reality of interoperable data and tools." In other words, SGML is the key that will allow us to get the data structure right, and thus realize the vision of an information utopian environment.

Brian Hawkins, Vice President for Academic Planning & Administration, Brown University. "Incrementalism Won't Get Us There!"

Hawkins brought us down to Earth by talking not about virtual reality but concrete, fiscal reality. His talk answered the question "Are there structures to finance [our technological] visions?" and emphasized that we need a plan to get ourselves where we want to be in the future.

In emphasizing the centrality of economics in the development of technology, Hawkins pointed out that there will be video in our homes at the flick of a button because there's money in it, but libraries of Alexandria are unlikely to appear on our desktops; they are not commercially-viable. Given these economic facts, Hawkins is skeptical of the hyperbole and promise of a new age of electronic scholarship, and believes that we will never reach our goals if we simply sit and wait for the electronic revolution, despite what the mass media would like us to believe. The grand "information superhighway" is still just a dream, a dream that will go unrealized if unaccompanied by a plan.

Hawkins has been studying the economics of the library universe, and he does not think university administrations realize the magnitude of the devastating problems we face. For example, data from the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) shows that Brown, sitting at the exact mean of the ARL group, has lost 40% of its buying power since 1980. And this figure only looks worse if one factors in the growth rate of the body of knowledge that the Brown budget has been trying to capture. Brown, like other libraries, has been buying smaller and smaller pieces of a bigger and bigger pie.

In short, Hawkins believes the "economics of the present model is doomed." The acquisition model, in which libraries purchase a collection and store it, will cease to exist in our lifetimes. The unsustainable nature of this model is revealed by the fact that even when the library budget grows at two or three times inflation, purchasing power still declines. If we continue to provide solutions (such as document delivery) that work within the same basic model and only nibble at the edges of the real problem, we will only delay our inevitable death warrant. Instead, we need to capture the new kinds of scholarship that are out there, using robust databases. The question is where to find the funds to pursue these radical solutions.

According to Hawkins, what we need is a business plan. This plan should guide us towards the development of an electronic library, and should be founded on four principles:
1. We should not fall into a pay-per-view trap. That is, we should not focus on metering and control but on providing free access to information for those who need it. This has been a fundamental construct of our society and should remain so.
2. We should target the segment of the market that is the most critical from a scholarly point of view: the journals.
3. We should be part of a larger economic and market structure, not isolated.
4. We must anticipate the future as well as archive the past, which requires us to live in the past and the future simultaneously.

Hawkins sees four possible market structures that could potentially control the new electronic world of scholarly information:
1. The entertainment model, which won't work,
since Chemical Abstracts will never have the broad-based appeal that a large commercial enterprise like Blockbuster Video would be attracted to, even if the same infrastructure that delivers entertainment may ultimately deliver a product like Chemical Abstracts.

2. The pay-per-view model, which is not attractive since it creates "haves" and "have-nots" in the information world.

3. The government model, which also won't work, since the problems facing us are international in scope and we "don't want Jesse Helms monitoring" our scholarly activity.

4. The nonprofit model, which for Hawkins is the correct market structure. In this model, an entity is set up that would have a single decision-maker, with a small staff and a budget. Following the nonprofit organization model, with a business plan, Hawkins sees us guiding ourselves into a new information marketplace. This shift will also require a change in academic culture, in which universities stop giving away the copyright to their faculty members' work.

So how, Hawkins asks, do we get there? We start to share and leverage existing resources. We depend on each other, and create a "virtual organization" in which one institution might house a medieval history collection, another an Asian Studies collection, and so on. Acquisition budgets would have to shift and become a national enterprise. Institutions would have national site licenses for given products. From Hawkins' point of view, universities are going into bankruptcy anyway if they follow their current course, so they have little to lose by attempting this solution; they must get away from bragging about how many more copies they have than a school down the street, and leverage their combined resources. What this means is essentially adopting an access model rather than an acquisitions model, an idea that has been discussed but never really implemented.

Implementing this model will require a kind of social engineering; we need to stop concerning ourselves overly with copyright law and instead examine tax incentives and change the fiscal pressures on business, to create the kind of impact that the Thor Power Tool Decision had. What is needed is a "radical shift," a "new paradigm."

---

Question & Answer Session

The first plenary session was followed by a question and answer session. Highlights of this session follow:

Q: To Tom Banchoff regarding preprints in the mathematics literature.

A: Banchoff believes that mathematics relies on peer review to ensure three essential elements of scholarship: correctness, significance, and originality. Preprints are not currently controlled by the peer review process, and have traditionally been limited only by the author's mailing budget. In an electronic format, distribution is free, and there are no limitations at all on wide circulation of non-peer-reviewed work. To Banchoff, this means that we may actually lose information when a sea of preprints becomes available online, since it will be impossible to wade through them all.

Q: To Mustard, regarding printing of research results in black and white in the Journal of Geophysics Research: given a choice, how would he like to publish his results?

A: MUSTARD replied that his day-to-day work is totally visual, even when he gives talks. It is only in publishing in a journal that he can't incorporate the visual dimension of his work, and he would like to publish his work the way he created it. Currently CD-ROM is the only medium that can do this.

A: BANCHOFF: Videotape and writing away for supplemental floppy disks of data are not viable long-term solutions to publishing visual data. The ultimate goal should be a two-way communication with the author, the ability to actually manipulate files as presented by the author, and build upon them.

A: RENEAR: The world being described by the other panelists is here, in a technological sense. The limiting issues are copyright, refereeing, peer control, and the like, not technology. He has colleagues, even those from other countries, accessing data on his machine routinely.

Q: How is Hawkins communicating with other university administrations about these issues?

A: HAWKINS believes that what all of these institutions must emphasize is that they should not give away copyright upon publication.

Comment from a publisher: "First copy" creation has been identified as the major cost in publishing...
a journal. Universities should not assume that publishers necessarily want a pay-per-view model or to restrict access. The problem is, they need help in defining the new paradigm and in visualizing the future.

HAWKINS: Publishers and universities need to be part of the same structure. They need to work together.

Q: Could the panel comment about pressure on faculty to publish a large quantity of publications?
A: BANCHOFF: The electronic forum needs quality control before electronic publication can have the stature of paper.
A: HAWKINS: Academic culture will not change in a radical fashion. We need a transition period, not a complete removal of print but a new way of assigning rights and a migration to holding electronic rights.
A: RENEAR: The NSF has put controls on the number of articles you can cite on a grant proposal. This is a sign of hope, a sign of change.

Q: How should we deal with archiving problems for material being produced electronically? We cannot count on certain mainframes remaining repositories of certain titles, or of scholars staying put.
A: BANCHOFF: This is not necessarily a new problem. Benedictine monks copied scrolls because otherwise they would deteriorate. What is required is constant upgrading, a constant effort to keep files fresh.

Q: Please comment on the trend toward scientists reaching the user directly, instead of through the intermediary of a library.
A: MUSTARD: He would NOT want to administer a general public server containing his data. He wants a publisher to do this. He thinks there's a role for people in publishing and libraries to maintain and monitor such databanks; this job needs to be centralized so that work goes through the proper channels and garbage is not filling the Internet.
A: BLANCHARD: The model he would use is that of a Learning Media Center or Media Lab. He's an author; he wants people to buy his book and he'd like people to take it home, and he's not used to the model that an author develops something and then gives it away. He believes the work of serials librarians will be around for a long time, but he's not sure exactly how.
cope with turning raw facts (information) into knowledge (a broad base of understanding in a given area). The current demand for relevance is now driving the creation of such tools, prompted by a demand for ways to navigate and interrogate sources on the net, ways to sift and filter this almost limitless supply of information.

Wall sees that in the future, the role of bibliographers will be to provide this filtering function by doing machine-assisted retrieval and adding value to the information gathered. For example, the bibliographer must begin to enhance the indexing and abstracting function by providing a specific context for, and perspective on, the material as well as offering a value judgment.

The only way we will achieve these goals is through the development and application of standards, including Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML), to facilitate linkage between resources. We will need a means of identifying individual articles; even an article-specific ISSN may not be adequate. We may need to rely more often on the kind of technology used to create a theme issue for Library Hi Tech: transaction log analysis, a dynamic pattern for generating scholarship by interacting over the net. We will need to accommodate diverse patterns of future serial publications, through dynamic numbering systems, that will allow linkages and retrieval of specified resources. Wall believes this can be done by building on the ISBN and ISSN along with Internet and BITNET standards.

Wall believes that libraries need to become publishers. Dial-up access to the OPAC created a role for libraries as institutional file servers, which could be expanded so that the library maintains material from outside the library but also locally produced material, for example, dissertations, research studies, faculty papers, and the like. These "materials in the netherland between the invisible college and formal publication" could be mounted on library file servers. The library would need to administer the procedures that allow the author to update the documents and legitimate annotations by other outsider reviewers, while still guarding the integrity of the data. In this model, the library would perform the role of the electronic publisher. These file servers, maintained by the library, are the serial of the future. Librarians can position themselves to provide quality control over them, design them, supervise them, and maintain them.

As far as the publisher's role in the future, Wall believes that traditional publishers will continue to exist if they continue to add value to publications. One possible scheme could be to have articles in locked or unlocked categories, so that they are mounted electronically early in development, and then unlocked when the article is fully developed, say, when included in an indexing and abstracting service. The benefit of giving the publisher access to a file server is that it allows the publisher to evaluate interest in topics; to offer automatic downloads in a kind of SDI option; and to revise articles previously published in a dynamic mode.

In terms of access to electronic serials, Wall sees that early access on a file server with ongoing online commentary and the ability to find related relevant material on the Net, will speed access to information. However, the extreme rate of growth and diversity of users may prohibit the development of this process. Excessive, redundant, nonproductive use may cripple the system unless we find a way of putting critical intermediate guides in place to interpret resources and navigate among them. Wall believes we need to evaluate the role of these intermediate guides in the future, to make them knowledge mapping tools. We will need to provide more than location elements; content-related information must also be offered to allow the user to judge the item's value and usefulness. Developments in artificial intelligence are beginning to make machines add such value to documents by creating abstracts using "knowledge" of where to find key phrases. These abstracts are actually indistinguishable in tests from those developed by human beings (and are likely to be rated just slightly better than human-written abstracts.)

Wall closed by reiterating that libraries must become knowledge places, not information places. We must upgrade our tools to be knowledge tools. What we do is important, in that what we do to enhance our tools is a critical factor in solving the monumental human problems we face today.
Answering the question "What will the journal look like in the year 2020?" Lenzini noted that for popular journals, the portable, convenient print format we now today will continue to exist even in 2020, and that trade journals and house organs are also likely to remain in their current form. Scholarly and research journals, however, stand a good chance of changing from paper to electronic format, moving at the same time from a linear mode to an interactive mode with a more active end-user.

In addition, Lenzini predicts that by 2020 the unit of scholarly discourse will no longer be the issue but the article. Networked users will be linked to a combination of databases containing articles at various stages of development—those that are in consideration, in process, and complete. A virtual database will control many smaller databases. A master copy of an article will be held electronically by its publisher, and distributed by that publisher on demand. The cost of this master copy will be paid by the author or by society in the form of grants. The publisher’s role will be as facilitator, producer, distributor, and one of many money handlers.

In this shifting economics of scholarly communication, if an author wanted to mount an article on a server, that person would bear the cost of having it mounted. The value of an article would be based on its use once mounted. Thus the economics of publication would shift from payment before the fact of use to after the fact of use. This aspect of the future will arrive sooner than 2020; it is already at work and will be fully in place by 1995 or 1997.

What we will see in 2020 will be a dramatic shift towards multimedia technology, offering a new kind of work similar to the article in its treatment of one topic but not limited to linear expression. This new system will recreate events through modeling and simulation; instead of listing citations, in the multimedia environment one will have access to a full reproduction of the referred-to text or data.

Lenzini also speculated about the barriers to achieving this future she has envisioned and pointed out that the ability to author in this mode, since only some have the necessary tools, is a serious limitation that nevertheless may be overcome by the ability of the commercial sector to provide products for general consumption. Microsoft, for example, is investing heavily in multimedia technology which may enhance general access to the technology.

Looking ahead to what role librarians might play in the serials world of 2020, Lenzini sees that we are "seriously threatened," unlike the publisher and scholarly society, whose roles will remain the same. To survive, academic librarians must become subject-oriented consultants. Libraries will be storage houses, and what we now think of as the campus library will be limited to undergraduate facilities that will function somewhat like public libraries, offering a cultural center and access to technology. Training for librarians will not be library-based; we are seeing the seeds of this trend already in the closing of library schools across the nation.

Despite the fact that this future may sound bleak, Lenzini feels that this is "not a bad or discouraging picture." She sees that librarians will have a role, but that it will be radically different.

Richard Lucier, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Information Management and University Librarian, University of California at San Francisco.

Lucier, who was project director for the Human Genome Database at Johns Hopkins, and is now principal investigator for the Red Sage project, focused on the influences that will affect scientific communication in 2020. He sees the entire cycle of scientific communication breaking down, as the traditional flow from scientists to publishers to libraries to readers crumbles with the advent of technology that allows publishers to reach the end user directly with their product.

Lucier believes that the journal as we know it will disappear by 2020. He’s not sure what will replace it, but he can see that technology is altering the
way research is done and that radical change will
occur. He sees the 1990s as the "decade of the
brain," in which the traditional journal will step
aside as unable to meet the needs of researchers
publishing large databases of information related
to mapping the brain. Telecommunications will
then become the most influential factor shaping
scholarly communication in the year 2020. Given
the importance of telecommunications, Lucier
believes that is the arena we must try to influence.
We should also not lose sight of two important
elements of the landscape of the journal's future:
knowledge management and intellectual property
rights.

Lucier has considered what we can do to influence
these major trends so that we will have a major
role to play in 2020. He is less optimistic now
than he was several years ago about the position of
the librarian in that future, noting that he himself
currently holds a position for which five years from
now he would not be seen as qualified. Thus if we
want to have a future, we can't wait passively, we
must act: we must deal with both paper and
electronic formats, we must focus our energy as
much as possible on the critical knowledge
environment, taking time away from the paper
environment and spending at least one quarter of
our time on the creation of the virtual library.

The virtual library will depend on knowledge
management, which can be defined as a shared
responsibility for scientific and scholarly
communication through a collaborative process
(including librarians and scholars) using various
tools. The steps in the process of knowledge
management include forming a collaboration,
developing a knowledge base, creating online tools
for maintaining data (aiming for currency, quality,
and integrity), and developing customer-focused
information products and services. This process,
not information retrieval, will be the focus of the
future.

In the knowledge-based environment, we need to
concentrate on building technical infrastructures on
our campuses, putting software into the structure,
and leaving behind the concept of the turnkey
integrated library system, which will no longer
suffice. We will need to recruit a new kind of
people into libraries; people with MLS's won't be
able to do this work; those with in-depth subject
expertise will.

We need to form collaborations on campus,
creating federations of campus informatics groups
interested in knowledge-based applications and
information technology. We must participate and
experiment, improve our informatics skills.
Librarians will become trainers, educators, and
tool builders. All of this change will require
funding, and we must diversify our sources of
funding if we want to survive. Our future will be
as collaborators, working as intermediaries
between scholars and users.

Laura Gasaway, Director of the Law Library &
Professor of Law, University of North Carolina at
Chapel Hill.

Gasaway focussed on the legal issues facing us in
2020. She believes that copyright or a similar form
of protection for creative works will continue to
exist, but factual works may have a different type
of protection, such as restrictive access codes.

The 1976 copyright revision tried to be forward-
looking, moving beyond questions of print-based
production in Section 101, which addresses works
created over time and different versions. Law
dealing with different versions of a work is relevant
to what we now face on the Internet with evolving
revisions, and Gasaway believes current copyright
law is therefore adequate to recognize each
version. Fixation can be used as a concept to deal
with the electronic journal format.

In Gasaway's ideal year 2020, publishers would
have found a mechanism to deal with the fair use
of journals, allowing printing, downloading, and
transfer to a particular single user. Publishers
would also allow interlibrary loan so that not all
libraries need to subscribe to a given journal, and
would have tracking mechanisms to check for
overuse or unauthorized use.

Gasaway sees more information being distributed
informally in 2020, and a possible sharing of
ownership for copyright between faculty and
universities. In developing such a change, the
university must examine the cost of the entire
scholarly endeavor, not segmented into parts, but
as a whole. It may be that it will be found
advantageous to increase the funding of university
presses to manage the issues of rights, etc., for
faculty work.
As for peer review, Gasaway sees that societies may need to manage this process in the future. Whether or not scientists will assume their own liability for inaccurate results, and peer review will become outmoded, she is not certain.

For their part, libraries must exercise fair use rights and negotiate effectively for them. Even computer programs have been accommodated in the current copyright law, so the same law will probably work for whatever other problems we face in the electronic era.

**David Rodgers, Head of Systems Development, American Mathematical Society/Mathematical Reviews.**

Rodgers sees the shift towards electronic communication in scholarship as following a pattern established when the spreadsheet was introduced: like the spreadsheet, the new electronic media offers a web of information, is used for knowledge and information management, is displayed in different formats, and will transform standard practices. This shift towards electronic communication will happen; and it will happen in his children's lifetime, if not his own.

The future depends on publishers’ response to challenges confronting them: challenges to add components of traditional value in new ways, to add components of new value in new ways; to seek new, different, faster, cheaper forms of access; and to transform the process of scholarly communication so that it is more efficient. Rodgers' own vision of how the market will respond is that electronic communication will be the predominant model for most disciplines. While the values underlying scholarship will remain the same, collaborations will be common, multimedia technology will be pervasive, and customized, personalized resources will be more widespread. Access to information will be possible anytime, anywhere; interactive bibliometrics will be possible; tools will be available that can retrieve, interpret, and apply knowledge; authoritative versions of artifacts will be editable; and information will be distributed in many forms and channels, coming from both the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors well into the next century.

Facing these challenges and in this new environment, Rodgers sees outcomes that seem to him certain, some almost certain, and some probable. The outcomes that Rodgers sees as certain are that the scholar's major source of information will be his own desktop; the unit of transaction will be the idea rather than the article; the time between creation and dissemination of a piece of scholarship will be reduced; printed versions of scholarship will be the "most crippled version available;" the access model will win over that of ownership; scholarship will be influenced by television; and standard user interfaces will become the dominant concern.

Those outcomes that seem to Rodgers "almost certain" include the renegotiation of the roles of providers, intermediaries, and consumers of information by 2020, and the preservation by libraries of their position as primary intermediaries despite a change in their basic nature. Probable outcomes, according to Rodgers, are that authored communications will continue to dominate scholarly communication; copyright law will remain much the same; and universities will remain repositories and distribution centers.

**Janet Fisher, Associate Director of Journals, MIT Press.**

Fisher began her remarks by commenting that her opinion on what the marketplace for journals will look like in the future changes on a daily basis, and so she can in no way claim to have "20/20 vision about the year 2020."

As for her current vision of where publishers will be in 2020, Fisher sees that the market is changing. It has in the past been supported by institutional subscriptions and this may not be possible any longer. Given the limited resources institutions are now working with, transformation is inevitable. The library market is declining, and individual subscribers are not taking up the slack, since they still expect the library to provide access to the titles they need. These market pressures force us to ask whether universities will continue to support the system of scholarly publication.

Publishers in the future will have to deal with an increasingly splintered market. Fisher finds, for example, that some subscribers want paper, others want electronic delivery, others want the title on CD-ROM, or on a floppy disk. Some want prepublication distribution; others want a database.
mounted so that other researchers can access it. Thus the publisher of the future will need to provide information in a variety of forms, while still remaining financially solvent.

The MIT Press, in attempting to meet the needs of this fragmented market, is offering some journals on paper, and will continue to do so for a long time, but future products will also include titles on floppy disk and CD-ROM, through LISTSERVs, and via prepublication methods based on use alone. MIT Press plans to offer an on-demand collection of articles for classroom use. All of these products require investment, however.

Fisher’s predictions for the journal marketplace include a shrinking market in which many journals will decline and die. It will be increasingly difficult to start new print journals, so the electronic format will be used more and more often. Publishers will suffer from increased overhead costs, given the necessity to offer more than one format, and the entire financial flow will shift, with income flowing in after publication rather than prior to publication. Since publishers today do not know exactly how often each article they print is used, it is difficult to estimate what a publisher’s finances will be like when payments are based on use alone. Given these pressures, two outcomes are likely: small publishers will be consolidated into larger ones or disappear, and the services of lawyers will be, inevitably, in high demand!

From Fisher’s position at a university press, the picture of the future marketplace does not look very good. Subsidies from university administrations are being cut back, price sensitivity has increased in all market segments, back issue sales are down, and subsidiary income is growing too slowly to compensate for lost sales.

In this new environment, publishers will need close ties with computing centers or places with technical expertise. They will have to be ready to take on electronic journals, and must develop systems beyond ASCII text. They must, as well, teach their customers that their product is worth paying for.

Fisher sees a decline in emphasis on publications in the granting of tenure, which will mean a drop in article supply, but also an increasing demand for prepublication discussion formats. There will be more difficulties weeding good from bad scholarship, given this use of prepublication formats, since without the identifying labels of a given press or institution, it will be more difficult for users to judge the content of an article quickly. This could lead to an overall reduction in access rather than enhanced access, given the inability to effectively filter research.

Fisher is also concerned about a shift in philosophy among libraries. They seem to have moved from their original goal of guiding on-site users to on-site materials, to a much broader goal of providing access to any user anywhere, to any information anywhere. This implies that fewer actual purchased copies of a given journal need exist, and that the library need not own every relevant title. If every library borrows from another library, publishers will inevitably have to increase their prices, since publishers need some kind of return on their investments. Publishers will, in fact, have to increase their prices until they are paid for every use of their product. Publishers will have to reach the individual more and more, as the library market shrinks; this will require new forms of publication, but not necessarily new publications. How publishers sell, and to whom they sell, will be very different in 2020.

---

NASIG 8TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
CONCURRENT SESSION I:
"Cataloging Electronic Serials: Today and Tomorrow" / Maggie Horn

Introduced by Ann Vidor, Head, Cataloging Dept., Emory University, three speakers addressed the thorny problems of cataloging the wild electronic serial -- progressing from the sneaky "we'll just publish a CD-ROM supplement to this issue" to the up-front "we'll publish a CD-ROM serial" to the elusive "we'll publish an ether serial."

Dina Holiman Hutto, Serials Cataloger, Pennsylvania State University.

Hutto addressed the problem of the "electronic publication wanna-bes." These are disks which regularly (or occasionally) accompany a paper issue. She noted that when these disks first arrived they were few in number and had only a peripheral connection to the journal, but that they quickly
reached critical mass and also became integral parts of the journal issue. She then led the attendees through the Penn State policy for coping with these items. The policy, very briefly summarized, states: if the computer disk is bibliographically related to the serial, it is retained, added to the serial record via note and/or physical description with additional access points for significant titles. The disk is backed up on receipt and eventually stored with the main item, usually in a pocket.

Gail McMillan, Serials Team Leader, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

McMillan then brought the audience one step further, as she discussed cataloging (or catching?) COLDS: Computer Optical Laser Disk Serials. Just as there is no cure for the common cold, there appear to be no right answers for the common COLDS. She noted that in learning how to catalog these beasties she used her serial knowledge first and then turned to AACR2 Chapter 9 for additional information to include in the record. The question of which MARC format to use -- serial or computer file -- is, at the moment, a local decision or a system-defined one.

There are unique problems in cataloging COLDS, a major headache being access to equipment in order to read internal sources for bibliographic descriptions. McMillan discussed internal and external sources of information and how to display them, recommended applying the same guidelines for classification and subject analysis as for "normal" titles, and emphasized that notes are extremely important.

Priscilla Caplan, Head, Systems Development Division, Office for Information Systems, Harvard University Library.

Last, but not least, Caplan led the audience into the intangible world of cataloging resources available on networks only. After a brief review of the development of electronic media (social science datasets, microcomputer software, CD-ROM databases), she noted all the resources now available on computer networks: electronic documents, newsletters and journals, white pages, library catalogs, and a host of other files. The challenge to catalogers is how to tell a patron a) what is "out there" and b) how to access it. She presented the background of and recommendations from the Internet Resources Project of OCLC. Suggestions have been forwarded to CCDA and MARBI. A particularly intriguing "pie in the sky" possibility is encoding information in a MARC record such that a patron could issue a command from the appropriate field which allows a direct connection.

This reporter came away from this session quite comfortable with the supplemental CD-ROM problem, less intimidated by COLDS and other tangible electronic journals, and intrigued by the possibilities of bibliographically controlling the Internet.

NASIG 8TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE CONCURRENT SESSION II:
"Between a Rock and a Hard Place: The Future of the Subscription Agent" / Ellen Finnie Duranceau


Maddox began by explaining that from the viewpoint of a European vendor, North American vendors are "specialized" because they tend to deal in serials only or books only, while in Europe vendors deal with both. There are different degrees of specialization: by geography, or material type, and so to some extent or another, all vendors specialize. There is a trend, too, when competition increases and the market pressures are strong, for "megavendors" to imitate "specialized" vendors by shrinking their staffs, or "rightsizing."

Vendors, according to Maddox, prepare services either "just-in-case" the customer wants them or "just-in-time," when the vendor knows the market wants a given service. Basically, then, some vendors take a more proactive stance that relies on thinking and hoping about customer needs. These vendors rely on being the first to the market with a new service that they think customers require. Other vendors have a reactive philosophy of doing business; they wait until they know exactly what the customer wants, and provide that service at a high quality without emphasizing being the first to offer it. The choice of strategy, proactive or reactive, is not necessarily related to the size of the vendor.
This choice of business philosophy, however, does have an effect on the vendor's chances for survival. For example, in the case of document delivery, there are vendors adopting the proactive stance and jumping into the market, assuming it is what customers want; other vendors are waiting, holding back, to see if document delivery is the right economic future and waiting to know more before they enter the market. This reactive stance means that survival is more certain, since it does not risk failed investments. There is a great deal of risk in looking into the future and trying to predict what will be needed; a focus on the future can also mean that a vendor will lose sight of what is needed in the current market. A balance between present and future is essential to success, but current services are the most important.

As for the future, Maddox believes that there are two key concepts that will influence us: interactivity and outsourcing. In terms of offering interactive products to meet market need, investing in quality people who can innovate will be essential. The new interest in outsourcing may or may not evolve into a major trend, but if it is adopted on a wide scale, Maddox anticipates that such programs may be more costly in the long run than their planners expect. As we look to the future, Maddox warns, we need to analyze what we are giving up for what we are getting.

John Cox, B.H. Blackwell, Ltd. "The Megavendor: Threat or Promise?"

The business of selling journal subscriptions has been a low-profile business in the UK, a back-room service operating as an adjunct to bookselling. Handling books has now diverged from handling journals, and subscription processing is now a large and specialized business. This market is, worldwide, about 2 1/2 billion dollars per year, and greater than half of this market is in the U.S. Approximately 120,000 titles are managed from about 12,000 publishers, who have a huge range of requirements and business practices. Eighty percent of the subscription business goes through subscription agents; this fact alone suggests that vendors must have some value.

For Cox, this value consists of consolidating reporting and managing the traffic of subscription handling: vendors simplify and rationalize. The service vendors offer is directly related to the need for one-stop shopping, and helps publishers who would be overwhelmed by the individual needs of libraries, as well as libraries who would be overwhelmed by the individual requirements of publishers.

The vendor business, is, then, much like that of the travel agent. The travel agent offers a myriad of personalized services, all of which you could do for yourself, but at much expense. The subscription agent performs a similar role, but is even more important as an intermediary because the publisher can't really provide for the library's needs directly at all; an interface between the publisher and the library for title changes, currency exchange, and reporting requires a reliance on technology that the vendor can provide.

The difference between large and small vendors is growing. Large vendors have all entered the document delivery market. The subscription agent must cover an ever-increasing base of operating costs by expanding the customer base and increasing volume. This ultimately leads to a consolidation of the agency business, where fewer, larger players exist, following a classic economic model.

This consolidation has been going on for a while now in the subscriptions business. Some small agencies may survive, but in general Cox believes they are a threatened group unless they specialize. The market is now dominated by four major vendors: Blackwell's, Faxon, EBSCO, and Swets. Small vendors will be not be able to match the services that will be provided by these vendors.

In another market shift, Cox sees that publishers will establish their own direct link to the customer for document delivery. These services will need to be organized and paid for. This role will fall to an intermediary, to rationalize and coordinate the process, and thus there will be a new enhanced role for the middleman.

The library, meanwhile, has little to worry about as the role of the vendor shifts or as market consolidation takes place, since as long as there is some choice of vendor, with competition between them, libraries can count on good service, even if it is not from the "corner shop supplier" but rather from one of the larger vendors, where quality service will still be available.

Stephens reviewed for us the "information landscape," in which two models exist simultaneously, the old print/mail system for dissemination of information, and the new electronic/digitized system for dissemination of information. While most businesses are now living somewhere between these two models, the small agent will still have many years ahead relying on the standard business without entering document delivery. Meanwhile, the author and the user will remain the constants in the marketplace, as they have been in the 200 or so years since the journal evolved.

Our way of doing business and even thinking about the journals business has been defined by the packaging of articles into a single issue in print, and delivering that issue by mail. In the new electronic mode, it is possible to bypass both the vendor and the library; for example, television will offer more and more to the consumer in his home, and institutional information will have to compete head-to-head with consumer sources of information just in terms of the volume of information that will be made available.

EBSCO has always looked for services they can provide that revolve around the dissemination of information, and they are therefore going into document delivery, where the lines between the roles of publisher, vendor, and integrated library system are being crossed. In this budding market, technology was at first a huge obstacle. Barriers to entry are now lower, but competition will still be stiff. User-friendliness, speed of delivery, low cost, and good coverage will be the key elements of success.

This market is a good opportunity, but its outcome is uncertain; a vendor must be careful not to be made obsolete, but entering new markets carries its own risks. The traditional print/mail system still provides a vast opportunity, and is still the most important. Stephens believes it will remain so for quite a while. The vendor of this material will need to keep an eye on new services to mediate between publishers and libraries, providing financial and bibliographic data to help with management decisions, and offering to analyze data in new ways, such as price per page of text, etc.

Stephens sees our time as one that offers more questions than answers, an exciting time that finds us in transition between two systems, the traditional one of print/mail and the new one of electronic/digitized information dissemination. The demand and the supply of information exceeds what we can cope with, but all of this is to the good. We need a certain level of "nondisruptive mental anguish" in life, since the right level of anguish affords an opportunity to be creative.

Adrian Alexander, Southwest Regional Manager, The Faxon Company.  "Ownership and Access: Strategic Implications for Subscription Agents."

Alexander provided a conceptual framework for the decision-making process that all vendors will need to use in the next one to five years if they want to remain in their current position--between a rock and a hard place! There are strategic planning factors that Alexander believes need to be taken into account, and he discussed each of the following:

1. Declining subscription base
2. Eroding publisher discounts
3. Increased competition
4. Strategies for survival
5. Insurmountable opportunities

In terms of the declining subscription base, Alexander noted that an average of 600 titles were cancelled in each ARL library last year. Many of the cancellations were STM titles that bring much of the vendor's revenue.

Eroding discounts have a direct impact on vendor revenue, since discounts and service charges are the two primary sources of vendor revenue. Vendors must rely more and more on publisher discounts as libraries put pressure on service charges, but publishers are trying to reduce their costs and the easiest solution for them is to cut vendor discounts, which is what major STM publishers did last year. It is essential, in this environment, to define the market correctly and to recognize that the subscription business is currently a low-growth business.

Increased competition is the result of the declining subscription base and the eroding discounts. The
Vendors in this market are forced to increase their size, either through buying more share by lowering their price, and playing the "price-cutter" role, or by broadening and enhancing their service package, and playing the "service enhancer" role. Most vendors have tried to do both to survive, but both strategies reduce the operating budget. The service enhancer faces the high cost of providing services, and may lose out when price pressures increase.

Vendors therefore need a plan for long-term survival, and this requires that the vendor determine what resources are available, what the financial objectives are, and what level of risk the leadership of the company is willing to assume. Each strategy has its own vulnerabilities. For example, the key implications of the niche strategy are that it can limit the company's ability to grow and force the company to cut expenses; the vendor with more ambitious financial objectives has trouble with higher operating costs, and feels the pinch when price pressures increase. As the pressure to increase access services mounts, technical and human resources may need to be enhanced. And above all, top level management must understand the entire information industry in order to be successful in both the subscription and access businesses.

The "insurmountable opportunities" Alexander referred to are that any vendor may lose out if they define their business the wrong way. Vendors can't afford to see themselves in too limited a market, as railroad industrialists did when they failed to see themselves as part of the transportation business, rather than the railroad business.

**Question & Answer Session**

A Question & Answer session followed the four speakers. Highlights follow:

Q: To "megavendors": the temptation to diversify is strong. Is there some likelihood that vendors will stray from their core responsibility from the library's point of view? What outsourcing do they see themselves doing?

A: COX: Outsourcing has been known for years in the UK, travelling under the phrase "market testing," which is a means of reducing headcount. It is pervasive in the UK government right now, but is not an issue in other places, for example, in Australia. The main point for the vendor is that if they are to provide services to libraries who want to outsource, they will need to form alliances with those who have the skills they don't have, to come together and provide services no one can provide alone. It is easy to neglect the core business in the face of more exciting opportunities, but vendors can avoid this by maintaining close contact with customers.

A: ALEXANDER: Business with low market growth and high market share are "cows;" what a vendor chooses to do with revenue generated from this kind of business varies quite a bit. It behooves the vendor to keep the "cow" healthy; that is, the subscription service must be maintained. As for outsourcing, it has been around a long time. Catalog cards have been purchased from LC, for example. This is outsourcing. But now the idea is that outsourcing will be a more pervasive mode of doing business, with a heavier impact on human resources. Some vendors will be in a better position than others to meet this need, but many will need to form partnerships to be able to do it. While Faxon has done some outsourcing (checking-in and processing journals for libraries) Alexander is unsure how prevalent extensive outsourcing will become.

A: MADDOX: Harrassowitz has done outsourcing before, preparing issues for the shelves and sending records with them on magnetic tape. This was common in the era from 1977 on, at the suggestion of an innovative librarian at the National Library of Medicine. But it proved very costly and that project has now been dissolved.

Q: There was a comment from one of the panel members about the need to invest in people. How are the vendors represented on the panel recruiting, training, and retraining people at their companies?

A: STEPHENS: The subscription business is a people business. The biggest challenge as a manager in this business is to get a good team of people and keep it evolving. EBSCO tries to invest in training and keep the jobs interesting, as well as giving people authority. Turnover is tremendously costly and must be avoided.
A: COX: Cox agreed with Stephens, and pointed out that there is a need to recruit well and train well. Employees must be inculcated with the idea that the customer counts.

A: ALEXANDER: Vendors, like libraries, are in the service business. Automation without the people to make the machines do what you want them to do is not the answer. Service comes down to people being properly trained.

A: MADDOX: Maddox pointed out that Harrassowitz has had a hiring freeze because they anticipated reduced business. No one at Harrassowitz is automatically replaced, and there is a commitment to those people in current jobs so that they feel secure and can perform well, rather than being distracted by the possibility of losing their jobs. Harrassowitz is hiring, however, and when they do they look for special skills to help the overall company grow and develop.

Q: What will the impact be on vendors of changes in Eastern Europe?

A: COX: Eastern Europe is a complex situation politically and economically and in relation to Western Europe. Hungary, and Poland, for example, are more developed than Yugoslavia. All of those within the Commonwealth of Independent States are in a "dreadful mess," and it will be a generation before these places catch up with Western Europe. These countries are still dependent on international aid to increase their libraries.

A: ALEXANDER: Faxon has an office in Moscow and has tried to work with the Soviets to help them understand how to price their publications and how to distribute them now that the government is not controlling the process.

A: MADDOX: The complications of dealing with Eastern Europe have increased. Titles are announced and never published, but it is impossible to know if when you do not receive something this is because it was never published, or if it was lost or not shipped. Harrassowitz has formed a strategic alliance with specialists in the Eastern Europe area, Kubon and Sagner, but even with this help, the process is very imperfect.

NASIG 8TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
/ Eric Celeste

The presenters at this concurrent session described two experiments under way which provide electronic access to respected scientific and technical journals in specific fields. The Red Sage project, a cooperative venture of the University of California at San Francisco (UCSF), Springer-Verlag, and AT&T, will attempt to distribute electronic editions of journals in the fields of Molecular Biology and Radiology this summer. Meanwhile the abstracts, and eventually the full text, of a number of Astrophysics journals are being made available through NASA's STELAR service.

Both projects seek to put researchers in touch with the information they need for their daily work. Both attempt to provide a single interface for the researcher to use. Both projects also explore the legal, economic, and social issues surrounding the distribution of journals in a networked environment. Yet, their responses to these challenges are quite varied.


Lucier and Badger described Red Sage, a project to put scientific and technical journals on the electronic desktops of researchers. Researchers at UCSF use 23 journals from Springer-Verlag through a software interface designed by AT&T. All the parties in the venture benefit: UCSF gets to provide its researchers with a state-of-the-art online resource; Springer-Verlag gets practice converting its publications into electronic form; and AT&T's RightPage information navigation tool gets a real-world shake down cruise before AT&T turns it into a commercial product.

RightPage provides a powerful graphic representation of the journals in the system, they look just like the real thing. The researcher actually sees a "pile" of journals on the screen, and can navigate through the pile by clicking on journals and their tables of contents. Red Sage also can analyze the researchers' behavior since RightPage can record what articles are consulted,
which pages were looked at, which illustrations were examined in detail, and so on. RightPage runs on Sun workstations and Macintosh computers, with support for Microsoft Windows planned.

Michael Van Steenberg, Goddard Space Flight Center, NASA. "STELAR."

Van Steenberg introduced the Study of Electronic Literature for Academic Research (STELAR). He noted that electronic resources are becoming tools of the trade, no less than telescopes, spectrographs, and photometers. NASA is working with organizations ranging from the American Astrophysical Society and the Royal Astronomical Society to the National Science Foundation and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Currently STELAR provides journal abstracts, abstracts from meetings, a job register, and many other services through a Wide Area Information Server (WAIS). Eventually they hope to provide the full text of the journals online.

It is important to NASA that STELAR be fully open and allow access to everybody. Since the WAIS standard is available, and already implemented for many workstations and personal computers, it offers STELAR a platform independent delivery mechanism. WAIS can't, however, present the journals in the same familiar way that RightPage makes possible. Searching journals using STELAR feels more like browsing a database than browsing a journal.

Variations on a Theme

When asked if users care about having public domain tools for access to projects like Red Sage, Lucier replied that he did not think the tools we will end up using most will be public domain. "Standards are important," he noted, "but money is the driving force."

Responding to a question about copyright concerns, Badger also pointed out that there is a copyright notice on each article and that institutions are required to maintain a print subscription in order to receive an electronic copy. Both Badger and Lucier anticipate more charges in the future and expect those charges to be passed on to the user.

Van Steenberg has been encouraged by the speed with which the scientific societies are adopting the notion of electronic publication. One year ago some of the societies he works with were predicting it would be ten years before they were ready to provide the data that would form the basis of sophisticated electronic journals. Now, one year later, they are asking NASA to move more quickly. For his part, Van Steenberg insists that STELAR continue to use only publicly available software to keep its doors open as wide as possible.

It is clear that electronic journals are a real part of present scholarship. As these presenters showed, though, their future price, availability, and sophistication are yet to be determined.
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Brian Kahin, Director of the Information Infrastructure Project, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Kahin explored the ways in which the electronic environment is changing our concept of copyright and how those changes can affect libraries. What is a complex set of issues in the paper/print environment becomes increasingly complex as the media, distribution, and viewing technologies are transformed. Kahin contrasted how those rights are exercised for print materials vs. electronic ones. In the print mode, the consumer received a finished product via the library or bookstore. In the electronic mode, distribution and communication are so much more efficient that the consumer can interact with the author, the publisher, the library, and other consumers, any of whom can modify the original product.

Because the electronic environment is so much more fluid and complex, the tendency is to invoke more rights to cover specific issues. For example, display rights are not a problem when buying a printed volume, but are key questions for CD-ROM purchases. Kahin focussed on copyright solutions in scholarly publishing and suggested that since monetary compensation is not commonly a concern for scholars, there could be a simple method of handling copyright through joint ownership among the participants in the research. He also suggested that a model for managing
rights in electronic publishing might be found by examining the system that public television uses to acquire television shows.

Laura N. Gasaway, Director of the Law Library and Professor of Law, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Gasaway first reviewed the incentives (economic and scholarship) for protecting works from limitless modification and replication. She also gave clear advice to libraries to exercise their rights as users. Copyright is a means of identifying and rewarding creativity, and providing for use of the creation. Copyright serves a social-cultural function that is more important than just the economic aspect. In her point-by-point review of Section 107 and 108, Gasaway explained the many ways in which the nature of electronic communication runs counter to the concepts in the law. Where a photocopy of a page really is a single copy, a scanned image of that page, intended for just one user, actually exists as at least two copies: one is in the scanner and the other is the image delivered to the user. We need to find ways to balance the attributes of electronic technologies with the copy rights, but this is difficult.

Gasaway advised librarians to be very aggressive about negotiating rights to electronic information products. She described some licenses as "copyright imperialism," a situation that libraries ought not to tolerate. Her battle cry is "alter that sucker!": never sign anything without first negotiating the rights that your library and users need.

NASIG 8TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE PRECONFERENCE:
"NASIGNET and Beyond: A Guided Tour of Electronic Networking Resources for Serialists"
/ Ellen Finnie Duranceau

Marilyn Geller, Serials Cataloger, MIT Libraries, and Co-Chair, Electronic Communications Committee Birdie MacLennan, Serials Cataloger, University of Vermont, and Co-Chair, Electronic Communications Committee.

In a lively and entertaining four-hour session, Geller and MacLennan provided a wide-ranging overview of NASIGNET, the Internet, and serials resources on the net. Even for those who use email on the Internet and are subscribers to lists such as ACQNET or SERIALST, this session was informative and practical.

The preconference began with a summary of NASIGNET's history and evolution, an overview of the Internet, and a discussion of the relevance of networks to serials work. Following this context-setting introduction, MacLennan delved into an overview of electronic discussion forums and newsletters and reviewed the differences between moderated and unmoderated lists, as well as open and closed lists. She also described the differences between Unix Listserv (of which NASIG-L is an example), a newer capability developed in 1990 at Boston University, and the older, BITNET listserv, developed by Eric Thomas in Europe. Before breaking for lunch, MacLennan taught the audience how to search BITNET listserv archives by going into SERIALST and Citations for Serial Literature archives interactively and in batch mode.

After lunch, MacLennan and Geller delved more deeply into NASIG's own Internet resources on NASIGNET and the NASIG Gopher. After Geller's introduction to Gophers, including their punctuation and structure, MacLennan introduced NASIG's own gopher. The presentation included such important tidbits as how to create a "bookmark" to a gopher location so that you needn't redo every step to get to a distant gopher.

In mid-afternoon, File Transfer Protocol (FTP) was introduced, and MacLennan demonstrated an anonymous FTP from the ACQNET archives. Geller completed the afternoon session with an overview of Internet resources from publishers, including the MIT Press catalog on the MIT gopher, and Kluwer Academic Publisher's FTP access for their books and journals in computer science and electrical engineering, as well as gopher access to the same material. Services from Springer, Elsevier, Meckler, and the planned AAUP product, based on the University of Nebraska Press's operational system, were also reviewed.

This summary can only provide the barest outline of the preconference, given the amount of material and the level of practical detail at which it was covered. NASIG members who did not attend the session can look forward to the availability later this year of a revised version of the preconference booklet that will be the official NASIGNET user's manual.
NASIG 8TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
NASIG AWARD PRESENTATION: Tribute to Dave Rodgers, American Mathematical Society
/ Ann Okerson

[The following is the text of remarks made by Ann Okerson at the award presentation during the Conference.]

In an academic department of a prestigious college where tenure had for decades been the purview of men and only men, a brilliant woman scholar at last reached those dizzying heights and became a tenured faculty member. Now, it was the custom for the tenured faculty of this particular department to go on a fishing trip cum retreat at the beginning of each academic year -- in this case for the first time joined by a member of the female sex.

As the fishing boat left shore, the woman faculty member, realizing she had left her handbag behind, asked that the group turn back for it, but her colleagues refused. So she got out of the boat, walked across the water to the bench where her bag lay, retrieved it, and walked back to the boat and sat down.

One of the male faculty members turned to the others and said, "See, I knew she couldn't swim."

At last winter's meeting, the NASIG Board voted to give a very special award and commendation for service to NASIG. While we do attempt to recognize the considerable investments that our own NASIG members make in the organization through volunteer leadership roles, we also wanted very much to be able to thank individuals outside of NASIG who have made a real difference for us. In particular, we wanted all our members to know of the partnership of a very exceptional colleague, David Rodgers, Director of Electronic Publishing at the American Mathematical Society and his systems support team in Ann Arbor. So, to him we are delighted to proffer a Special Service Award, which we shall informally call the We-don't-know-if-he-can-swim-but-he-certainly-can-walk-on-water-Award.

I'd like to share three important insights with you about Dave:

First, he is a great believer in the power of technology, well-conceived, to improve scholarly communications, scholarly publishing, and the lives of individuals.

Second, he is a leader and innovator in designing some of the most progressive and advanced electronic systems and platforms for electronic publishing today.

Third, he shares his enormous skills and gives his time generously to collaborative, partnering projects with members not only in the mathematics community but also many others. Specifically, he is a great fan of libraries and their role in the "information chain."

In the last two years, NASIG has developed an Internet electronic multi-faceted "organization," NASIGNET for its members, with discussion lists, committees, newsletters, proceedings, and more to come. Very little of this would have been possible without the tutelage, support, and partnership of the AMS and Dave. Dave gave us a model of what NASIGNET could be in the "e-math" design for the AMS' 40,000 members and affiliates; he helped us work out NASIGNET step by step; and he gave us machine space to do our experiments and communications.

There is a fourth thing -- he is an immensely nice person. Those of us who have had the pleasure of working with him learn this every week.

So, Dave, we want our members to know you and we want to recognize you for being "there" -- in Ann Arbor, on the phone, and in Cyberspace -- for us, for teaching us to swim or at least tread water, in this electronic age. From us all, an engraved NASIG crystal paperweight inscribed to you for your services with our thanks and our wish for your continued leadership and prosperity.

Dave Rodgers' response [written after the Conference]:

The NASIG meeting at Brown was one of the most interesting, most informative, and most pleasant professional meetings that I have ever had the privilege to attend. In chemistry, mathematics, computer science, or in electronic publishing. By professionals or volunteers. A benchmark. Really. Brown was a wonderful venue but you clearly shaped it to best advantage for participants in your conference. GREAT JOB! You should all feel very proud, as individuals and as an organization.
I also was surprised and flattered by the Special Recognition award. NASIGNET is very much a team effort. Most of the real credit goes to Ann Okerson and Birdie MacLennan for their vision, and for the stubbornness that is always required to turn vision into reality. The American Mathematical Society was quite pleased to be a partner to the effort. There were numerous lessons for us about what you have to do to make network tools attractive to electronic communities that involve people of varying levels of knowledge and experience. It was also a lot of fun.

Thank you very much for letting me work amongst you. NASIG is a wonderful organization. And you folks and your colleagues make it so.

NASIG 8TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
NONCOMPETITIVE FUN RUN/WALK A SUCCESS

On Saturday morning of the conference, a noncompetitive fun run/walk was held, coordinated by Mike Markwith. He writes that: "It was great to have a non-competitive outing. I think we ended up going for about 5 miles. Two of the runners had not run that far previously! The runners were:
Kat McGrath, UBC
Carl Macadam, Princeton
Sharon Gasser, James Madison
Keith Westover, BYU
Glenn Jaeger, Faxon
Myself, Faxon

The two runners who made this their milestone were Carol and Sharon. Next year Kat promises another glorious run by the water in Vancouver."

Elaine Teague led the eight walkers, along with Matt Hartman from UBC. Unfortunately, we don't have a complete list of participants, but Elaine reports that "they had a great time."

We'll look forward to a repeat in Vancouver!

NASIG 8TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
DRA INFORMAL DISCUSSION GROUP
/Nancy Dagle (Bucknell University)

About 20 people attended this session. The main topic of discussion was the imminent release of version 2.2 of the DRA serials module. We were fortunate that Bonnie Postlethwaite from Tufts, a test site for 2.2, was present and was willing to outline some of the main features of the new version. It promises to be a vast improvement over the current version, permitting greater flexibility in the checking-in of irregulars, unexpected issues, etc.

The group agreed that implementing ED1 is a high priority and that we need to communicate this message to DRA.

NASIG 8TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
DYNIX SERIALS USERS INFORMAL DISCUSSION GROUP / Marcella Lesher

The Dynix Serials Users Group met with 21 in attendance. The meeting was co-moderated by Marcella Lesher of St. Mary's University (San Antonio, TX) and M. Diane Raines of Dynix. Ed Riding, also of Dynix, was present to answer the group's questions and discuss upcoming changes in the Dynix system.

Ed Riding gave an overview of upcoming Release 140's impact on the serials module. He mentioned that a new feature would be the system's capability to read European Article Number (EANs) barcodes. With the purchase of additional software, UPC barcodes can also be read for check-in purposes. Currently, the system will read SISAC barcodes. He directed the group's attention to an article in the June, 1993 edition of Dynix Dataline, for a further explanation of Dynix's work with SISAC.

Another added feature in Release 140 will be the system's capability to print a Union List of Serials Report, so that libraries who want a print copy of their holdings can have one made available. Also mentioned were new Copy Record defaults added to the Subsystem Record, partial shipment claiming, plus analytics and monographic serials control.

Riding also discussed Dynix-Canada's work on the acquisition module, which will provide a link with
the serials module. U.S. beta site testing is expecting to start in the fall of 1993. The group then discussed individual issues and problems such as maintenance of check-in records, use of RECALL, and Dynix customer support of PALS/UNISYS users. How to handle multiple physical format subscriptions and variants in printed issue ISSN's were also considered.

Marcella Lesher, Periodicals Librarian
St. Mary's University, Academic Library
One Camino Santa Maria
San Antonio, TX 78228-8608
Phone: 210-436-3441
Bitnet: acadmarc@stmarytx
Internet: acadmarc@vax.stmarytx.edu
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INNOVATIVE INTERFACES DISCUSSION
GROUP / Elizabeth Parang

A record sixty-five people attended the Innovative Interfaces Users Group meeting on Sunday, June 13. Following a welcome by moderator Elizabeth Parang of UNLV, the Innovative representative, Sandy Weaver, talked briefly about the organization of I.I.I. and whom to call for help when. Basically two types of help exist:

1. Telephone support via the 800 numbers during the following hours:
   - Mon-Fri  5 am - 10 pm PST
   - Sat      8 am - 6 pm PST
   - Sun      9 am - 10 pm PST
   
   The 800 numbers are:
   - 1-800-878-6600 for U.S. users
   - 1-800-444-2344 for Canadian users

2. E-mail support, for non-urgent calls at the following two addresses:
   - Tech Support questions: ts@iii.com
   - Library Services questions: ls@iii.com
   
   E-mail messages are checked every hour and handled in the order they are received.

The main portion of the meeting consisted of a presentation on the Electronic Data Interchange Innopac-SISAC-X12 Claims Pilot Project conducted by Dartmouth College Libraries, Innovative Interfaces, and Faxon. The presentation was made by Carol Magenau of Dartmouth utilizing information/ transparencies provided by Joan Griffith, Assistant Serials Librarian at Dartmouth. Sandy Weaver supported the talk with an online demonstration and additional comments on the pilot project including anticipated enhancements.

NASIG 8TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
NOTIS USERS INFORMAL DISCUSSION
GROUP / Connie Foster

Susan Davis (co-chair, NOTIS Serials SIG) from SUNY Buffalo presided. Helen Gbala, NOTIS Systems Inc. was also present.

The official NOTIS Serials SIG group meets at ALA on Tuesday morning, and this gathering was an open and informal discussion. The 1993 NUGM meeting will be October 14-16 in Chicago with programs on LSER Implementation (Josie Williamson, University of Delaware, one of the presenters, was in the audience), Problem Patterns (Beth Weston, University of Delaware, one of the presenters, was in the audience). Other sessions include: conspectus work at the University of Louisville, the Ideal Acquisitions system, Reports (Quik, SAS and other), Electronic Interfaces, and the "Ask the Experts" session.

Susan mentioned that no enhancement ballot will be sent in 1993; instead the LIB1 group has proposed the formation of a NOTIS Users Council, to be comprised of four to six people. The Serials SIG co-chairs will be participating in the Users Council selection process at ALA. These recommendations will be forwarded to NOTIS for its approval.

NOTIS 5.1 has been loaded by a number of institutions (University of Delaware, Catholic University, Gallaudet, Vanderbilt-Management Library only, to name a few). Delaware is actively using LSER for its check-in. The University of Alabama, Burroughs Wellcome, and Virginia Commonwealth, among others, plan to implement LSER soon. Brigham Young, however, has decided NOT to use LSER, and continue instead to work with OPRs because they have an in-house predictive serials control system that interfaces with NOTIS and works better than LSER. BYU works with OPRs to make payments but does not use them to record receipt statements, according to Keith Westover, Serials Librarian at BYU.

Comments and observations revealed that some
are bringing up LSER only in response to administrative pressure, not because they want to use it. Unfortunately, Faxon SC-10 clients have to migrate off that system as Faxon Manager has been scrapped. The question of how long NOTIS will support check-in on OPR records remains unanswered. There are still many legitimate reasons to use OPRs for check-in since LSER is really designed for predictable serials (and how many are truly regular and predictable?).

NOTIS 5.2 will be the overhaul of circulation. No release date has been announced yet. Helen Gbala mentioned that NOTIS will introduce its client service product at ALA, she could only reveal that its name will be NOTIS Horizon.

Location-based catalog searching is not being used by anyone present. Delaware tried it, but it slowed down the OPAC system so much that they had to take it down. Helen suggested that the CICS system needed fine tuning to ease the problem of VERY slow response time. Delaware reported they tried to fine tune as best they could, but the system was still quite slow. This fall three of the SUNY University Centers, Binghamton, Stony Brook and Buffalo plan to implement PAC-Link.

Steve Savage, University of Kentucky, tested LSER with 100 titles. He is recommending to his administration that they not implement LSER because it would greatly reduce the amount of information available for public service use. The Medical Library at UK, however, will migrate to LSER because of the demise of SC350. Steve prefers staying with the manual kardex system to provide sufficient assistance to patrons.

Bill Sozansky, University of Minnesota, experienced security problems in LSER beyond just sharing bibliographic records. Even by processing unit, security seemed to be fallible.

Josie Williamson (Delaware) advised not to do retrospective check-in on LSER because it throws off the prediction algorithm. She recommends starting to check-in with the issue in hand and going forward from that point. The expected date needs to be the date you expect the next issue, not when you expect to start using LSER. This will mean different expected dates based on the actual arrival dates of your titles.

5.1.1 contains a fix for the JX search which retrieves authority records in OPAC.

Further discussion shifted to standards for holdings and the hooks to holdings for those libraries using MDAS. The ISSN is the hook to holdings in MDAS. If one processing unit has suppressed a record for a title represented in MDAS, you must remove the 022 field to allow the holdings to display for the remaining units. If you wish to "suppress" receipts from OPAC, you can change the fixed field S/T from "p" to blank and still use "R" statements. LSER will allow the display of 60 current receipts (each issue occupies a separate line), so patrons could have to scroll through several screens to find the particular issue they need. LSER will maintain the actual receipt date in the history file. The OPR Modification Date (MD) changes each time you edit the R line.

Steve Savage described the problem with correct prediction of 4 or 6 combined issues. You need to start with a pattern for a monthly frequency, but the system cannot predict the correct issue numbers after the first combined issue. Many commented on the inflexibility of the new serials module. Beth Weston (Delaware) remarked on the need for a toggle from list to LSER and vice versa, since payment and claims are still handled with the OPR.

The issue of receipts for government documents and gifts was raised. Since there is no payment or claiming of U.S. Depository material, SUNY Buffalo records receipts directly onto the MHLD.

Susan Davis noted that LSER does not predict months in other languages. ANSI Level 4 Holdings Standard requires you to use the information from the piece. English only is contrary to this standard, as is the NOTIS recommendation to use open-ended holdings statements on MHLDs once you start using LSER. Where is NOTIS with EDI? Will LSER be able to take advantage of developments in this area?

Joyce McDonough (Columbia) asked if anyone else was having difficulty with system messages about storage violations and fiscal year out of scope when posting invoices. One other person had also experienced this problem. Delaware had had a similar problem with file corruption.

Alex Bloss (UI-Chicago) and others observed that administrators are often the ones driving us to
implement LSER (or more generally NOTIS modules), and it would be very difficult to convince them not to adopt any new releases/modules that NOTIS develops. However, after the frustration expressed during the meeting and the recognized short-comings of LSER, many were prepared to return home and fight the good fight.

Thanks to Connie Foster, Western Kentucky, for taking notes at what turned out to be a very lively and informative session (for 8:15 am on the last day of a conference!).

NASIG 8TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE CATALOGERS' INFORMAL DISCUSSION GROUP MEETING: INTRODUCTORY REMARKS / Marilyn Geller

A number of people deserve credit for the success of this year's Catalogers' Meeting. Volunteers who helped to make the meeting run smoothly include: Paula Sullenger, Barbara Weir, Crystal Williams-Jackson and Gretchen Yealy. People who suggested topics for the agenda, made brief presentations and/or provided documentation include: Carroll Nelson Davis, Beverley Geer-Butler, Matt Hartman, Birdie MacLennan, Kevin McShane, Margaret Mering, Regina Reynolds, Kay Teel, Mitch Turitz, and Don Wood.

At the close of this year's meeting, I "announced my retirement" as moderator of this session. I am very pleased to announce that next year's Catalogers' Meeting will be in the capable hands of co-moderators Beverley Geer-Butler and Margaret Mering. I know that we will all be hearing from them in the coming months as they start organizing for our meeting in Vancouver next June.

On thinking about the change of moderators, I was looking for a bit of historical perspective. Tina Feick supplied some information from her memory banks. Tina was the President of NASIG when we held our 3rd annual conference at Oglethorpe University in 1988. During the conference, Tina was asked for time and space for an informal discussion. She quickly canvassed the Board members for approval and asked Roger Presley, as a member of the Local Arrangements Committee to find us a room. (Having served on the Brown Conference Planning Committee, I now understand what is entailed in such a request. Thanks, Roger!) Tina reminded me that over 100 people showed up for that first informal meeting and that the feedback was so positive that informal discussion meetings have become a standard part of our conference program. All of us who have attended informal discussion meetings owe a debt of gratitude to the Board members of 1988 for finding a mechanism to fill the members' needs.

Marilyn Geller
Serials Cataloger
MIT Libraries, Rm 14E-210A
Cambridge, MA 02139-4307
Phone: 617-253-0587
Fax: 617-253-2464
Internet: mgeller@mit.edu

NASIG 8TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE CATALOGERS' INFORMAL DISCUSSION GROUP MEETING / Barbara Weir and Paula Sullenger

About 55 people attended the meeting of the discussion group moderated by Marilyn Geller.

1. CONSER: Marilyn introduced Regina Reynolds (Head, National Serials Data Program) and Kevin McShane (official CONSER acting liaison to NASIG) who reported on CONSER activities. CONSER is publishing a serials cataloging manual which will be available from the Cataloging Distribution Service at LC. The manual will be published as a series of modules, each focusing on some aspect of serials cataloging (CD-ROMs, imprints, linking records, etc.). The manuals will have lots of illustrations and will be a useful tool for training or for everyday cataloging. Flyers describing the publication as well as a firm price (around $70) should be available by ALA.

CONSER discussed maintenance of serial records in an Enhance program similar to that used for monographs. This is still in the discussion stage. Also under discussion is what libraries should do about cataloging serials for which they have insufficient language expertise. Should they do these and not put them in CONSER? Or should these be done and identified by some fixed field element or note on the theory that some cataloging is better than none?

Regina Reynolds reported that NSDP is looking for a new name. She also told us that there has been discussion of the use of the 265 field for
versions. He began by describing the old card catalog solution to multiple versions: dashed-on entries. When we first began to use MARC records, there was something in the fixed field to indicate a dashed-on entry. However, AACR2 eliminated the dashed-on entry and went to the full-time assistant and some student help for her project, which involved inventorying newspapers held in barns and bathrooms as well as in libraries. Beverly recommended plenty of public relations work to keep people informed, especially since there may be a long time from the planning phase to the cataloging phase. Let people know that their participation in the project means their newspapers must be accessible to the public and that there will be ongoing costs for Idr storage. Who will pay for this and will there be an effort to keep up with changes to titles? Will there be some papers you won’t catalog such as those published outside the state or those that are primarily advertising vehicles? Will the work be done on forms, or might you use a portable PC? Gail McMillan (Virginia Tech) suggested that NEH may pay for a portable PC if you have it in your proposal. Beverly said that NEH wants all states to participate in the USNP and will help you write your grant proposal. For more information, contact NEH (nehpres@gwuvm.gwu.edu). She also recommends contacting Jeff Field at NEH (202-606-8570; for cataloging questions contact Robert Harriman, the USNP coordinator at harriman@mail.loc.gov. Also recommended is the following publication: Butler, Todd. Newspaper cataloging and union listing manual. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1990.

4. BENDING THE RULES: Marilyn opened this discussion with one groundrule: No whining! What we wanted to do was identify situations in which we do need to bend the rules and can we bend the rules in an organized fashion? Matt
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Harman (University of British Columbia) said in his library, public services staff want to have all records for a serial title together. What you are able to do will depend on your local system. His system displays titles and dates of coverage, so title changes are a little clearer. Public services has a legitimate complaint if this information is not clear. Should we let systems dictate how we deal with this problem, or push systems vendors to come up with better solutions? The discussion continued regarding how much customizing should be done to accommodate a system or individual requests. There may be future problems brought on by too much customization. Many libraries keep some kind of documentation on problem fields and exceptions. This is especially important when you change systems or get a system upgrade, as these have the potential to wipe out any customizing you've done. Paul Weiss concluded that we catalogers need to be more proactive and have more input into system changes; in fact, we should whine!

5. PROPOSED LCRI 21.30J CHANGE: Carroll Nelson Davis (Columbia University) described the proposed rule change (which would restrict title added entries for the alternative form of the title to the title proper) and asked for the group's input. The feeling was that this is an attempt by LC to reduce its workload and to eliminate unnecessary 246 fields. A quick survey of the group showed that most catalogers use discretion in adding 246 fields, often depending on their system and their public services staff. Kevin McShane feels that the variant titles are often the most important part of the record. Mitch Turitz deletes those that file together to avoid the appearance of duplication. How will this RI affect the contents of LC or CONSER records? Carroll provided some examples showing how access may be lost in some particular records. The audience was reminded that LCRI's are for LC and that we are not bound to them.

6. KEYWORD VS. CONTROLLED VOCABULARY SEARCHING: Time was short for Don Woods' (Southern Illinois University) discussion of keyword searching. Keyword searching can produce too many responses for the average user and often too many false hits. Contents notes may aggravate the problem unless the searcher makes use of adjacency and avoids high frequency words. Machine indexing may not be any worse than the indexing done by catalogers. Instead of adding only the "best" subject heading, it may be better to add all those you can think of.

The group concluded that this might be a good workshop topic for next year, perhaps expanded to how we work with our systems regarding keyword searching, LCRI's etc. Marilyn Geller announced she would be retiring as moderator and is looking for someone else to take over [see her Introductory Remarks, p.30--Ed.]

Reported by:
Barbara Weir
McCabe Library
Swarthmore College
Swarthmore, PA 19081
Phone: 215-328-8487
Internet: bweirl@cc.swarthmore.edu

Paula Sullenger
Ralph Brown Draughon Library
Auburn University
Auburn, AL 36849-5606
Phone: 205-844-1727
Internet: sullepa@auducadm.duc.auburn.edu

NASIG 8TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
WORKSTATION ERGONOMICS INFORMAL DISCUSSION GROUP / Margaret Guccione

The discussion group on workstation ergonomics was attended by nine very articulate professionals—5 from academic libraries, 2 from medical libraries, 1 from UMI, 1 from Datatrek—and everyone had something to contribute. While there are no definite solutions for many of these problems, it was good to realize that no one is experiencing them in a vacuum. We talked about furniture in relation to back and upper body aches and repetitive stress injuries; lighting, glare screens, and monitor color in relation to eye strain; research and equipment design in regard to ELF emissions.

Workshop participants noted that none of these "solutions" are completely successful, and that in many of their institutions, funding isn't available for even basic improvements like proper lighting or sturdy adjustable chairs.

Approaching the problem from the opposite direction, we thought about strategies to get people away from their terminals occasionally during the work day. Some had tried assigning tasks which are still accomplished manually (e.g.,
claiming), or assigning staff to public services tasks (e.g., sitting at the public service desk, roving in the periodicals area to answer questions). But we agreed that sooner or later, all serials maintenance functions will be online, and even job rotation strategies will be moot.

Gaele Gillespie reported that a campus-wide ergonomics committee to investigate health and safety issues had had some success at the University of Kansas. Several people thought that warning administrators about potential worker compensation problems would be effective. Many of us had discovered that prodding for any kind of information or action is not very effective if "the library is the only department expressing concern in this area" as one administrator at St. Lawrence put it. I think that an expanded workshop (with state-of-the-art expertise) would be well-attended if you're thinking about future programs. This is a real area of concern for many of us.

Margaret Guccion
St. Lawrence University
Canton, New York 13617
Bitnet: mguccion@stlawu

NASIG 8TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE
UNION LIST INFORMAL DISCUSSION GROUP
/ Betty Landesman

On June 13, 1993, 12 people attended a NASIG discussion group on the subject of union listing. The session was moderated by Betty Landesman of George Washington University, Cathy Doyle of Christopher Newport University, and Kate Thorne of the University of San Jose.

Attendees shared some of their experiences and concerns. The University of Texas is the only private institution in their union list group, and the state institutions have not been able to keep it up. Rutgers is on RLIN, and is no longer working on the statewide union list they had been batch processing for the state; RLIN shows holdings for all RLG libraries.

How to motivate people to keep a union list up-to-date? Staff need continual training or do some every day, so they can see this is "do-able". Publish the list regularly and let people know when a new version is due out -if they don't update, they won't look good! Focus on the needs of ILL - up-to-date holdings will assist ILL staff to not get requests for items the library no longer has.

Training is always a topic for discussion. How to choose the "right" record? Try searching the union list for holdings of larger libraries who have the same title and use the record they chose. Since deletion is only a few keystrokes, "cheat sheets" can be developed for students or administrative staff. A manual of practices is essential. To assist in developing one, get copies of other manuals and use or adapt them! Having a union list coordinator/network staff person go to the individual libraries is good, but requires staff availability. An option for some groups is to have an overall advisory group that meets every so often and gets back to libraries on a regular basis.

It is difficult to discuss any topic these days without the subject of standards arising, and union lists are certainly no exception! Standards are important in a union list; if everyone does the same thing, the list can more easily be migrated to a new system or new software or new standards (!). Who sets standards for a union list? Which records can be used - any record, or only DLC records, or only successive entry records, or separate records for separate formats?record for the paper copy only, or ... ? The most important criterion is that everyone does the same thing.

All in all, it was quite a lively discussion for very early on a Sunday morning, and the group agreed that this topic should continue to be discussed at NASIG.

Betty Landesman
Coordinator, Systems Planning
Gelman Library
George Washington University
2130 H Street NW
Washington, DC 20052
Phone: 202-994-1333
FAX: 202-994-1340
Bitnet: betty@gwum
Internet: betty@gwum.gwu.edu
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NASIG BYLAWS COMMITTEE 1992/93 ANNUAL REPORT / Joyce Tenney

Committee Members:
Joyce Tenney, Chair (UMBC)
Brenda Hurst, Executive Board Liaison (CIST)
Martin Gordon (Franklin & Marshall College)
David Winchester, Tabulator (Washburn University)
Gaele Gillespie, Secretary (Univ. of Kansas)
Sandy Folsom (Central Michigan University)

It is my pleasure to submit the annual report of the Bylaws Committee for 1992/93.

The committee welcomes a new appointee, Sandy Folsom, and a new Executive Board Liaison, Brenda Hurst. The current size of the committee is five members.

In April the committee received a request to review the Bylaws for possible changes to the following three sections:
Article VI, Committees, Section 3, Terms of Office
Article VII, Nominations and Elections, Section 1, Nominations
Article VI, Committees, Section 2, Standing Committees

The information was distributed to Bylaws Committee Members prior to the 8th Annual NASIG Conference.

The committee met in open session at the annual conference on June 10, 1993. The issues raised in the request were discussed in detail and a draft response was agreed upon. After final review by all committee members, a response will be sent to the original requestor. Should a formal proposal for a Bylaws change materialize from this, a ballot will be prepared and mailed to the membership in early 1994.

A formal charge for the committee was discussed and will be looked at in more detail in the fall of 1993.

Martin Gordon will be rotating off of the Bylaws Committee at the close of the 8th Annual NASIG Conference. He deserves special gratitude for all of his efforts on the Bylaws Committee over the last few years.

NASIG CONTINUING EDUCATION COMMITTEE 1992/93 ANNUAL REPORT / Adrian Alexander and Marifran Bustion

Members of the Continuing Education Committee for the period June 1992 to June 1993 have been:
Adrian W. Alexander, Co-Chair (Faxon)
Marifran Bustion, Co-Chair (George Washington University)
Donnice Cochenour (Colorado State University)
Mary Fugle (Elsevier)
Kit Kennedy (Readmore)
Janice Lange (Sam Houston State University)
Anne McKee (Arizona State University/West)

In January 1992, the NASIG Executive Board recommended the following goals for the Continuing Education Committee:
- Develop NASIG participation throughout the country
- Enlist the aid of regional councils and local/state groups
- Explore the possibility of spinning off some of the conference workshops as "road shows"
- Focus on practitioners as our primary audience
- Explore the feasibility of registration fees for workshops

Additionally, the committee was asked to develop outlines for the three sections (library, vendor, publisher) of the general "serials management workshop" that has been the staple of the committee's activities in the past. This last item has been completed, with assistance from all members of the committee. These outlines are now available for use by any member(s) of the committee or the association. One such workshop presently is being planned by Kit Kennedy, with assistance from Phil Greene (Ebsco). Another such workshop was planned originally for the Dallas-Ft. Worth area this past spring, but was not held.

At ALA Midwinter in Denver, Adrian Alexander reported to the NASIG Board on the findings of the Association's Strategic Planning Task Force, as they related to continuing education. Alexander's report specifically addressed the issue of limited geographic dispersion of previous workshops, and
the need expressed by the membership for workshops that address a variety of more specific serials topics.

In response to these needs, the committee has developed an excellent workshop that could serve as a model for regionally-based, topically-focused programs in the future. This workshop has been planned by committee members Donnice Cochenour and Anne McKee, and will be held on October 1, 12993, as a pre-conference at the Mountain Plains Library Association annual conference, and will cover topics such as vendor selection, changing automated systems, bindery selection, and document delivery.

NASIG DIRECTORY AND DATABASE COMMITTEE 1992/93 ANNUAL REPORT
/ Joan Stephens

The 1992/93 year has been an eventful and productive one for the Directory and Database Committee. Recently our activities were highlighted in the first committee profile in the Newsletter. Current [as of spring 1993] committee members are Beverley Geer-Butler, Judith M. Shelton, Roger L. Presley, Dan Tonkery (Board Liaison), and Joan Stephens (Chair).

This year's activities have included the continuing tasks of maintaining the membership database, producing mailing labels and other reports as needed, and producing the NASIG Membership Directory. Our current membership stands at 952 members, 195 of whom are new for 1993.

In addition we have added several enhancements to the database. We have revised procedures so that non-renewing members are retained in the database for selected mailings. We have established procedures with the Electronic Communication Committee for keeping e-mail addresses up-to-date in both the database and NASIG-L. We have begun to notify the newsletter editor of job changes so that members with new responsibilities can be highlighted in the "Title Changes" column.

The Directory also included a number of enhancements this year. We included information on using NASIGNET and Shiela Osheroff's listing of vendors which provide Internet access. Our thanks to Birdie MacLennan, Teresa Malinowski and Shiela Osheroff for their assistance with this.

In addition, we took steps to improve the appearance of the directory. We used better quality paper for the directory, heavier cover stock, a second color on the cover and plastic comb binding. The cost of this year's directory was approximately $5600. The feedback we have received has been very favorable.

The committee has several unresolved issues and concerns. The charge for the committee has not been completed, although it should be completed by the time of the conference. Other issues that will need to be discussed are switching to a more sophisticated software package, working out a better distribution of workload, adding further enhancements to the directory, and establishing electronic access to the directory.

NASIG LIBRARY SCIENCE STUDENT GRANT COMMITTEE 1992/93 ANNUAL REPORT
/ Harriet Kersey

Committee

Members: Harriet Kersey (Chair), Eleanor Cook, Gail Julian, Kenneth Kirkland, Janice Lange, Lisa Macklin, Kay Teel

General activity:
Because of several revisions and improvements made during the previous year 1991/92, the committee was able to function for 1992/93 on a "business-as-usual" basis, without significant change in its activities.

Publicity

Grant announcements continued to be placed in selected journals and on SERIALST, AUTOCAT, and NASIG-L electronic lists. Letters were sent to deans/directors of all ALA-accredited library schools, to selected faculty, and to representatives at related libraries.

Two problems continue to exist in publicizing the grant. First, one of our key journals is not getting the grant announcement in print prior to the application deadline. Additionally, not all library schools are doing an equally adequate job of disseminating the grant information to students. Having received very limited response to requests for additional contact persons, we need increased efforts in updating the list of faculty contacts. Contacts at related libraries, however, appear to be
doing an excellent job of reaching potential applicants who are in their employ. Students who are not employed seem more likely not to hear about the grant.

Applications

Sometimes the most minor changes prove to be the most helpful. Added to the application form this year was a space for the student's email address. Having this information greatly facilitated our communication with the recipients in particular.

Selection Guidelines and Criteria; Rating Process

The revisions made in 1991/92 greatly simplified the committee's task. A simple quantitative approach allows us to winnow the applicant pool to the top 10-12; those candidates then are rated on each of five specific criteria, as well as on a sixth open-ended factor. This two-step process provides a more objective approach to the selection of recipients. With so many excellent applicants, however, the decision still is never easy. Choosing six recipients from this year's 46 well-qualified candidates was a true test of our selection process, our decision-making skills, and our good judgment.

The committee continues to have at least one concern about the selection process. Because more and more applicants have significant paraprofessional experience, it is becoming difficult to remain within one of the original purposes of the grant, i.e., to entice into serials work persons who may not otherwise have considered it. It takes substantial effort to balance the number of recipients without serials experience or prior commitment with those with some paraprofessional experience (whose commitment to serials we want to retain as they become professionals). The committee is looking closely at ways to select recipients with fairness to both groups.

Other

One of the 1992 recipients was chosen to write a report on the conference for Serials Review. Cindy Hepfer, SR editor, is considering making this a "trend."

Grant Recipients for 1993

The committee was pleased that four of this year's six recipients came from library schools not previously represented. This year's recipients are:

Mary Cassner (Emporia State University)
Susan Elaine Chinoransky (University of Maryland at College Park)
Robert M. Cleary (Rutgers University)
G. LeGrande Fletcher (Brigham Young University)
John C. Harrison (University of Texas at Austin)
Karen Zuidema (University of Chicago at Urbana-Champaign)

NASIG PROFESSIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE 1992/93 ANNUAL REPORT / Minna Saxe

The NASIG Professional Liaison Committee (PLC) consists of individuals who serve as liaisons to and from NASIG and another organization. At present there are eleven such individuals representing ten organizations.

This committee was established by NASIG to: (1) establish a formal line of communication between NASIG and other professional organizations interested in the serials information chain, (2) assure the continuity of communication once links have been established, and (3) communicate concerns and information between organizations.

It has been the practice of each liaison to fulfill these purposes in a variety of ways. At the PLC's meeting at Brown, each of the reporting liaisons stated that she has periodically presented oral and/or written reports on and about NASIG to the other organization. These presentations have served to provide the non-NASIG community with information on the Annual Conference, the availability of the Proceedings, etc.

At several NASIG annual conferences, some liaisons have addressed the membership. It was recommended at the PLC meeting that the liaisons continue to be introduced at the Annual Conference, but that, instead, a brief written report be prepared that could be included in the NASIG Newsletter.
NASIG REGIONAL COUNCIL 1992/93 ANNUAL REPORT / Leslie Knapp

Again, thanks to the efforts of the regional coordinators and provincial/state representatives in general and to Teresa Malinowski, Sylvia Martin, and Ellen Duranceau in particular, I am happy to report that NASIG is becoming a household word all over North America.

After adding two new committees and changing the Treasurer's address, we ordered another 5000 NASIG brochures and membership inserts from our dependable printer in South Carolina. Fresh supplies of brochures were mailed to all regional coordinators and board members. To promote the NASIG scholarship, brochures were distributed to library schools throughout North America.

Besides mailing membership information in response to direct requests, I personally handed out brochures at numerous regional and local library meetings; most regional coordinators and state/provincial representatives reported doing the same. Many more brochures were distributed by the Conference Planning Committee.

A list of all current state/provincial representatives and regional council coordinators was published in the April Newsletter.

There was more discussion about the charge for the committee; the goal is to complete it this year. Since the results of the NASIG questionnaire are now in, we have been in touch with the chair of the Continuing Education Committee and will be working more closely with that committee this year. Also, because the annual meeting will be in British Columbia next June, we have a great opportunity to recruit more Canadian members.

On the whole, this was a productive year and the Committee is looking forward to meeting the challenges noted above.

FINANCE COMMITTEE: TREASURER'S 1992/93 ANNUAL REPORT / Ann B. Vidor

Our financial status is strong. Our investments continue to grow, thus assuring us that we have resources to cover any unexpected expenses or emergencies. The membership had exceeded 1,000 for the first time before the end of the renewal period. Our current membership totals 954.

For the second year, we used the September Newsletter to send out renewal notices (and directory forms). The Finance Committee sent out individual reminders in November to those people who had not renewed. Names of members who had not renewed for 1993 were deleted from the membership database, so only current members received ballots and the first conference mailing.

Finance Committee members for 1992/93 were: Martha Hill, Charles May, Judith Shelton, and Joan Stephens. Again this year, Joan did an outstanding job of preparing financial reports. This was a less eventful year than the past three. The only major change was acquiring a permanent address for NASIG. The address will be used primarily for directory listings, tax purposes, and to include on the membership application. Mail will be forwarded from the mailbox in Decatur, Georgia to whoever is Treasurer. This summer will be busy, with the transition to the new Treasurer, Dan Tonkery. With investments, a safe deposit box, and automated accounts, the transition will be more involved than it was four years ago.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS: NASIG OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE BOARD / Kathy Soupiset

Names of NASIG members are solicited through October 15, 1993 for the 1994/95 NASIG Vice-President/President Elect, Secretary, and three Members-at-Large of the Executive Board.

The nomination form is included in this issue of the NASIG Newsletter; members may put forward names of their NASIG colleagues to the Nominations and Elections Committee by mail, Bitnet/Internet, or telephone. Members are encouraged to nominate themselves.

The individuals whose names are forwarded must be current NASIG members and should meet the eligibility requirements in Article VII, Section 1 of the NASIG Bylaws.

Ballots with the final slate of nominees will be distributed to the NASIG membership on February 15, 1994 and should be returned to a member of the Nominations Committee by March 15, 1994. Election results will be published in the June 1994 NASIG Newsletter.
The Vice-President/President Elect coordinates the Annual Conference program and site selection for the Annual Conference during her/his term of office, assists the current President with committee appointments and activities coordination, chairs the Executive Board meetings in the absence of the President, serves, if needed, as NASIG's representative, and serves as President if a vacancy occurs. The incumbent is Past President in the year following her/his term of office.

The Secretary (two-year term) prepares official minutes of Executive Board and Annual Business meetings, is the primary contact for membership information, handles general correspondence for the NASIG Program Committee, and is liaison to the Regional Council and the Membership Committee.

The Members-at-Large serve on the NASIG governing body for two years to represent the general membership, carry out special assignments as requested by the President and Executive Board, and may serve as liaison to one or more committees. In addition to six Members-at-Large, the Executive Board includes the NASIG President, Vice-President/President Elect, Past President, Secretary, and the Treasurer.

NASIG has been blessed with excellent leadership which has enabled it to be the vital growing organization it is today. It is important that NASIG members participate in the nominations and elections process. You can make a difference. We urge you to submit names of individuals who will be committed to building on NASIG's past accomplishments. If you believe you can do this, please do not hesitate to nominate yourself.

Nominations and Elections Committee:
Ann Farwell (CANEBSOCO)
Martia Gordon (Franklin & Marshall)
Judy Johnston (University of North Texas)
Larry Keating (University of Houston)
Judy Luther (Faxon)
Teresa Malinowski, Ex-officio (California State University, Fullerton)
Kathy Soupiset, Chair (Trinity University)
ksoupise@trinity.edu

TASK FORCE TO PREPARE NASIG VISION STATEMENT / John Tagler

A task force has been set up to prepare a vision statement for NASIG. The statement, entitled "NASIG 2000," will provide direction for NASIG officers, the executive board and committee chairs in developing strategic plans to guide the association through the 1990s.

Priorities outlined in the vision statement will be based in part on the data gathered in the 1993 membership survey. Input will also be sought from NASIG officers, committees and membership at large.

The task force, co-chaired by Mary Beth Clack and John Tagler, includes Adrian Alexander, Tina Feick, Cindy Hepfer, October Ivins, Birdie MacLennan, Teresa Malinowski, Barbara Meyers and Ann Okerson.

There are six key areas that the task force will be exploring for possible inclusion in the vision statement: defining NASIG's role in education, expanding electronic communication among NASIG membership, financial planning for NASIG's future, evaluating membership priorities, establishing professional liaisons and setting guidelines for recognition and compensation.

The schedule calls for a draft statement to be prepared by the task force during the summer and submitted to the NASIG Executive Board in time for its November 13th meeting. Pending approval from the Board, a proposed vision statement will be circulated to the entire NASIG membership for comment by the end of this year.
UPDATE ON NASIG-L / Birdie MacLennan

[Revised from message mounted on NASIG-L 8/2/93]

The Electronic Communications Committee has just completed a major update to the NASIG-L subscriber listing. The dreaded NASIG-L "purge" of non-renewed members took place over the weekend of July 30th, along with several other updates and changes.

We implemented a number of changes to bring the subscriber listing more in line with information contained in the current membership directory (by "current", we mean as of July 16, 1993), as well as to update a number of BITNET addresses to Internet forms of address, where we were able to determine parallel (or "alias") Internet nodes for BITNET nodes. The changes from BITNET to Internet forms of address should, in many instances (we hope) make it easier for BITNET subscribers to interact with NASIG-L, which, because it resides on an Internet node, prefers Internet forms of address over BITNET forms -- particularly for message postings and sending command options to the listserv.

Here's some specific statistical breakdowns of the work that was done:

As of July 31 there were 738 subscribers
As of Aug. 1 there are 687 subscribers

There are 51 fewer subscribers

Based on a list of 188 non-renewals: 79 persons with e-mail addresses were REMOVED from NASIG-L. Based on a careful cross-check of 976 names in the membership directory: 28 persons with e-mail addresses were ADDED to NASIG-L. NOTE: If any of the 28 additions are intentionally NOT subscribed to NASIG-L, members of the Electronic Communications Committee would prefer that you set your NASIG-L subscription to MAIL POSTPONE, or notify Birdie MacLennan <bmaclean@uvmvm.uvm.edu> or Ann Ercelawn <ercelaa@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu> that you do not wish to receive NASIG-L mail. We are trying to maintain NASIG-L as a current and working listing of all known e-addresses within the membership. If you do NOT wish to be on the subscriber listing, you need to notify us. If you do not wish to receive NASIG-L mail, the SET NASIG-L MAIL POSTPONE command (to listserv@e-math.ams.org) should satisfy your wish.

Additionally, we identified 26 NASIG-L subscribers whose names were not found in the membership directory OR on the list of non-renewed members. If you are one of the 26, your NASIG-L entry now has a "(?)" next to your name (i.e., you have not been removed from the list) and the next step will be for us to review your membership status. Subscribers should be able to view their current list entry by requesting a copy of the subscriber list. Send the request as an e-mail message that reads: RECIPIENTS NASIG-L to LISTSERV@E-MATH.AMS.ORG. Entries are arranged alphabetically by last name.

We also identified @60 BITNET addresses as having a variant Internet form of address, and changed those to the Internet form. There are still a number of subscribers (@150??) with BITNET only addresses. If you are subscribed under a BITNET address and know that you have an Internet form of address, we would appreciate it if you would update us by simply sending a subscription request/e-mail message to listserv@e-math.ams.org that reads SUBSCRIBE NASIG-L <your name>. We will then be able to overlay your old form of address with your current address, and you will be able to send messages and interact with the listserv (rather than only being able to receive NASIG-L mail).

There are currently 687 subscribers on the list, out of a total of 976 NASIG members. This reflects a figure of approximately 70% of the membership with access to the electronic networks.

We hope these changes, additions, and deletions to NASIG-L will make the list more current and provide better service to you, the users. However, because of the magnitude of the updates, a few things may have slipped by us. If you have questions or concerns, or encounter problems, please notify:

Birdie MacLennan
bmaclean@uvmvm.uvm.edu
or
Ann Ercelawn
ercelaa@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu
SERIALS-RELATED CONFERENCE REPORTS

ALA ALCTS SERIALS SECTION PROGRAM REPORT: "ELECTRONIC JOURNALS: MEETING THE CHALLENGE"/ Judith Hopkins

Marcia Tuttle, Head of the Serials Team, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, spoke about the Newsletter on Serials Pricing Issues which she founded and edits. NSPI originated in 1989 in the ALCTS Publisher/Vendor - Library Relations Committee as a vehicle to provide timely information on serials pricing matters. It was distributed over three networks: Bitnet/Internet, ALAnet, and Faxon's DataLinx.

In April 1991 NSPI became independent of ALA. Because of concern that it seemed slow in comparison with the electronic discussion lists it joined forces with SERIALST@UVMVM. Many messages go out on SERIALST but the most relevant ones are redistributed through NSPI.

In 1989 NSPI had 50 electronic subscribers and 100 more who received it in hard copy; today it has 1394 electronic subscribers in 15 countries and hard copy distribution has been discontinued. Tuttle described some of the problems encountered in issuing NSPI: looping messages, maintaining the address list, etc.

The next speaker, Gail McMillan, Serials Cataloging Maintenance Team Leader at Virginia Tech, described the status of "Electronic journals at Virginia Tech today." The recommendations of the March 1991 electronic journal report have been largely implemented. Mainframe access to ejournals is now routine and the University is moving in the direction of distributed computing. The Library has obtained a DEC System 50 with Unix OS; its address is NEBULA.LIB.VTU.EDU. Ten journals in 228 issues have been loaded; they occupy 20 megabytes of space.

McMillan described some of the problems encountered in providing ejournal access. Some journals, such as PostModern Culture, often publish articles in several files.

Special routines have been set up to receive and process "CHIP News" from the Chile Information Project (a daily newsletter) without human intervention. (Cf. description by Harry Kriz distributed over PACS-L (message 8156) on 3 March 1993 with subject line: Electronic journal system).

The Virginia Tech Library supports the Scholarly Communications Project (SCP) which joins traditional library roles with publishing. With a staff composed of one full-time director and one part-time staff member it publishes three ejournals:

2. Community Services Catalyst. Twenty years of the back issues of the quarterly print journal are being scanned.
3. Journal of Technology Education was founded in 1989. The articles are received as well as disseminated electronically. All issues are available in ASCII and PostScript. Electronic subscribers receive the issues two weeks before the print issues are mailed. The number of electronic subscribers is rising while the number of print subscriptions has not dropped.

McMillan described some other electronic projects carried out by the Scholarly Communications Project. In one project, hard copy journals are scanned to create GIF images of texts interspersed with mathematical symbols. The SCP also disseminates the electronic discussion list: VPIEJ-L@VTVM1 (Publishing Electronic Journals List) which has some 800 subscribers.

The third speaker, James O'Donnell, Professor of Classics at the University of Pennsylvania and Co-Editor of the Bryn Mawr Classical Review, entitled his talk "From the Editor's Disk," which is the title of a regular column in his journal.

BMCR is a journal of book reviews by scholars in Greek and Roman studies. Some 130 reviews are distributed annually to 700 electronic subscribers; a print version containing 6 issues (totaling 450 pages and costing $15.00) goes to some 200-300 subscribers. The market will determine when it is time to stop issuing the print version.

Another journal, the Bryn Mawr Medieval Review, will soon start publication. There will be a slight overlap between the two. Electronic subscribers to both will be able to set an option so that they receive only one copy of any review.
The largest and most pleasant surprise O'Donnell has found in publishing BMCR is the sense of community it has engendered. The community of readers and the community of reviewers are beginning to merge. The list of books received elicits offers from readers to review specific titles. Those who complain about reviews are asked to become reviewers themselves. There is, however, no necessary place for libraries in this community. Libraries, if they wish to be involved, must make their own place there. Some librarians have done so, e.g., Kenyon Stubbs and John Price Wilkins at the University of Virginia are archiving past issues of the journal and indexing it via WAIS.

To a question from the audience on the relative start-up costs of an electronic journal vs. a print one, O'Donnell said that it would depend on what values are added; electronic journals with editorial boards and paid editors, that do copy-editing, etc. will have many of the same costs as a print journal, avoiding only the final design, print, and distribution costs.

The last speaker was John Ulmschneider, Assistant Director for Library Systems at North Carolina State University. His topic was "The Electronic Non-Serial: the Future and Fate of Periodicals in an Electronic World." Limiting his focus to the future of the scholarly journal, he noted that it is very easy to use currently accessible technology to do unusual things that can't be provided through the print medium, e.g., multimedia.

The future is constrained by four factors:

1. How long serials will exist in their present forms (print and electronic, mostly ASCII). The pace of change is slow because there are strong conservative interests, both intellectually and technologically. Among the pressures for change are user demands. The telecommunications industry is using entertainment as a carrot to create new user demands.

2. The evolution of architecture and standards (Z39.50, TCP/IP, etc.). No standard can capture all the elements that make up a print journal but lots of experiments are underway. The next five years will see experiments in expanding the use of the existing standards.

3. Economic models that govern publishing are pressing to move to electronic journals. Ejournals offer ways for publishers to preserve and improve their revenue flow. While print journals are based on subscriptions, ejournals are based on licensing agreements. Licensing eliminates fair use; every use has to be paid for.

4. Evolution of scholarly communications. Publishing is only one way to communicate electronically. Information is often shared prior to publications and there will be more and more of this pre-publications exchange of information over the networks. There will be new ways to conduct peer reviews and new ways to provide for the tenure and promotion process in the new electronic world.

The serials of the near future will continue to be in print form, print that is captured electronically. Some attempts will be made to expand that by use of SGML (Standardized General Markup Language) and proprietary efforts to disseminate graphics. There will be very few new standards; instead there will be a proliferation of proprietary experiments that are application and vendor specific.

The long-term (25-50 years) future will see the disappearance of serials as we know them. They will be replaced by articles loosely joined together by subject which will be retrieved from archived databases. Libraries can become database publishers. The value that publishers added to journals by printing them will disappear.

The economic picture of the serials of the future will see articles on demand instead of "just in case." The value of an individual article will change over time, depending on demand; markets respond to the profit motive.

How will we handle these changes? The present system of publishers producing journals for income will give way to a different distribution method in which libraries and producers of the content will have a larger role because the tools will be available to us at lower costs. Serials cataloging will disappear, but we will have a more important new role: to develop other new powerful tools for making knowledge accessible.
ALA ALCTS SERIALS SECTION PROGRAM REPORT: "SERIALS CLAIMS RESPONSIBILITIES, RESPONSES AND TRADE OFFS" / Susan Davis

This program was planned by the ALCTS Serials Section Acquisitions Committee, and presented speakers from various parts of the claims process.

Trisha Davis, Ohio State University, described the ideal claims flow, which doesn't quite happen in reality. Some factors which affect smooth processing are: type of library/parent institution, status of material budget, number of subscriptions/pieces received, number and level of staff, availability of automated systems, and access to publisher/vendor information.

Sandy Gurshman, Readmore, discussed a claims study her company had done. They found that a majority of orders do not require any claiming. In 1991/92 38% of all claims were sent to less than one percent of the total number of publishers. Faxon had done a similar study and found that 49% of claims were "unnecessary." Gurshman recommended a prevention approach. Libraries should fine tune receipt/expected issue patterns and claiming cycles. Publishers need to be more aggressive in announcing frequency and title changes. In many cases even the vendor is not made aware of changes by the publisher. Timing is also a critical factor. Late renewals can prevent start up with the correct issue. Publishers are sending fewer grace issues to non-renewals, which results in more gaps.

Susan Malawski, John Wiley & Sons, described a study of first claims by subscription agents to Wiley. Taking a sample of 100 claims, 49 were found to be "real" claims, 40 were "premature" and 11 were other (damaged or duplicate issues, for example). Of the premature claims, 9 were for issues not yet published, the remaining 31 were for issues published within one month of the date of the claim. From another sample of 200 claims, Wiley found that they replaced the issue in 41% of the cases, and replied with the issue mailing date 52% of the time. Wiley was looking forward to the widespread implementation of EDI and the associated standards to avoid dealing with those premature claims.

Malena Silva and Donna Hauswold, Neodata represented fulfillment centers and gave specifics on their firm. (NASIG Conference attendees will recall Silva's workshop presentation at this year's conference. She gave a somewhat briefer and less informative account at this program.) Neodata receives two and a half percent of the nation's mail. Some common problems causing service interruption or non-service were reported as: lack of address consistency, incorrect or lack of general label information, and bulk or multiple records for the same address. Neodata provides services for publishers and negotiates individual contracts for specific services. In some cases the publisher does not make backstock available or let Neodata know of its availability from the publisher's own supply. Neodata's goal is to process claims within 3 days.

The next speaker was Linda Richter, MSUS/PALS. She listed some requirements for an ILS system related to claiming: * allow the library to control claiming * store publication patterns * store information needed by agent or publisher to process a claim * alert staff that an expected issue did not arrive or was skipped * assist in processing the report of issues to be claimed * create a claim containing all the pertinent information * allow the user to create a manual claim * generate subsequent claims (2nd, 3rd) * prevent a claim from being created if the issue is checked-in

There are many difficulties inherent in trying to develop the ideal claim system as described by Trisha Davis. We are all familiar with the unpredictability of many serials. Also, it is hard to know how long to wait before claiming. All the records must be accurate and up-to-date, and claims must be reviewed by competent staff before sending to the vendor or publisher.

In the future, electronic developments will positively affect the claiming process. Electronic claims will be processed more quickly and efficiently, resulting in faster claims resolution. Electronic invoices will provide complete and accurate data posted directly to the library's records. They can also provide the specific data required by the agent or publisher. Electronic claims response will provide standard responses
that can be processed automatically without human intervention.

Electronic data interchange (EDI) was the focus of the final speaker, Tina Feick, Blackwell Periodicals. The advantages of using EDI are to: replace paper orders, invoices, claims, etc.; save time and money; eliminate human error; lower inventory; and permit an organization to divert staff to other activities. EDI requires: extraction of data, translation into a standard format, communication, and uploading.

All in all this was a very informative program with well prepared and delivered presentations from the panel.

ALA ACRL PROGRAM REPORT:
"DISCUSSION OF THE TRIANGLE RESEARCH LIBRARIES NETWORK MODEL UNIVERSITY POLICY REGARDING FACULTY PUBLICATION" / Susan Davis

Marcia Tuttle moderated the ACRL Journal Prices Discussion Group program which presented various reactions to the Fall 1991 draft of a "Model University Policy Regarding Faculty Publication," developed by the Triangle Research Libraries Network.

Gary Byrd, TRLN, described the factors contributing to the development of the document, such as: exponential growth in the number and price of journals, acquisitions funds primarily going to support journal subscriptions, and academic libraries' role as a primary support unit in jeopardy.

TRLN defined three goals of scholarly communication:
* rapid, convenient access to information at a reasonable cost
* peer review and editing
* preservation for future generations

TRLN has the following view of the future:
* initial publication by agencies directly supporting research scholars and their institutions
* electronic publication via public, worldwide Internet
* research libraries as primary access nodes and archives
* commercial publishers as a secondary market for value-added products
* technical systems and access policies developing from wide-spread collaboration

He then went on to briefly describe the policy itself. Since it has appeared elsewhere (cf. Newsletter on Serial Pricing Issues, issue 46), its content will not be repeated in this report.

Paul Mosher, University of Pennsylvania, reacted from the librarian's point of view. He reminded the audience that it is just a few publishers who are causing most of the problems.

Eric Swansou, John Wiley & Sons, responded from the commercial publisher's view. He did not agree with much of the draft policy and was very concerned about how copyright would be enforced if the university or author retained the rights. He did not believe faculty really wanted to deal with the paperwork associated with retaining their own copyright.

Dr. Jack Timberlake, University of New Orleans, is a chemist and spoke from the scholar's view. He is very concerned with quality and the need to continue the peer review process. He also wants the library to be able to afford all the journals he needs for his research.

The final speaker was Fred Spilhaus, American Geophysical Union, representing a learned society which is also a publisher. His opinion was that the model policy focused on the librarians' view and would actually maintain the status quo. He advised libraries to cut bad journals and suggested they focus on increasing the productivity of the researcher/scientist.

In the discussion which followed one person suggested that it was becoming clear that we still haven't really identified the problem, therefore we aren't coming up with any plausible solutions.
ALA ALCTS PROGRAM REPORT:
"ACQUIRING AND ACCESSING ELECTRONIC INFORMATION" / Susan Davis

Ken Dowlin (San Francisco Public Library), moderated this program sponsored by the ALCTS Acquisitions Section Technology Committee. Speakers included: Becky Lenzini (CARL Systems), William Hannay, a Chicago lawyer, and Trisha Davis (Ohio State University).

Primary data, or "full text" can be acquired in many formats, for example, ASCII, image, or some combination. Vendors, according to Becky Lenzini, should be providing platforms for all formats with a goal of honoring the rights holder (via license or copyright arrangement) yet avoiding barriers to use.

Bill Hannay talked about contract negotiation for license agreements. He advised the audience not to sign anything they did not understand. Remember those license agreements are written in the publisher's best interests, not necessarily the library's (or end user's). One can also amend the agreement by crossing out parts or adding in clauses. So far the courts have considered software purchases to be covered by the Uniform Commercial Code.

Trisha Davis concluded with some practical tips for librarians on handling license agreements. First, try to FIND the agreement (you never know where it might be secreted!), then you have to UNDERSTAND the contract. Determine WHAT to negotiate and WHO will negotiate and then sign the contract. Try to abide by the fair use doctrine. (She also mentioned that the Publisher, Vendor Library Relations committee is working on a model license agreement.)

SUMMARY OF AAUP ANNUAL MEETING / Janet Fisher, MIT Press

The 1993 Annual Meeting of the Association of American University Presses was held in Snowbird, Utah, June 26-29. The theme of the meeting was "New Horizons: Knowledge, Culture, Technology," and participants were urged to prepare for changes and new opportunities caused by the reconfiguration or disappearance of traditional structures. The meeting was preceded by workshops on electronic publishing, contracts, and management. Plenary Sessions were held on: Freedom of Speech, The First Amendment and Publishing; Futurism: Virtual Reality, Artificial Intelligence, etc.; Saving Professors from Themselves and Detoxifying Academic Prose; and Virtual Academy?: Change and Academe.

Concurrent Sessions dealt with the practical issues facing publishers today as well as in the future: postal problems, forecasting sales, surviving in the electronic environment, the importance of knowing your mission and your resources, changing delivery and production methods for scholarly journals, science publishing, computerization, developing and marketing new electronic products, the changing bookseller market, copyright, the future of monographs, and seasonal catalogs.

Focus Sessions were held on advertising in journals, damaged books, "green" production, negotiating contracts, indexing, managing electronic media without an electronic manager, NEH funding of electronic publishing projects, ethics in acquisitions, jacket disasters, and reports on new electronic projects at university presses.

In addition special dinner speakers were Cynthia Enloe, Professor and Chair, Department of Government, Clark University; Patricia Limerick, Professor of History, University of Colorado; and Terry Tempest Williams, Naturalist-in-Residence, Utah Museum of Natural History.

Of particular interest to the NASIG community were:

John Cox, Managing Director of the UnCover Company, described their operation and how they wish to work with journal publishers. Margaret Landesman, Acquisitions Librarian, Marriott Library, University of Utah, discussed how document delivery systems are used within libraries and how they complement or compete with traditional paper subscriptions.

John Seely Brown of Xerox Corporation talked about the changing mission of their company from "Technology for Documents" to "Documents as Technology" in the midst of the two biggest challenges facing business today (i.e. Managing Change and Keeping It Simple). He described the Xerox Watershed Event (in capital letters!!) in
May 1993: the development of flat panel displays of 6.5 million pixels that surpass print quality (resolution) of the printed page for the first time. This will probably be commercially available in two years.

Electronic projects such as the Journal of Higher Education at Ohio State University Press, 19th Century Literature and Classical Antiquity at University of California Press, and upcoming electronic journals at MIT Press were outlined, in addition to SGML, floppybacks, CD-ROM projects, and alternative production methods for scholarly monographs.

Ann Okerson, Association of Research Libraries, graciously flew up from ALA to give university presses an update on copyright initiatives, particularly in relation to the AAUP Task Force on Intellectual Property Management.

Richard M. Dougherty, Douglas Greenberg (ACLS), and Professor of English Susan Aiken bumped views on "Change and Academe." They all addressed change -- what is changing, and whether it is good or bad -- from their specific viewpoints. All agreed on the importance of collaboration between university administrators and faculty, university presses, and librarians, and the importance of creating forums where these issues and their implications can be discussed and heard from all sides.

REPORT ON THE SOCIETY FOR SCHOLARLY PUBLISHING ANNUAL MEETING / John Tagler

The 15th Annual Meeting of the SSP, held June 16-18 in Crystal City, Virginia, attracted 369 attendees representing members of the publishing, scientific, library and vendor communities. This year's theme was, "Changing Roles in Publishing: What Will We Be Tomorrow?"

The program offered presentations in a variety of formats. Three plenary sessions addressed broad issues in scholarly communication. Registrants also selected three sets of workshops from a series of concurrent sessions. Finally, two working breakfast sessions provided attendees with an interactive environment to discuss case studies one day and network with colleagues the next.

SSP Plenary Sessions

The first plenary and keynote speaker was Paul Gherman (Special Assistant to the Vice President for Information Systems, VPI). His presentation, entitled "The Virtual Library," offered some reflections on the changing nature of industry roles and functions forced by the advent of the virtual library and the establishment of the National Data Highway System.

Observing that by the year 2000, more information will have been published on the Internet than we are now currently holding in our libraries, Gherman stressed that, in future, information will be bought with increasing discrimination and in smaller units. He drew a picture of a scholarly communication process in which the author assumes one of the traditional publisher roles by mounting his work on the Internet, thereby dispensing with any need for an intermediary to handle printing and distribution. In view of this, publishers will need to emphasize more strongly their traditional functions of authentication and quality control as material published on the Internet is collected and maintained within a publishers' database rather than within the confines of a printed journal.

The archival function, traditionally performed by the library, will be assumed by the publisher as a database compiled of previously- and newly-published materials is maintained at a far lower cost than that of traditional warehousing of inventory. Meanwhile, librarians will serve as intermediaries and trainers for users attempting to access those multiple databases on the Internet or to use his words, "take a drink from the fire hose."

Gherman briefly reviewed the structure needed to support this "firehose" of information. For example, the Public Broadcasting model might serve whereby a large body of information for a select audience, expensive to produce but in the public good, received federal subsidization. Other models included the APS model of a national subject database or a national database archive, not dissimilar to the Library of Congress.

Gherman recommended that publishers learn to price information by the smallest unit. Indeed, "charging by the drink" became a subsequent catchphrase for the meeting.
The second plenary, "Library (of Congress) Without Walls: Problems and Promise," provided an overview of some of the projects already developed or in development in LC.

Robert Zich of the Library of Congress opened the session with a description of the evolution of American Memory, multimedia historical collections from LC holdings. "Ike program is LC's pioneering effort to share some of its unique collections with the nation via new technology. The product offers multiple means of access and delivery and has been developed for use in libraries of all types.

Jacqueline Hess (Director, National Demonstration Laboratory for Interactive Information Technologies, Library of Congress) provided an overview of long-range plans for electronic communication. The Internet was created for scholarly communication but has expanded beyond its original concept. No protocol exists for who owns evolving digital materials and this remains a big obstacle.

Three categories for electronic distribution were outlined. The first, stand-alone systems, are easy to manage but irrelevant in the long-term; their best applications are for the K-12 market. For the research community, LANs and WANs are the wave of the future.

Payment methods remain a point of confusion. Some people have recommended the model used by ASCAP (American Society for Composers, Authors, and Publishers), but this arrangement services a definable market. With digital communication, the universe is enormous and untraceable.

The third plenary was also the concluding session of the conference. Entitled "Who Should Own Copyright: Us, Them, or No One?", it generated animated response from attendees. Shim Perlmutte (Assistant Professor of Law, Catholic University of America) opened the program by explaining that there is no clear, unified position about copyright. The matter of ownership is not a single property but a bundle of rights. Copyright exists as an incentive to create and invest, but controversy exists as to who should hold that copyright. It is easiest for the publisher to get all rights but the decision should not be made because of expediency. Copyright should be flexible as to what all parties reasonably need and this can be addressed by contract. By extension, the institution where an author is employed may be entitled to hold rights rather than the author.

The publishers' perspective was presented by Mary Curtis (Senior Vice President and Publisher, Transaction Publishers). Curtis reviewed the functions of the publisher: commissioning a project, developing it, quality control, publicizing, production, marketing and distribution — all of which require time and expertise. All publishers, regardless of profit status, operate in a market environment. With the present system under attack, people are seeking alternatives. Electronic publishing is not the panacea because of the inconsistencies and lack of quality control on networks. Additionally, librarians will soon realize that electronic costs will be high. Faculty are likely to resist universities acting as copyright holders since the universities already hold enormous power over tenure and promotion. Faculty appreciate the flexibility of choosing their medium for publication. Curtis maintains that the present copyright structure is sound and just needs fine-tuning rather than revolution.

Gary Byrd (Assistant Director for Finance, Planning and Research at Health Sciences Library, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill) was the third speaker. Byrd's paper presented a proposal that has already gained its own, independent profile (see also p.43). Known as a Triangle Research Library Network position paper, it presents a model to support copyright and strengthen the university's role by bringing materials produced under the control of the producers. Three characteristics of the present scholarly communication system were presented as motivation for change:

(1) research libraries cannot keep pace with the proliferation of materials,
(2) distortions in the economic marketplace for research information have created the possibility for monopolies, and
(3) authors are not motivated to seek remuneration for their journal articles since they have received recognition via publication.

Byrd presented a five-point vision statement for copyright revisions. These include: (1) initial publication by agencies supporting research, (2)
electronic publication via the Internet, (3) research libraries serving as primary access nodes, (4) commercial organizations marketing secondary, value-added products and (5) the technical systems and access policies evolving to support this structure through combined efforts of the involved parties.

A.F. Spilhaus (Executive Director, American Geophysical Union) was the concluding speaker. He opened his comments by indicating that Byrd’s proposal probably violates antitrust laws. According to Spilhaus, the present copyright structure serves the author whose principal concerns are job security and advancing science. Anything less than full copyright transfer leaves authors with unwanted responsibilities of archiving and disseminating the material. A publisher is best equipped to provide ongoing access and dissemination widely and quickly. Among publishers, however, Spilhaus advocates that scientific societies are the only institutions authors should consider for dissemination of their publications since societies exist solely for the advancement of science. In concluding, he indicated he would prefer seeing all papers exist in the public domain rather than hamstringing scientists with constraints of copyright management.

SSP Concurrent Sessions

In addition to the plenary sessions, several concurrent sessions addressed topics of potential interest to NASIG members.

In "Article by Article," a panel focused on the roles of document delivery services and interlibrary loan (ILL) from the perspective of both publishers and librarians. Mary Jackson (University of Pennsylvania), who is currently serving as Visiting Program Officer for ARL, discussed the growing importance of interlibrary loan for the library community, the costs incurred through ILL, and the role of electronics in the day-to-day operation of ILL. Jim Ashling (IEEE) discussed his organization’s recent experiences in building a document delivery service. IEEE, which publishes 20-30% of the world’s engineering literature, created the database by collecting and scanning IEEE publications from a loosely affiliated global community. John Barnes (UMI) presented his company’s access and delivery system, PROQUEST, currently in beta-site testing. The system involves a bibliographic database in CD-ROM or tape lease, software to provide access to that database, and the hardware to deliver it to the user.

"CD-ROM; Just Another Medium" discussed the status of CD-ROM as a medium of delivery within the library. Jenny McGee (Information Access Company) outlined the viability of CD-ROM as a medium and as a source of revenue for publishers. She offered caveats to traditional publishers regarding partnering with CD-ROM publishers but stressed that partnering was the wisest course. Gayle Baker (University of Tennessee-Knoxville) outlined the life cycle of a CD-ROM on her campus tracing the product from acquisition through use evaluation. Diane Hoffman (BIOSIS) discussed appropriate pricing mechanisms for CD-ROMs, pointing out that this medium is distinct from online and needs to be priced differently. Possible pricing models ranged from pricing per machine, per user, per server, per site/entity, and price per number of concurrent users.

"Re-inventing Libraries" explored fee-based library services and their impact on the information marketplace. Brigid Welch (ARL) chaired a panel that included Steve Coffman (Los Angeles Public Library) and Helen Josephine (Arizona State University). Fee-based information services were defined, followed by discussion of how they fit into the overall library organization. Consideration was given to the various economic and environmental factors forcing this change. Models for the library of the future were discussed along with an examination of the players in this vision and their changing roles.

The notion of changing roles seemed to be a thread running through many of the presentations at the SSP meeting. Whether in plenary or concurrent sessions, or in the case studies and networking breakfasts, there was a cognizance of the professional changes being experienced by everyone in the scholarly communication system.

THANKS!

Special thanks from the Editor to all of the committed reporters for this (large) issue. --Ed.
WORST SERIAL TITLE CHANGE OF THE YEAR AWARDS

[Reprinted from ALCTS Network News Vol. 6, no. 2 (July 28, 1993).]

In honor of the Tenth Anniversary of the official creation of the Worst Serial Title Change of the Year Award Committee, we have selected the following ten titles for the 1993 Awards.

1. The "No-Nonsense Award" goes to Brain, Mind and Common Sense. Over the last few years they changed from Brain, Mind Bulletin to, most recently, the New Sense Bulletin. In selecting an appropriate award for this title, we had also considered the "Nuisance Award!"

2. The "Too Many Pralines Award" is being presented with pride to the Journal of Diabetic Complications for making the daring move to the new title, Journal of Diabetes and Its Complications. Thank you for not complicating matters more by changing the numbering as well.

3. The "Bourbon Street Award" is reserved for Applause/Best Plays Theater Yearbook of ..., which recently changed from the Burns Mantle Theatre Yearbook of ..., after it had already changed titles FIVE times before with equally entertaining and significant changes.

4. The "Muddy Waters Award," in honor of the New Orleans jazz great, Muddy Waters, goes to, yes, Piano & Keyboard, the Bimonthly Piano Quarterly. This title changed from the distinguished title, Piano Quarterly, in order to publish more issues per year--too bad they couldn't have done it more cleanly.

5. Country Reports, for all of its changes this last year due to the changing world around them, is honored by the "New World Order Award." Let's hope they can keep the countries in the SAME order from one issue to the next, which appears to be a problem for them currently.

6. The "Long Overdue Award" goes to OCLC Systems and Services [published by Meckler] for changing from OCLC Micro, reflecting the need for OCLC users to talk about more than just their micros.

7. The "Hands Across the Sea Award" is bestowed upon the European Journal of Cancer, for two reasons--one, because it's European and "across the sea", of course. And the other reason is because the nomination came to us from a library in Geneva, Switzerland. This fine journal split into two sections (after only recently appearing to have changed title to EJC) one of which is simply called, Part A. Very distinct, Part A.

8. The "Most Un-Popular Award" goes to Popular Photography for suddenly changing its numbering system from v. 100, no. 4 (April 1993) to v. 51, no. 1 with the May 1993 issue. All this grief for us and our patrons just so they could reflect the number of years of publication in their numbering. Thank you, Ziff-Davis, we are not amused.

9. We usually have a "Snake in the Grass Award" but must alter that award this year to the "Inadvertent Snake in the Grass Award" so that we can bestow it upon JASIS, whose editor personally wrote us to note a typographical error and save us from title change misery. He also asked not to give him the "Snake in the Grass Award," so, we didn't. We thank you and honor you with this special award, Donald Kraft, editor of JASIS. At least YOU care!

10. The "Worst Serial Title Change of the Year Award" goes to Broadcasting and Cable Yearbook. Bowker has had this title for two years and already published it under two different titles: the one above and Broadcasting and Cable Marketplace. For a title which has had more title changes than we care to discuss, we ask Bowker to pick a title and stick with it, PLEASE! The Title Change Police WILL be watching!

[Submitted by Rosanna M. O'Neil, 1992/93 Chair]
SAMUEL LAZEROW FELLOWSHIP FOR RESEARCH IN ACQUISITIONS OR TECHNICAL SERVICES IN AN ACADEMIC OR RESEARCH LIBRARY

This award fosters advances in acquisitions or technical services by providing fellowships to librarians for travel or writing in those fields. Research projects in collection development or the compilation of bibliographies will not be supported by this fellowship.

AWARD: $1,000 cash and a citation donated by the Institute for Scientific Information.

CRITERIA: The proposals will be judged with an emphasis on the following:
1. Potential significance of the project to acquisitions or technical services work.
2. Schedule for project.
3. Estimate of expenses (e.g., travel, faxing, data analysis, computer time, photocopying, typing).
4. An up-to-date curriculum vitae should accompany proposal.

AWARDEE OBLIGATION: Recipients of the fellowship are required to submit a report of the results of their research to ACRL for possible publication in C&RL News.

SUBMISSION PROCEDURES: Send eight copies of the application to the Samuel Lazerow Fellowship, Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, IL 60611.

STAFF CONTACT: If you have questions or need help in compiling a nomination, contact: Althea H. Jenkins at 800-545-2433, ext. 3248, or, 312-280-3248. Internet: u55385@uicvm.uic.edu

DEADLINE: December 1, 1993.

TITLE CHANGES / Ellen Finnie Duranceniu

NOTE: Please submit items about yourself or other NASIG members to the Editor.

In a creative (and appropriate) announcement, W Ted Rogers reports:

This publication did not have so much of a title change as a change of publisher. The title is still "Serials Librarian"; the publisher has changed from Houston, Tex.: Brown & Root, 1990-1992, to Norfolk, Va.: Old Dominion University, 1993-.

The content of this publication has changed a little, the greatest change being the addition of supervisory concerns plus the entire content has a more academic slant now and a more diverse subject interest to increase the readership. Please address all subscription inquiries to the new addresses which are:

HOME: W Ted Rogers
1674 Tulane Road, Apartment A
Norfolk, VA 23518-5231

WORK: Serials Librarian
Collection Management Dept., University Library
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA 23529-0256
Bitnet: wrt100f@oduvm
Internet: wrt100f@oduvm.cc.odu.edu

GEOSCIENCE INFORMATION SOCIETY ANNUAL MEETING

The Geoscience Information Society (GIS) will hold its 28th annual meeting in Boston, Massachusetts, from October 24-28th. The meeting will be held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Geological Society of America (GSA).

In keeping with GSA's theme of "Charging into the Future," the Geoscience Information Society is sponsoring a symposium on "Finding and Communicating Geoscience Information" on Tuesday, October 26th from 8:00 a.m. until noon. The symposium will highlight the rapidly changing world of publishing and dissemination of earth science and environmental information. It will also explore the advances and challenges of new technological access to geological information.

Conference registrants can also attend an Intermediate/Advanced GeoRef Workshop, a Digital Database Forum and an interactive Internet demonstration featuring earth science resources. In addition, there will also be a technical and poster session. Registrants for the GIS Conference are welcome to attend the GSA sessions.

For further information, contact:
Connie Wick, GIS Vice-President, Kummel Library, Harvard University, 24 Oxford Street Cambridge, MA 02138, Phone: 617-495-0791, FAX: 617-495-4711
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CALENDAR OF UPCOMING EVENTS

October 1-2, 1993
International Conference on Refereed Electronic Journals: Towards a Consortium for Networked Publications
Delta Winnipeg Hotel
Winnipeg, Manitoba, CANADA

October 24-28, 1993
American Society for Information Science Annual Meeting
Columbus, OH

November 4-6, 1993
Issues in Book and Serial Acquisitions Conference
Charleston, SC

February 5-10, 1994
ALA Midwinter Meeting
Los Angeles, CA

June 11-16, 1994
SLA Annual Conference
Atlanta, GA

June 23-30, 1994
ALA Annual Conference
Miami, FL
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NASIG EXECUTIVE BOARD 1993/94

PRESIDENT:
Cindy Hepfer
Head, Serials & Bindery Dept.
Health Sciences Library
Abbott Hall
SUNY Buffalo
Buffalo, NY 14214-3002
Phone: 716-829-2139
Fax: 716-829-2211
Bitnet: HSLCINDY@UBYM
Internet: HSLCINDY@UBYM.CC.BUFFALO.EDU
LIAISON TO: Newsletter Editorial Board, and, Regional
Councils and Membership Committee

VICE-PRESIDENT/PRESIDENT-ELECT:
October Ivins
Head, Serials Services
Louisiana State University
Room 241 Middleton Library
Baton Rouge, LA 70803-3342
Phone: 504-388-4364
Fax: 504-388-6992
Bitnet: NOTORI@LSUYM
Internet: NOTORI@LSUYM.SNCC.LSU.EDU
LIAISON TO: Program Planning Committee

SECRETARY:
Susan Davis
7721 Lewiston Rd.
Batavia, NY 14020-9345
Phone: 716-645-2784
Fax: 716-645-5955
Bitnet: UNLSDB@UBVM
Internet: UNLSDB@UBVM.CC.BUFFALO.EDU
Head, Periodicals Section
Lockwood Library Bldg.
State University of NY at Buffalo
Buffalo, NY 14260-2200
LIAISON TO: 1994 Conference Planning Committee, and, Professional Liaisons

TREASURER:
Dan Tonkery
President and CEO
Readmore, Inc.
22 Cortlandt St.
New York, NY 10007
Phone: 800-221-3306
Fax: 212-608-4614
Internet: TONKERY@READMORE.COM
LIAISON TO: Finance Committee

PAST PRESIDENT:
Teresa Malinowski
Serials Coordinator
Cal. State Univ. Fullerton
800 N. State College
P.O. Box 4150
Fullerton, CA 92634-4150
Phone: 714-773-3713
Fax: 714-469-7135
Internet: TMALINOW@FULLERTON.EDU
LIAISON TO: Nominations & Elections Committee

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE:
Connie Foster
Serials Supervisor
Western Kentucky University
Cravens 306
Bowling Green, KY 42101
Phone: 502-745-6160
Fax: 502-745-5943
Bitnet: RFOSTERC@WKYUVM
LIAISON TO: Student Grant Committee

Julia Gammon
Head, Acquisitions Dept.
Bierce Library
University of Akron
Akron, OH 44325-1708
Phone: 216-972-6254
Fax: 216-972-6383
Bitnet: RlJAG@AKRONVM
LIAISON TO: Proceedings, and, Program Planning Committee

Brenda Hurst
641 Bathgate Drive #2711
Ottawa ON K1K 3Y3
CANADA
Phone: 613-993-9958
Fax: 613-952-8245
Internet: BHURST@NRCNET.NRC.CA
Head, Acquisitions
Canadian Institute for Scientific and Technical Information
LIAISON TO: Bylaws Committee

Birdie MacLeannan
Serials Cataloger
University of Vermont
Bailey/Howe Library
Burlington, VT 05405
Phone: 802-656-2016
Fax: 802-656-4038
Bitnet: BMACLENN@UYMYM
Internet: BMACLENN@UYMYM.UYM.EDU
LIAISON TO: Electronic Communications Committee

Jim Mouw
Head of Serials
University of Chicago Library
1100 E. 57th St.
Chicago, IL 60637
Phone: 312-702-8767
Fax: 312-702-0853
Bitnet: UCLMOUW@UCHIMYSI
Internet: MOUW@MIDWAY.UCHICAGO.EDU
LIAISON TO: Directory & Database

John Tagler
Director, Corporate Communications
Elsevier Science Publishing
655 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10010
Phone: 212-633-3780
Fax: 212-633-3764
LIAISON TO: Continuing Education Committee
NASIG COMMITTEE CHAIRS 1993/94

BYLAWS:
Joyce Tenney, Chair
Serials Department
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
5401 Wilkens Ave.
Baltimore, MD 21228
Phone: 410-455-3594
Fax: 410-455-1078
Bitnet: Tenney@umbc2
Internet: Tenney@umbc2.umd.edu

1994 CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE:
Kat McGrath, Chair
Order Division
Library Processing Centre
University of British Columbia
2206 East Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z3
Canada
Phone: 604-822-4578
Fax: 604-822-3201
Internet: kmcgrath@unixg.ubc.ca

CONTINUING EDUCATION:
Adrian Alexander, Chair
Regional Sales Manager
Faxon Company
P.O. Box 120010
Arlington, TX 76012
Phone: 817-795-2458
Fax: 817-795-2485
Internet: alexander@faxon.com

DIRECTORY & DATABASE:
Beverley Geer-Butler, Chair
Cataloging Department
Maddux Library
Trinity University
715 Stadium Drive
San Antonio, TX 78212-7200
Phone: 210-736-8124
Fax: 210-735-3342
Internet: bgeer@trinity.edu

ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS:
Birdie MacLennan, Co-Chair
Bailey/Howe Library
University of Vermont
Burlington, VT 05405
Phone: 802-656-2016
Fax: 802-656-4038
Internet: bmaclellan@uvvm.uvm.edu

Marilyn Geller, Co-Chair
MIT Libraries, Room 14E-210A
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
77 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139-4307
Phone: 617-253-0587
Fax: 617-253-2464
Internet: mgeller@athena.mit.edu

FINANCE:
Dan Tonkery
Readmore Inc.
22 Cortlandt St.
New York, NY 10007
Phone: 212-349-5540
Fax: 212-233-0746
Internet: tonkery@readmore.com

NEWSLETTER:
Ellen Duranceau, Chair & Editor-in-Chief
Serials & Acquisitions Services
MIT Libraries, Room 14E-210
Cambridge, MA 02139
Phone: 617-253-7028
Fax: 617-253-2464
Internet: efinnie@athena.mit.edu

PROFESSIONAL LIASONS:
Minna Saxe, Chair
Technical Services
Mina Rees Library
City University of New York Graduate School
33 West 42 Street
New York, NY 10036
Phone: 212-642-2888
Fax: 212-642-2896
Internet: mosco@cunyvm.cuny.edu

1994 PROGRAM PLANNING:
October Ivins, Co-Chair (Plenaries)
Serials & Acquisitions Services
241 Middleton Library
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803-3342
Phone: 504-388-4364
Fax: 504-388-6992
Internet: notori@lsuvm.sncc.lsu.edu

Julia Gammon, Co-Chair (Workshops)
Acquisitions Department
Bierce Library
University of Akron
Akron, OH 44324-1708
Phone: 216-972-6254
Fax: 216-972-6383
Bitnet: rjag@akronvm

REGIONAL COUNCILS & MEMBERSHIP:
Leslie Knap, Chair
New England Field Account Services Manager
EBSCO Subscription Services
52 Hammond Place
Woburn, MA 01801
Phone: 908-342-8600
Fax: 617-938-8286
Internet: lknap@eboco.com

STUDENT GRANT:
Lisa Macklin, Chair
as of September 13:
Serials Control Department
Georgia Institute of Technology
Library and Information Center
Atlanta, GA 30332-0900
Phone: 404-894-4521
Fax: 404-892-8190
NASIG PROFESSIONAL LIAISON COMMITTEE 1993/1994

Minna C. Saxe
Chief, Technical Services Librarian
Mina Rees
Library
City University of New York
33 West 42nd Street
New York, NY 10036
Phone: 212-642-2888
FAX: 212-642-2896
Email: mcsge@cunyvm.cuny.edu

BOARD LIAISON:
Susan Davis
Head, Periodicals
State University of New York at Buffalo
Lockwood Library Bldg.
Buffalo, NY 14260
Phone: 716-645-2784
FAX: 716-645-9595
Email: unlsdb@ubvm.cc.buffalo.edu

Susan Davis
(see above)

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAW LIBRARIES:
Cecilia Kwan
Head Cataloger
University of California, Davis
Law Library
Davis, CA 95616
Phone: 916-752-0327
FAX: 916-752-8766
Email: ckwan@ucdavis.edu

Janet Fisher
Journals Manager
The MIT Press
55 Hayward Street
Cambridge, MA 02142
Phone: 617-253-2664
FAX: 617-258-6779
Email: fisher@mitva.mit.edu

Julie Gammon
Head, Acquisitions Department
University of Akron
Bierce Library
Akron, OH 44325-1708
Phone: 216-972-6254
FAX: 216-972-5383
Email: fjag@akronvm

CANADIAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION TBA

CANADIAN SERIALS INDUSTRY SYSTEMS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (1993-1994):
Lucy Bottomeley
Library Network Specialist
National Library of Canada
Information Technology Services /IAS
Ottawa, ON K1A ON4
Canada
Phone: 819-994-6831
FAX: 819-994-6835
Email: lucy.bottomeley@nlc-bnc.ca

Kevin McShane
National Library of Medicine
8600 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, MD 20894

LIBRARY BINDING INSTITUTE:
Sally Grauer
Library Binding Institute
7401 Metro Blvd. Ste. 325
Edina, MN 55439
Phone: 612-835-4707
FAX: 612-835-4780
Email: 7l0353504@compuserv.com

Barbara Carlson
Head, Serials Management Library
Medical University of South Carolina
171 Ashley Avenue
Charleston, SC 29425
Phone: 803-792-2352
FAX: 803-792-7947
Email: bobbiecarlson@smtpgw.musc.edu

SERIALS INDUSTRY SYSTEMS ADVISORY COMMITTEE:
Tina Feick
Senior Serials Specialist
Blackwell's Periodicals Division
U.S. Sales Office
324 Main Street
Cold Spring, NY 10516
Phone: 914-265-2304
Phone: 800-458-3706
FAX: 914-265-2402
Email: feick@bnamf.blackwell.com

SPECIAL LIBRARIES ASSOCIATION (1993-1995):
Audrey N. Greene
Regional Sales Manager
EBSCO Subscription Services
1163E Shrewsbury Avenue
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702
Phone: 908-542-8600
FAX: 908-544-9777

Albert Prior
Swets United Kingdom Ltd.
32 Blacklands Way
Abingdon Business Park
Abingdon, Oxon OX14 1SX
England
Phone: 0235 530809
FAX: 0235 535055
NORTH AMERICAN SERIALS INTEREST GROUP
CALL FOR NOMINATIONS
EXECUTIVE BOARD AND OFFICERS
1994/95

VICE-PRESIDENT/PRESIDENT ELECT

Name:
Affiliation:
Address (if available):
Phone (if available):

SECRETARY

Name:
Affiliation:
Address (if available):
Phone (if available):

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE (three to be elected)

Name:
Affiliation:
Address (if available):
Phone (if available):

Name:
Affiliation:
Address (if available):
Phone (if available):

Name:
Affiliation:
Address (if available):
Phone (if available):

Nominations will be forwarded to the Nominations and Elections Committee for review and consideration.

Return Nomination Forms by October 15, 1993 to:

Kathy Soupiset
Head of Acquisitions
Trinity University
Maddux Library
715 Stadium Drive
San Antonio, TX 78212
Internet: ksoupise@trinity.edu