NASIG NEWSLETTER

Vol. 16, no. 3	ISSN 0892-1733	September 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRESIDENT'S CORNER

Maggie Rioux, NASIG President

Theodore Roosevelt once referred to the Presidency of the United States as a “bully pulpit.” Well, the presidency of NASIG isn’t quite so bully as that of the U.S., but I still get a chance to preach four times this year in the *Newsletter*. This is my first sermon, so I’ll try not to make it too hard to take.

One advantage of the NASIG presidency is that you know that you’re going to be “it” more than a year in advance (unlike our recent U.S. Presidential election). I’d like to tell you that I spent my vice-presidential year pre-writing my President’s Corner columns, but that would be a lie. I did, however, spend some time thinking about what I wanted to say in the first one. What I’d like to do is tell you a little about how I got into this pulpit in hopes that it will encourage other NASIGers, especially newer members, to seek out opportunities to volunteer and also to say yes when the opportunities come to you.

Once upon a time, way back in 1991, clutching my brand-new MSLIS, but five years into being the WHOI Acquisitions Librarian (albeit a paraprofessional one) in the MBL/WHOI Library, I attended an ALA-sponsored regional institute on “The Business of Acquisitions” in Boston. Someone had put a few NASIG brochures on a table in a hallway and I picked one up. “Hmmm. That looks interesting. And it’s cheap!” So I joined up, just too late to attend the first Trinity conference. The next year (1992) I attended the conference in Chicago, including the first ever Electronic Communications Committee preconference, done entirely by the remarkable Birdie MacLennan. The conference was the best one I’d ever been to, and I was totally hooked. Later, I asked Birdie how I could get involved (I was already lurching toward geekdom), and she said (drum roll here, I think), “I suggest you volunteer to serve on a committee and ask for the Electronic Communications Committee."

So in June of 1993, I found myself on the ECC with a lot of other great people. NASIGNet was still in its relative infancy. Remember gopher? Well, we had one of them. During my first year on the committee, Co-Chairs Birdie and Marilyn Geller pulled a "Tom Sawyer" on me: "If you're really, really nice and really, really good, we'll let you help us put *Newsletter* issues on the NASIG gopher." Wow! What a deal! Actually, it was fun and stood me in good stead when I got handed our library gopher not too long after that. The next thing I knew, it was the 1994 NASIG conference in Vancouver, and I was talking about gopher to a couple of hundred folks at the ECC-sponsored pre-conference. I still have the stuffed toy gopher I used as a visual aid. After this,

NASIG NEWSLETTER

The *NASIG Newsletter* (ISSN 0892-1733) is published 4 times per year for the members of the North American Serials Interest Group, Inc. It is available through personal membership in the organization, or by subscription of $35 per year in the U.S.; $45 per year outside the U.S.

Send all submissions/editorial comments to:
Steve Savage
Head, Monograph Acquisitions, Exchanges & Gifts
Room 1, Hatcher Graduate Library
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1205
Phone: (734) 936-2308
Fax: (734) 936-2304
E-mail: ssavage@umich.edu

Send all items for "Title Changes" and the Calendar to:
Carol MacAdam
188 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10016
Phone: (212) 592-7345
Fax: (212) 592-7355
E-mail: clm@jstor.org

Send all inquiries concerning the NASIG organization, membership, and change of address information to:
Meg Mering
University of Nebraska Libraries
Love Library, 209N
Lincoln, NE 68588-0410
Phone: (402) 472-3545
Fax: (402) 472-2534
E-mail: mvm@unllib.uni.edu

Send all claims for un-received issues of the *Newsletter* to:
John Harrison
Ladd Library
Bates College
Lewiston, ME 04240
Phone: (207) 786-6270
Fax: (207) 786-6055
E-mail: jharriso@abacus.bates.edu

NASIG address:
2103 N. Decatur Rd., PMB 214
Decatur, GA 30033
URL: http://nasig.org

The *Newsletter* is published in March, June, September, and December. Submission deadlines (February 1, May 1, August 1, and November 1) are 4 weeks prior to the publication date. The submission deadline for the next issue is:

November 1, 2001

NO LATE SUBMISSIONS WILL BE ACCEPTED

things just kept getting better. In June of 1995, Steve Oberg (you remember Steve – the guy in a kilt at Carnegie Mellon) and I became co-chairs of the Electronic Communications Committee. It took both of us to replace Marilyn Geller (and Birdie before her). Being a committee chair is work, yes, but it's a lot of fun, too. It's fun making things happen and seeing a difference in the way NASIG works because of something you did. During our co-chair-hood, we moved NASIGNet to a new site, gave birth to NASIGWeb and coordinated ECC-sponsored conference presentations both years.

After I rotated off ECC, I tried to take a year off, but I got tapped for a task force (the one which resulted in our establishing the NASIG Publications Committee) and then got asked to run for the Executive Board as Member at Large. I was elected to the Board and then two years later was asked to run for Vice-President/President-Elect. Well, obviously, I got elected to that one, too, because here I am, writing this President's Corner and hoping I paid enough attention to previous presidents the past three years so I can do half as good a job as they did. Luckily, Connie Foster is still around as Past-President to keep me in line and on the right track.

Okay, that was interesting, but what's the point? Well, the point is that NASIG is a really, really good organization to get involved in and an organization that rewards those who take the time to help out. The second point is that while some of the jobs available may seem daunting at first glance, they're all quite doable (hey – if I can, so can you) and a lot of fun besides.

More on Point One: As you can probably tell by my saga, NASIG is really easy to get involved in, as much or as little (sometimes) as you want. You just have to raise your hand once. We have a lot of committees and close to 10 percent of our membership serves on committees. Also, NASIG is a relatively small organization (well, compared to ALA anyway) and it's easy to get to know folks. Having our conferences on campuses helps here, too—the person sitting across from you at breakfast may very well be the person in the serials industry you've been dying to meet. Some of our employers are a little rigid and don't value NASIG involvement as highly as they do activity in "that other organization," but lots of them do. Want to write? The *Newsletter* is eager for contributions about NASIG and serials activity, and the Publications Committee has writing opportunities and advice as well. Want to speak? Submit a conference program proposal, or talk to the Continuing Education Committee about your ideas. Want to run things? Complete a committee volunteer form or nominate yourself for the Board (or nominate someone else). You can also be sure that someone will take note of what you've done and say thank you for what you've done for NASIG – in a letter and maybe at our annual business meeting.

And more on Point Two: Yeah, all this sounds great, but being on the Board (or committee or whatever) takes too much time and it's way too hard. Nonsense! First of all, we know we're all really smart, capable, organized people—we're serialists, after all. And second of all, it's not hard and it doesn't take too much time. Remember where I said that whole bunches of NASIGers are on committees? Remember when your mother used to say "Many hands make light work"? Well, put those two thoughts together. NASIG is very well organized and most of the committees (and the officers, too) have manuals with guidelines, calendars and other tools to help get things done. For some of the bigger jobs, like treasurer or Database & *Directory*, there is money in the budget to pay someone to take a bit of the load off. I've found in the various NASIG positions that I've held that as long as I've kept on top of things and not let them go until the last minute, the workload hasn't been bad at all. Sometimes there's a short period of heavy demand, but that doesn't come very often. It's certainly no worse that writing an article for publication! And it's been a lot of fun seeing something I've worked on or contributed to being used and enjoyed by my fellow NASIGers.

And now for the final moral of this tale: NASIG depends on you, its members, to continue to be the great organization it is now. So if someone asks you to run for the Board or serve on a committee or just facilitate a workshop at a conference, PLEASE SAY YES!!! Get involved and stay involved. Nominate your friends. Nominate yourself! I'm really glad I said yes all those times to NASIG and I'll keep saying yes as long as NASIG keeps asking (well, most of the time). If you are considering taking on a NASIG responsibility but aren't sure, call me and we'll talk. My phone number's in the online *Membership Directory*.

So, end of the sermon, amen, pass the collection plate, and I'll see you in the next issue of the *Newsletter*.

NASIG EXECUTIVE BOARD MINUTES

Meg Mering, NASIG Secretary

Date, Time: May 22, 2001, 8:30 a.m.-4:45 p.m.
Place: Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas

Attending:
Connie Foster, President
Maggie Rioux, Vice-President/Pres. Elect
Dan Tonkery, Past President
Meg Mering, Secretary
Gerry Williams, Treasurer
Donnice Cochenour
Christa Easton
Don Jaeger
Anne McKee
Pat Wallace
Fran Wilkinson

Guests:
Beatrice Caraway and Carol Gill, Co-Chairs, 2001 Conference Planning Committee
Eleanor Cook, Marilyn Geller, Mary Page, and Kevin Randall, Incoming Board Members
Tina Feick, Chair, Strategic Plan/Vision 2015 Task Force
Steve Savage, *Newsletter* Editor

1.0 Closed Executive Session
The 2000/01 Board members held a brief closed executive session.

2.0 Welcome and introductions

President Foster welcomed Board members and guests to the meeting. She introduced incoming Board members, E. Cook, M. Geller, M. Page, K. Randall. She stressed the importance of Liaison roles, Board list discussions, and confidentiality for new members.

3.0 Secretary's report

3.1 Board Rosters

M. Mering distributed copies of the 2001/02 Board roster.

3.2 Actions since last meeting

M. Mering compiled the following Board decisions since the January meeting for inclusion in the minutes.

a. Approved the minutes from the January Executive Board meeting.
b. Approved the appointment of Susan Scheiberg and Shelley Neville as the *2001 Conference Proceedings* editors.
c. Set registration fees for the two 2001 preconferences.
d. Agreed to bond seven positions within NASIG that have the most financial responsibility.
e. Approved the appointment of Holley Lange as the Archivist for a three-year term beginning in the summer of 2001.
f. Approved the 2002 conference theme and call for proposals: "Transforming Serials: The Revolution Continues."
g. Thanked the 2002 Conference Theme Committee for its excellent and timely call for proposals for the 2002 conference.
h. Accepted the nominees for the Horizon Awards, the Student Grants, the Fritz Schwartz Serials Education Scholarship, and the Marcia Tuttle International Grant.
i. Approved the nomination of Viviano Milan-Martinez as the first recipient of the NASIG-Mexico Conference Grant.
j. Granted 1-year honorary NASIG memberships to the three UNAM professors who assisted with the NASIG-Mexico Conference Grant.
k. Accepted the results of the NASIG Executive Board elections.
l. Agreed to reimburse mileage for H. Lange when she moves the archives from New Mexico to Colorado.

3.3 Calendar

M. Mering announced that she would be revising the Executive Board Working Calendar in late August.

3.4 Stationery redesign

M. Mering provided each Board member with a sheet of the newly designed letterhead. She proposed that a PDF version of the letterhead be mounted on NASIGWeb in a password-protected area for use by Board members and committee chairs.

ACTION: M. Mering and ECC will explore options for making the letterhead file available to Board members and committee chairs.
DATE: Summer 2001

ACTION: The Board thanked M. Mering for her work in redesigning the letterhead.

4.0 Treasurer's report

4.1 2001 Conference finances

G. Williams reported on the 2001 conference's finances. She noted that there had been fewer requests for refunds for the conference. She attributed this reduction to the improved communication between PPC and the speakers this year.

4.2 Annual budget update

G. Williams reported that the budget remained on target even though most committees expend more of their budgets during the second half of the year after the conference.

4.3 Membership update

G. Williams announced that NASIG currently has about 1,250 members. She said there were a significant number of new memberships.

4.4 Investment update

G. Williams reported that the one-year CD account made $1,856 in interest. A new CD has been purchased for $29,000. The mutual fund has begun to increase in value.

4.5 Status of bonding

G. Williams continued investigating the possibility of bonding the President and the Treasurer.

ACTION: Denise Novak, the incoming Treasurer, will continue to explore the options for bonding the President and Treasurer.
DATE: Have a report by the fall Board meeting in October 2001

4.6 Treasurer position description

G. Williams and Board members discussed the Treasurer's job description and what qualifications candidates should have for the position of Treasurer.

ACTION: The Finance Committee will develop a checklist of qualifications for the position of Treasurer. N&E will use this list for the next election of a treasurer in 2003.

5.0 Task Force/Focus Group

5.1 Strategic Plan/Vision 2015

T. Feick, chair of the Strategic Planning/Vision Statement Task Force, discussed the plans for developing the statement. The first goal in developing the statement will be to survey the membership about what directions they would like to see the organization go between now and 2015. The membership previously was surveyed in 1986 and 1992. The second step will involve extensive analysis of survey data and drafting a vision statement and action points. Most likely, additional people will be involved in this second step, especially committee chairs.

ACTION: The Board will send T. Feick its input on what it would like to see covered in the membership survey.
DATE: July 1, 2001

ACTION: T. Feick will attend the Committee Chair Orientation and ask for the Chairs' input on the survey.
DATE: May 23, 2001

ACTION: T. Feick will verify that E&A's licensing agreement for Survey Pro will allow the task force to use the organization's current copy of the software.
DATE: June 2001

ACTION: The task force will create the survey and mount it on NASIGWeb.
DATE: September 2001

ACTION: The task force will prepare an interim report on the survey results for the Board.
DATE: October 2001

ACTION: The task will prepare a final report on the survey results for the Board.
DATE: January 2002

5.2 Bilingual Focus Group

D. Jaeger reported that Robert Endean-Gamboa, Lisa Furubotten, Steve Oberg (Chair), Jose Orozco-Tenorio, Elizabeth Parang, and Pricilla Shontz served on the group. They successfully and enthusiastically developed and coordinated the first NASIG-Mexico Conference Grant. The first recipient of the grant is Viviano Milan-Martinez. Group members will serve as his mentors at the conference.

The focus group will sponsor a networking node on NASIG's outreach to Mexico, Puerto Rico, and the Caribbean.

ACTION: The Board thanked the focus group for its work in coordinating the first NASIG-Mexico Conference Grant.
ACTION: The Board will review the final report of the Bilingual Focus Group and determine future strategies with appropriate committee involvement.
DATE: Report to be disseminated on or before June 15, 2001, and studied during the summer 2001.

6.0 Committee reports

6.1 Archives

M. Mering reported that Holley Lange, the incoming Archivist, would be moving the archives from the University of New Mexico to Colorado State University during the week of July 16. As suggested by the consultant's report on electronic archiving, H. Lange will work on developing a closer relationship with ECC and Bee.Net. She will study the recommended change in the archives' organization from an alphabetical to a subject arrangement.

Board members discussed the possibility of finding a permanent home for the archives.

ACTION: The Board thanked M. Mering and A. McKee for their work on the Archivist Search Committee.
ACTION: The Board thanked M. Fletcher for her service as Archivist for the last three years.
ACTION: The Board agreed that archival materials could be sent to H. Lange starting on Aug. 1, 2001.
ACTION: M. Mering will ask H. Lange to explore the issues involved in finding a permanent home for the archives.

6.2 Awards & Recognition

D. Jaeger reported that no applications were received for the Tuttle Award in its spring award cycle. A&R would like to consider going to an annual cycle rather than offering the grant twice a year. They would also like to discuss whether or not the award should be administered on the same annual schedule as the Horizon Award, conference student grants, and the Fritz Schwartz Serials Education Scholarship.

ACTION: D. Jaeger will ask A&R to evaluate the Tuttle Award's award cycle.
DATE: June 2001

The Board discussed advertising the Tuttle Award in library journals in addition to posting the announcement on discussion lists. They considered possible journals, which could advertise the award and the cost of advertisements. An announcement for the Tuttle Award was published in the April 1, 2001, issue of *Library Journal*. The advertisement received only one response.

ACTION: The Board decided NASIG would not pay to advertise the Tuttle Award.

The Board discussed the responsibility of buying the awards for the outgoing Board members and committee chairs. Last year the Past President bought the awards. In previous years, A&R had this responsibility.

ACTION: The Board reaffirmed that A&R would resume the responsibility for buying the awards for outgoing Board members and committee chairs.

The Board discussed whether a student conference award should be limited to those pursuing a Master's degree or could also include those working on a specialist or Ph.D. degree in library and information science.

ACTION: The Board agreed that students studying library and information science, regardless of the degree, were eligible to apply for the grant.

A subcommittee of A&R developed FAQ pages for each of the awards. At an earlier meeting, the Board approved the pages.

ACTION: A&R's web liaison will mount the FAQ pages on NASIGWeb.
DATE: Summer 2001

6.3 Bylaws

C. Easton reported that there were no proposed bylaws changes this past year. At the request of the Board, the Bylaws Committee drafted mailing procedures for the use by all NASIG committees based on Bylaws mailing procedures.

ACTION: The Board approved the Procedures for NASIG Committee Mailings, with minor clarifications.
ACTION: M. Rioux will distribute copies of the mailing procedures at the Committee Chair Orientation.
DATE: May 23, 2001

ACTION: The Board thanked the Committee for developing the Procedures for NASIG Committee Mailings.

6.4 Continuing Education

D. Jaeger reviewed the continuing education events of the past year. CE has been working to diversify the geographic location of events.

ACTION: Board asked CE to work with RC&M to identify a site in the Southwest for a possible continuing education event.

Birdie MacLennan, Judy Irvin, and Deberah England worked on outreach to library schools. They sent letters to all ALA accredited library schools. They also sent letters in Spanish and French to the University of Puerto Rico and the Universite de Montreal respectively. They received one response.

Lisa Furubotten, Elizabeth Parang, and Priscilla Shontz worked on the Bilingual Focus Group.

Per Board request in June 2000, C. Foster asked that CE follow up on the Canadian SISAC request for affiliation with NASIG.

ACTION: The Board asked CE to determine whether the Canadian SISAC request for affiliation was still viable.
DATE: Report by the fall 2001 Board meeting

6.5 Database & *Directory*

P. Wallace reported that NASIG members have been prompt about sending address changes to D&D. This year's mailings each resulted in only three pieces of returned mail.

The 2001 *Membership Directory* will be mailed in June.

6.6 Electronic Communications

Currently, NASIG has 26 e-mail lists for use by working committees and task forces. List activity was quite high this year. The awards list attracted a lot of spamming. Junk mail was posted to other lists. This activity on the lists added to time spent managing the lists.

The primary activities of the committee were maintenance, development, and support. A Web page listing past NASIG presidents was added to the site. ECC continues to work on making it possible to search all of NASIGWeb.

The Committee suggested having a training session for new committee Web liaisons at the conference.

ACTION: The Board agreed that during the annual conference ECC should try to schedule a meeting with all committee Web liaisons for training and discussion.
DATE: 2002 and beyond
ACTION: The Board asked ECC to investigate with Bee.Net whether software other than FrontPage 2000 would work to post files to the server.

EEC recommended archiving Bee.Net statistics on the first of each month and sending a printout of the statistics to the Archivist.

ACTION: The Board approved EEC's recommendation to archive the statistics each month and to send a printout of the statistics to the Archivist.

6.7 Evaluations & Assessment

F. Wilkinson announced that the 2001 conference evaluation would have fewer pages than last year's evaluation. At the January Board meeting, the Board approved E&A's recommendation of having one rating per speaker rather than having two separate ratings for speaker content and presentation.

A new version of the software Survey Pro will be used to conduct this year's conference survey.

The Board discussed mounting the evaluation form on NASIGWeb.

ACTION: At the conference committee meeting, Mary Page, the new Board Liaison, and E&A will discuss the possibility of mounting the evaluation form on NASIGWeb.

6.8 Nominations & Elections

D. Tonkery reported that 52 nominations representing 45 individual names were submitted for consideration as candidates for the Executive Board election. A relatively low number of nominees agreed to be considered for candidacy of Vice President/President-Elect and Treasurer. The Board discussed ways of encouraging members to run for office.

The Committee guidelines do not currently address the question of vote tally dissemination. The Committee's past practice has been to send the tally to the President who distributes it to the Board members. The tally is not distributed to all N&E

members. N&E raised the question as to whether the tally information might be useful to the Committee as a whole when preparing future slates.

ACTION: The Board agreed that the vote tallies would be distributed to Board members and all N&E members in the future.

N&E prepared a draft revision of the Committee's guidelines. The guidelines were written in 1990 and have never been revised.

ACTION: The Board approved the revised Nominations & Election Committee Guidelines.

The Board discussed the N&E's recommendation to consider online voting. The Board was uncertain how to guarantee the integrity of the election process through online voting and deferred action indefinitely on this matter.

6.9 *Newsletter*

S. Savage noted that $2,500 was saved by reducing the *Newsletter* to four issues in 2000/01.

S. Savage reported that the positions of Submissions and Profiles Editors are currently vacant on the Editorial Board.

After nine years on the Editorial Board, Maggie Horn has announced that she will resign as Copy Editor, effective after the June 2001 issue is complete. She will assist during the transition.

In the upcoming year, the Editorial Board will continue its efforts to increase the number of non-NASIG serials-related reports and NASIG profiles in each issue.

Starting with the March 2002 issue, the *Newsletter* will be available only in an online format. At its conference meeting, the Editorial Board will discuss the impact of this change on the production of the *Newsletter*.

6.10 *Proceedings*

D. Cochenour reported that the 15th annual *Conference Proceedings* were ready to be printed by Haworth. Lynne Griffin, the *Proceedings*' web editor, has not received the electronic files of the *Proceedings* from the publisher. Order forms for the 2000 *Conference Proceedings* will be available at the conference.

The Board discussed Haworth's plans to provide an online version of *The Serials Librarian*. They were unclear if the publisher intended to charge subscribers of the print version an additional charge for the electronic version.

ACTION: M. Rioux will contact Haworth and find out if they intend to charge subscribers of the print version an additional charge for the electronic version.
DATE: Report for fall 2001 Board meeting

6.11 Professional Liaisons/Publicist

A. McKee reported on the activities of the Publicist since the January Board meeting. She posted the 2002 Conference Call for Papers. She also negotiated and wrote copy for the *Library Journal* advertisement for the Tuttle award.

The Board discussed A. McKee's recommendations concerning the position of Publicist.

ACTION: A Board member, preferably the Past President, will continue to serve as Publicist.
ACTION: At each year's chair orientation, the Publicist will stress that all NASIG postings to outside lists need to come from the Publicist and that the Publicist may edit before posting.
DATE: 2001 and beyond

ACTION: The Publicist, rather than the Secretary, will send the call for proposals to outside lists.
DATE: 2001 and beyond

ACTION: Members of committees will give the Publicist a minimum two-week advance notice to mail NASIG membership brochures. If the brochures are needed in a shorter period of time, any extra charges in shipping will not be made at NASIG's expense.

The Board reviewed the Publicist's List of Lists for Announcement and made suggestions on what lists should continue to be used by the Publicist.

6.12 Publications

C. Easton reported that the Committee is sponsoring a pre-conference on practical advice in getting published in library-related publications. They will also be considering poster sessions as possible *NASIGuides*.

The Board discussed the status of the project to translate the *CONSER Cataloging Manual* into Spanish in light of impending revisions to the original manual.

ACTION: The Board requested a status report and the possibility of deferring this project until 2002 when pending changes can be evaluated.
DATE: Status report on the translation at the fall 2001 Board meeting

The Committee has been exploring the possibility of offering the conference handouts in electronic form. Server and archival issues would need to be resolved if the handouts were mounted on NASIGWeb.

ACTION: C. Easton will ask the Committee to explore the possibility of offering the conference handouts in CD-ROM format.

6.13 Regional Councils & Membership

A. McKee reported that RC&M continued to be very active in its recruitment of new members and promotion of NASIG. After the 2000 conference in La Jolla, 174 membership packets were sent to non-NASIG members. 50 percent of them became new members.

RC&M has not been able to fill all of its state representatives slots. The Board questioned if all states needed their own representatives.

ACTION: M. Page, the new Board Liaison, will ask RC&M to reexamine its committee structure.

7.0 Committee appointments for 2001/02

Board members reviewed the list of committee appointments and identified which committee members would serve as web liaisons to EEC. M. Rioux announced that all committee assignments had been filled.

8.0 2001 Conference Planning

B. Caraway reviewed the conference schedule and special events. She asked the Board to set the prices on souvenirs from the current and past conferences.

ACTION: The Board set prices on souvenirs and agreed that souvenirs from past conferences would not be shipped to the College of William and Mary, the site of the 2002 conference.

B. Caraway recommended that the conference database be reviewed for possible restructuring.

ACTION: A. McKee, the new Board Liaison, and the 2002 CPC will explore restructuring the conference database.

9.0 2001 Program Planning

M. Page reviewed the final plans for the conference sessions. Twelve poster sessions will be presented at the conference. She was pleased to announce that no workshops had to be canceled.

10.0 Site Selection Update

F. Wilkinson and A. McKee reported on their May site visit to the University of Utah. Sites for the 2003 conference and beyond are still under consideration.

ACTION: A. McKee will continue to explore sites for the 2003 conference.
DATE: Status report at the fall Board meeting

11.0 2002 CPC Overview

A. McKee presented CPC's preliminary budget for the 2002 conference. She also reviewed possible special events for the conference.

12.0 Closing Items

12.1 Committee Chair Orientation

M. Rioux reviewed the agenda for the committee chair orientation.

12.2 Review Opening and Business Meetings

C. Foster reviewed the agendas of the conference's opening and business meetings.

12.3 Reminder of fall meeting

The next Board meeting will be held on October 19-20, 2001, at the College of William and Mary. One agenda item will be to explore having a placement service at conferences.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Denise D. Novak, NASIG Treasurer

NASIG remains in good fiscal condition. As of 7/17/01, we have over $266,000 in assets. This will change as we receive final bills for the San Antonio Conference. The balance sheet appears below.

ACCOUNT BALANCES REPORT 7-2001

ASSETS	
Cash and Bank Accounts	
Charles Schwab-Cash	$902.50
Checking-264	$170,810.57
One year CD	$29,000.00
Savings-267	$41,789.33
TOTAL Cash and Bank Accts.	$242,502.40
Investments	
Charles Schwab	$24,034.50
TOTAL Investments	$24,034.50
TOTAL ASSETS	$266,536.90
LIABILITIES & EQUITY	
Liabilities	$0.00
Equity	$266,536.90
OVERALL TOTAL	$266,536.90

The conference to date has taken in over $249,000 and has expended a bit over $70,000. These numbers will change as the final bills for the 2001 conference are received and paid. It is not yet possible to determine if we will have a surplus from this conference.

2001 CONFERENCE TO DATE

INCOME	
Conference Registration	$238,612.11
Preconference Income	$2,590.00
Conference Handouts	$4,485.00
Conference Souvenirs	$3,970.44
TOTAL INCOME	$249,657.55
EXPENSES	
Conference-Advertising	$32.50
Conference-Equipment Rental	$1,235.00
Conference-Brochure	$1,875.00
Conference-Entertainment	$1,500.00
Conference-Housing	$220.00
Conference-Meals	$20,582.93
Conference-Souvenirs	$1,084.68
Credit Card Charges	$2,826.49
Conference-Photocopying & Printing	$2,331.50
Conference-Postage	$620.06
Conference-Registration Packet	$3,603.38
Conference-Supplies	$860.26
Conference-Speakers	$6,277.78
Conference-Transportation	$2,440.00
Conference-Refund	$6,579.61
Conference-Program	$101.86
Conference-Prepayment	$18,000.00
TOTAL EXPENSES	$70,171.05
TOTAL INCOME – EXPENSES	$179,486.50

As has been stated before, the ability to maintain the conference income for a period of time prior to paying the conference expenses allows us to increase our interest income. The interest allows us to support some of our year-round activities such as the NASIGWeb, *Membership Directory*, and continuing education. We continue to hold our one-year CD and to maintain a no-load mutual fund.

NASIG 16TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE (2001)
PRECONFERENCES

GETTING PUBLISHED: SURVIVING IN A "WRITE STUFF OR THEY WILL FIRE YOU" ENVIRONMENT

Ladd Brown, Acquisitions Librarian, Virginia Tech; Jeff Bullington, Coordinator of Reference Services, University of Houston Libraries; Wayne Jones, Head, Serials Cataloging Section, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Cindy Hepfer, Head, Collection Management Services, State University of New York at Buffalo

Reported by Mary Alice Robinson

This presentation was designed to encourage participants interested in publishing opportunities especially related to serials and library issues. Although not all of the participants admitted to being in a "Write Stuff or They Will Fire You" environment, most said that they were under some amount of pressure to publish for tenure or regular appointment at their institutions. A handful were not facing mandatory publishing demands but were interested in learning about the processes involved in writing, submission, revision, and acceptance for publication as well as learning how to find opportunities for publishing in the library literature. The presenters consisted of librarians with experience in publishing both from the author's and the editor's perspectives.

Cindy Hepfer (Editor of *Serials Review*) began with a discussion of what is involved in being the editor of a peer-reviewed journal and the general timeline that one can expect from initial submission of a manuscript to final publication. Although most manuscripts are unsolicited, editors often solicit articles on certain topics. A surprising discovery to many of the participants was that many editors are willing to work with writers on the revision of an article and that most articles are not flat out rejected for publication. In most cases where the idea and/or research for the article is promising, it is just a matter of how much revision will be needed before the article is ready for publication. Hepfer also discussed ways that writers can determine where to submit manuscripts. After determining which journals publish in the writer's field of interest, the writer should consider whether the journal publishes that particular type of article as well. In addition, writers should seek out as much information as possible such as copyright agreement, the style manual used by the editor, and turnaround time for articles.

Ladd Brown discussed issues related to publishing from the author's perspective. He emphasized his belief in the validity of "writing at work" since many or most institutions make publication a prerequisite for tenure and promotion. Brown then discussed the steps involved in the writing process, from deciding on a topic to the final revision of the manuscript. In addition, he encouraged participants to consider using the "team approach" to article writing. This approach has the advantage of producing a "team-oriented final product." In addition, it requires an organized approach and a "deadline oriented time table" for the writing process. Writers also have the opportunity to discover shared interests and compatible co-workers for future endeavors. Following discussion on the writing process, Brown led the participants in a hands-on exercise in revising of writing samples. Most participants were able to easily identify and revise the faulty passages.

Wayne Jones (Editor of *Serials Librarian*) discussed the practical steps involved in getting published and what an editor typically looks for in a manuscript. He emphasized the importance first of having an idea and being able to write in clear concise language free of jargon. In addition, editors look for correct format and style appropriate for the type of article. He also cautioned writers to be aware of copyright agreements, which can vary from publication to publication allowing the author more or less control of their work as intellectual property. Jones noted that it is important for writers looking for publishing opportunities to recognize that there are many types of articles. In addition to the research study, other possibilities are reports of conferences and meetings, surveys, book reviews, columns, interviews, case studies, and reviews of the literature. The *NASIG Newsletter* asks for volunteers to report on the workshops and sessions of the annual conference. In addition, Jones noted that *Serials Librarian* in fact, publishes the *Proceedings* of the annual NASIG conference each year, providing interested authors with additional opportunities to get into the publishing world. In any case, authors should make sure that the journals to which they submit manuscripts publish the specific type of article written.

The final presenter was **Jeff Bullington**, who began by advising participants in a "publish or perish" environment to find out the specific requirements at their institutions for tenure and continuing appointment. One should ask questions of the committee or a supervisor about what is required and what types of publications are acceptable. Next, in considering all the various opportunities, Jeff advised the participants to start on the "small side" particularly if they have never published before. For example, one can volunteer to take minutes at meetings or write for newsletters. While these types of articles are not usually acceptable for promotion and tenure, they are valuable for the experience that they provide to the writers. Bullington suggested that interested participants volunteer to report on the sessions at the annual conference for the *NASIG Newsletter* or seek out other reporting opportunities in journals such as *Serials Review*, *Against the Grain*, and *College and Research Libraries News*. All of these journals publish reports, columns, and reviews related to serials librarianship. And as a next step, Bullington suggested that participants consider applying to write for the *NASIG Conference Proceedings* published in *Serials Librarian*.

As a final "hands on" exercise, participants had the opportunity to work in small groups in which they plotted initial strategies for planning a research project. Using a team approach, the groups were given sample projects to choose from and were asked to design a strategy for obtaining data to answer the particular research question.

LICENSING FOR BEGINNERS

Laurie L. Thompson, Director, Health Sciences Library, SUNY Upstate Medical University; Harry Youtt, Attorney and Writer, and Instructor, UCLA and University of California at Irvine
Reported by Christine W. Blackman

Laurie L. Thompson and **Harry Youtt**, a librarian/recovering-lawyer team, developed this presentation three and a half years ago as an all day workshop for the medical library community. They conceived the idea during a Medical Library Association Conference when meeting to address needs in continuing education. The consensus at that time was that since librarians were signing licenses more and more frequently, they needed to have a better understanding of the licensing process and licenses for electronic resources.

The result was an in depth workshop that gives librarians strategies for negotiating and managing licensing agreements by developing a negotiation team, exploring the pre-negotiation process, profiling an institution's users and patterns of use, understanding the various types of licenses, and learning to read the legal language of the license. Youtt, the self-described "captive lawyer for a day," is usually available to participants to discuss the legal language of licenses but unfortunately was ill and unable to attend. However after having presented multiple times with Youtt, Thompson ably filled in the legal information with which she was familiar. Attendees were treated to a fast paced presentation that compressed what is normally an eight-hour question and answer session into this half-day pre-conference.

Thompson emphasized the need for every institution to have a negotiating team to examine licenses from multiple viewpoints. A complete negotiating team should consist of a representative for the budget, systems, user relations, and collections. She stated that it is even important for the team of one to be deliberate about wearing different hats. During the pre-negotiation period, each member of the team should work to answer questions and collect information pertinent to their area of expertise. To aid this, Thompson and Youtt included in their presentation packet a list of "primer questions" and "profile" checklists for each of the team members to use while collecting information from sales representatives and evaluating the resource.

Important "primer questions" explore such topics as the actual cost of the resource after accounting for access or system restrictions and needs and the varied nature of use that one can expect with the resource. For instance, will there be a need for the resource on ILL or on reserve and if so, does the current license allow for this type of use? What, if any, type of access to archival information is provided after the term of the license has ceased? The primer questions are set up so that every team member will be prompted to explore these issues in depth from their specific area of expertise.

The "profile" checklists will help each member to evaluate how well the resource, or the terms of the proposed contract meet the needs of your institution. Important things to remember in profiling the fit are to make sure that none of your institution's important locations or user groups is precluded from using the resource. Licenses often define the user population; that definition may differ greatly from that of your institution. The team's job is to use the profiles to take a snapshot of your users, including necessary special uses, and then make sure that these uses are accounted for in the user population as defined by the license.

When addressing issues that arise from this process and questioning sales representatives, it is necessary to be diligent in taking notes – promises of changes or fixes are only promises unless or until they are written into the contract. After this period, once entering actual negotiations, all information should go through a primary or chief negotiator and contract signer who, in many cases, will also be the budget representative. It is of utmost importance at this time to speak with one voice in negotiation so that you can craft the license into one that actually meets your institution's needs.

Your strategy then should be to develop your alternatives before you actually start negotiating, speak with one voice, and most important, establish a good working relationship with your institution's legal counsel. This means that you may need to educate yourself and your attorney about copyright law so that it can be used to your benefit. However, remember that license agreements supersede copyright.

The chief negotiator must also educate her/himself on the situations when you must consult legal counsel. You need to know which typical clauses need legal attention. Thompson mentioned that the Web site "LIBLICENSE" at:
http://www.library.yale.edu/~llicense/index.shtml
is probably the best place to start with your lawyer as it addresses some of the more common questions about the legal language of licenses.

“LIBLICENSE” also sponsors a discussion list that can be a valuable resource.

Thompson ran through the strengths of some other online resources, such as the Stanford site “Copyright & Fair Use” at http://fairuse.stanford.edu, which lists a number of resources on copyright and links to the laws for quick reference. Another good site that was mentioned is the “Software and Database License Agreement Checklist” from the University of Texas at http://www.utsystem.edu/ogc/intellectualproperty/dbckfrm1.htm which can help you to determine how a license meets the needs of your library.

The remainder of the session was spent analyzing an actual license line by line. Thompson stated that you should have your definitions, such as your user population defined by the “profile” checklist, at your side as you analyze any license. This way you can compare clauses and think about exclusions and therefore more accurately assess the contract’s fit with your institution. Thompson and Youtt also included in their information packet techniques for analyzing contract drafts that we used while running through our sample contract. The point of the exercise was to make us realize that we have the responsibility to understand these contracts and, most important, the power to redesign them so that they explicitly express what rights and responsibilities we have as a licensee.

PLENARIES

1. *CHEMICAL PUBLICATIONS: A CRITICAL EVALUATION*

Steven Bachrach, Dr. D. R. Semmes Distinguished Professor of Chemistry, Trinity University
Responder: Adrian Alexander, Executive Director, Big 12 Plus Libraries Consortium
Reported by Cheryl Riley

Steven Bachrach presented his perception of the problems with chemistry publications. Historically, chemists share and receive information from journals; most of these are paper based. By using 18th century techniques to communicate, chemists are very limited in the type and amount of information that can be disseminated to colleagues. By publishing on paper only, static images can be used and there is no animation, interactivity, or transferability.

The first question he asked about a journal was, from the researcher's perspective, what is required from a journal? The question was answered by three or four concepts: quality science, widespread distribution, and perpetual access. Perpetual access, to the chemist, does not indicate an interest in reading a 50 year-old paper, but rather the expectation that 50 years from now someone can read *my* article. The final quality researchers want is reasonably rapid publication, which for chemists is from three to nine month’s lag time.

The problems with scholarly journals include soaring costs, limited access, longer publication lag time, and archiving space. Fewer journals are making it into libraries. Statistics compiled by the Association for Research Libraries indicate that the average cost per serial is rising, as is the portion of the budget spent on periodicals. The response to these higher costs is a reduction in the number of journals being purchased. This is a concern for the researcher.

The next logical question is who is at fault. Bachrach provided a list of the "usual suspects," including the commercial publishers. However, rather than just malign the publishers, Bachrach asked the audience to consider the commercial publishers' mission. Most commercial publishers are publicly held and traded companies that want to make money, and we cannot deny them their profits. As an example, Bachrach showed that Elsevier has been profitable for a very long time.

Next, Bachrach turned to societal publishers. Logically, the tale of profitability should be different since these non-profit organizations are there to serve their associations and publishing is one method of service. Using figures from the American Chemical Society's annual reports, Bachrach showed that revenues from these publications are also rising. In 2000, the non-profit American Chemical Society made approximately $34 million dollars from their publications. Bachrach cautioned the audience of the need for members to be more aware of the net gains made by the organizations to which they belong.

The next usual suspects are libraries and librarians. According to participants at a publishers' conference Bachrach attended, librarians are the problem because they are not effective in raising budgets to cover the cost of journals. The library community has responded to the journal crisis by spending more on acquisitions and less on facilities and salaries.

Librarians have not done a very good job making this information known to the academic community.

Actually, Bachrach felt that librarians were blameless and that publishers should shoulder some of the blame, but that it is researchers who need to look in the mirror. Currently, the researcher's standard operating procedure is to write and submit an article (for no pay) to a journal editor (who works for little or no pay) who reviews the article. The article then goes through a peer review (peers who work for no pay) and is finally published. Once published, the author of the article transfers the copyright to the publisher. This process requires the author to *pay* to read the published articles. This is a problem. Unless we, as a profession, do something about the insatiable drive to publish, the system will not change. The academics are doing the publishing. Bachrach looked at a number of variables and found that, although university faculties have not increased significantly, publication has increased. In 1967 a professor published about 6 articles over a 2-year period, by 1999 that had increased to 12 articles.

Another aspect of the journal dilemma is the launch of new journals. Bachrach found 22 organic chemistry journals were launched in the last decade. Breaking organic chemistry down into sub-fields Bachrach explained that the field of carbohydrate chemistry is one of the most well established branches of organic chemistry, yet new journals are still being launched. Combinatorial chemistry is a brand-new discipline that began about 1990, but Bachrach questioned the need for five journals on the topic.

Bachrach then examined the flow of information within the chemistry discipline. The classic information flow is from author to publisher to databases to peers and colleagues. In the 21st century perhaps there is a better way to connect authors to audiences. There are initiatives to change the information flow: SPARC (www.arl.org/sparc) and Create Change (www.createchange.org)

To change the current system, we need to address cost, speed, and access. The Los Alamos pre-print archives, the Open Archive Initiative, the Chemistry pre-print server, and Pubmed Central are all attempts to change this vision.

SPARC intends to create a more competitive scholarly communication marketplace where the cost of journal acquisition and use is reduced and publishers who respond to customer needs are rewarded. However, Bachrach does not believe that competitive markets are desirable. Over the short term, this means that libraries have to buy both the expensive established journal and its less-expensive competitor. This requires a budget increased by the cost of the second journal.

Some attempts to change the publishing flow are working. The LANL pre-print archive shows a healthy rise in submissions. This archive is *the* way those in high-energy physics communicate. PubMed Central is a "crippled" pre-print archive because the information has already been published in journals. The journal is still the main arena; PubMed is an additional access route. To determine why the physics community jumped on the bandwagon, why the chemists are slow to adopt, and why the biologists (who use the Internet for many things) still continue to use the journals to publish, is a doctoral dissertation waiting to be written.

Bachrach felt the solution to the journal problem is to seriously review the "publish or perish philosophy" and dramatically re-think the promotion/tenure process. As a brand-new assistant professor he was introduced to the "least publishable unit" and taught how to break an article up to get more mileage. As long as we continue to teach new researchers this technique and support it ourselves, the journal problem will continue to increase.

We need to think long and hard about more journals. Do we really need more journals? We need to seriously consider and ultimately reject the copyright transfer policy. Why can't the publisher get the first right to publish and the author all subsequent rights? We need to support worthy journals and not referee, submit to, or purchase other journals. And finally, we need to cancel the journals we are not reading. We need to examine what the Internet can do for us and see how richly we can communicate when we use technology effectively.

Adrian Alexander began his response by assuring the audience that he came not to respond, but to praise and to augment the preceding remarks. He has spent much of his career on the periphery of the publishing debate. When he became a library director he was initially surprised to once again be involved in the debate. The Big 12 Library consortium now consists of 29-member research libraries from 15 states. Twenty-three of the 29 members are ARL libraries, and 12 are members of the Association of American Universities (AAU).

Alexander believes that the academy through its collective organizations of faculty, tenure, and promotion, created the current publishing system, and, some might argue, abdicated the responsibility to manage it as a steward by giving publishers the opportunity to control the intellectual effort. Libraries have not been able to change the system on their own.

The Big 12 Plus has been working with its provosts towards changing the current system. David Shulenberger, Provost at the University of Kansas, has been concerned for some time about the way scholarly information is disseminated. His call for action, "Scholarly Communication and the Need for Collective Action," was first presented in April 1988 to the provosts of the Big 12 Athletic Conference. It was then re-worked and became known as the "Tempe Principles," taking its name from the first Big 12 Plus Provosts Meeting, which took place in Tempe, Arizona. The provosts compiled a list of action items, which were: 1) to support and fund development of electronic journals that dramatically reduce cost to libraries or fill-in gaps in the literature; 2) to encourage faculty to sign the open letter on the Public Library of Science Web site; 3) to endorse the original "Tempe Principles" on each member campus; 4) to re-evaluate respective promotion tenure policies as they relate to editors, and provide more recognition for those involved with electronic journals; 5) to create a strategy to develop an array of scholar's portal initiatives including discipline specific content; and 6) to promote best practice and model language in institutional intellectual property policies.

The most important point of convergence of Alexander's and Bachrach's points is the control of intellectual property. The academy must work in concert to establish a policy on intellectual property that all its members can accept and support. When that happens, the academy can make rules about distribution and price, instead of leaving it to someone else. The time has come to change the rules of engagement.

2. *SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION: ISSUES IN PUBLISHING*

Stanley Chodorow, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Questia Media, Inc. and former Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning, University of California at San Diego
Responder: John Cox, Principal, John Cox and Associates
Reported by David Burke

Stanley Chodorow introduced the "Tempe Principles," a set of guidelines developed by to address the crisis in scholarly communication. This crisis consists of rising journal subscription prices, the growing number of articles to publish and number of journal titles in which to publish, and the decline of monographs. Meanwhile, library acquisition budgets continue to decline. The "Tempe Principles" aim to allow information to flow more freely by separating publication from purity (peer review) — namely by allowing publication on the Internet.

Chodorow listed and described the actual principles: affordability to the non-profit (especially academic) community; the permanence of the scholarly record; preservation of peer review; protection of copyright and fair use, including allowing universities and professors to maintain copyright for their writings in a digital environment; communication of new knowledge in a timely manner; emphasizing quality over quantity in rating an author's output; and making full use of new technology without violating fundamental values. Current steps to address the crisis generally fall short; consortia insufficiently deal with the economics and digital technologies are unreliable for preservation. Chodorow insisted universities themselves must change.

He gave a brief history of universities and their relationship with scholarship, leading to the current situation where universities share the creation and dissemination of knowledge with independent institutes and private companies. Universities have the responsibility to produce research (performed by the faculty), but the new knowledge economy impels competition for the resources to do so. Publishers exploit the cracks to maximize profits.

Chodorow concluded with suggestions for universities to respond to the crisis. First, they should enter the market themselves by publishing their own academic journals and supporting projects such as BioOne and SPARC. Also, faculty must learn the economic facts of scholarship and budgets. Universities should pledge not to support those publishers who will not allow authors to Web-publish their own articles six months after publication in the publisher's journals. Universities should work with funding agencies to improve the handling of copyright. Lastly, they should emphasize quality over quantity when considering publishing criteria in faculty promotion and tenure.

In his response, **John Cox** expressed skepticism towards the "Tempe Principles," especially the idea of universities entering the market while excluding market players. He agreed with Chodorow's assessment of the crisis in scholarly publishing; it is a dysfunctional market where the end-users (faculty) are insulated from the prices. Therefore the number of papers published soars while university library expenditures decline. But Cox remained confident prices will find the right level, adding that consortia are giving libraries stronger leverage in price negotiations.

Cox had a number of other criticisms. He insisted most publishers do allow creators to continue using their works and suggested that the software and entertainment industries push the trend toward tighter copyright restrictions. Persuading faculty to support only journals with good behavior seemed futile; certain journal titles present a "brand" associated with quality articles. He did agree with Chodorow that some publishers unnecessarily restrict the full potential of digital technology and universities would do well to emphasize quality publishing over quantity. Still, he generally felt the "Tempe Principles" reflected the American atmosphere of confrontation between publishers and libraries; he advised looking towards Europe where the relationship is more collaborative. He ending by stating he felt the model suggested by the "Principles" may not fully respond to academic needs.

3. *GENERATION Y: A DISCUSSION OF TODAY'S YOUTH AND THEIR IMPACT ON HIGHER EDUCATION*

Stephen R. Merritt, Dean of Enrollment Management, Villanova University
Reported by Gale Teaster

Using a combination of humor, facts, and years of accumulated experience, **Stephen R. Merritt** delivered an enlightening presentation on the characteristics of Generation Y and their impact on American culture, knowledge relevant to anyone involved in higher education. Merritt focused on three specific areas: general impressions of Generation Y, the challenges they pose for higher education, and some of the relevant issues Generation Y will face, and pose, for the future.

To understand Generation Y, one must understand this group's relationship to previous generational groups. Merritt stated the various generations can be broken down into:

- G.I. generation (1901-1924) – The last "hero" generation, the generation who won World War II
- Silent generation (1925-1945) – This group saw America as a good place to live; they "fit in"
- Boomers (1943-1960) – Post World War II generation
- Generation X (1961-1980) – A much smaller group than the generation preceding or succeeding it; this group has less clout and influence
- Generation Y/Millennials/Echo Boomers (1981-2003)

The Generation Y group would prefer to be called the "Millennials." They do not want to be considered related to Generation X because they consider themselves to be a more positive group than the Generation Xers. Merritt recommended reading the book *Millennials Rising: The Next American Generation*, by Neil Howe and William Strauss, which reinforces the hypothesis that Generation Yers are harder workers and better community builders than any generation since the G.I.s. This group has also been called "Echo Boomers" because they tend to reflect the ideas and beliefs of their Boomer parents.

The relationship between Generation Y and their parents, the Boomers, is more harmonious. According to an MTV research study, the adolescent perception of "us versus them" is not as prevalent as in the past. It is "cool" to like your parents and to enjoy doing things with your family. According to Don Tapscott, author of *Growing Up Digital*, "...there has never been a generation of parents more loving and concerned about doing the right thing for their kids than the boomers." Parents and their children are sharing values around music, clothing, and entertainment. Marketing experts are making the most of these shared values and are cross marketing products. Both the parents and the Generation Y children value service. Parents encourage their children to be active in community service activities, projects, and organizations, *e.g.*, SADD (Students Against Drunk Driving).

Parents of Generation Yers are training them to be doers and achievers. Boomer parents want their children to be involved in a wide variety of activities and encourage their children to start early, for example, "thinking about college" brochures are given to sixth and seventh graders. Involvement in sports is advocated as a means of developing teamwork and as an indicator of how the child will react under pressure and stress. Academic acceleration is also promoted. Parents feel they must get their children started early, so they can graduate early and get into a good college. In addition, involvement in a variety of activities equals recognition, which in turn equals entrance into a good college and good career placement. All of this leads to what Merritt described as "an apprentice adulthood." Colleges and universities must be prepared for this influx of accelerated, motivated students.

Generation Yers are immense consumers and are developing adult buying behaviors. They bargain for prices and return items if unsatisfied. This consumer behavior is evident in how they compare and evaluate potential colleges and universities. Education is considered a commodity and limitless academic options are the expectation of students and their parents. Students want value-added courses and experiences. As previously discussed, many students and parents accept academic acceleration as a necessity to ensure the student's early acceptance at the college of his/her choice. Advanced Placement (AP) courses are the norm for many students and acceptance of these courses by colleges and universities is a necessity. "Middle college" is the term currently being used to define the AP phenomenon. Enhanced personal support and seamless administrative support are also important to Generation Yers and their parents. Since the Internet is the instinctive point of reference for Generation Yers and it is a necessity for developing and maintaining relationships for these students, colleges and universities must provide 24/7 access and speed. One of the challenges for higher education is to meet these demands.

Generation Yers are technology veterans. They are extremely comfortable and knowledgeable about the Internet and make use of it instinctively. According to a Fortino Group study, 10-17 year olds will ultimately spend one-third of their lives on the Internet. They do not view the Internet as a tool, but as an integral part of their lives. Generation Y's technology expertise is not limited to use of the Internet. By 2005, 70% of teens will own a wireless phone (Yankee Group research study). Using Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs), students can turn in homework, get reminders from their teachers if an assignment has not been turned in on time, and parents can receive student grades. Higher education must also provide these amenities. Parents and students will begin to expect these services.

Generation Y is an increasingly diverse group, who embrace change along racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic lines. Justice is about what is fair or not fair, not based on race or economics. The desire of both parent and student is for the student to attend a college or university that places a high value on recruiting and maintaining a diverse student body.

What other challenges and issues from the Generation Y group are facing higher education today? Higher education must provide opportunities for student growth intellectually, spiritually, and technologically. The demands for up-to-date technology previously mentioned must be met. For a time, colleges and universities will need to balance the costs of old and new technology and hope for economic stability. Colleges and universities must develop intelligent learning environments and focus on critical thinking in both an academic and personal context. The responsibility of higher education is to determine how to address these challenges and issues and, since Generation Y freshmen are already entering colleges and universities, decisions must be reached and implemented now.

For a complete copy of Merritt's presentation, visit his Web site at:
http://www.homepage.villanova.edu/stephen.merritt

CONCURRENT SESSIONS

1. *SENSEMAKING AND DIGITAL LIBRARIANS*
Mary Lynn Rice-Lively, Assistant Dean and Coordinator of Information Technology, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Texas
Reported by Sandy Folsom

Mary Lynn Rice-Lively began by presenting three objectives for the session. These were to explore new roles for library and information professionals, to define and expand on the concept of sensemaking and the digital library, and to identify and discuss innovations and changing work processes in the digital library environment. Three concepts were identified for definition and clarification: the role of the library and information professional, the digital library, and sensemaking.

Exploration of the role of the library and information professional began with Rice-Lively asking about librarians' historical roles. Session participants' responses included organization, standardization, preservation, providing access, gatekeeping, evaluation, and finding information. Rice-Lively stated that at present librarians continue to undertake these traditional roles but in a very different environment than in the past. Library and information professionals are expected to combine up-to-date technical expertise with traditional knowledge and skills. Rice-Lively identified several new roles of library and information professionals, resulting from the digital environment. Included among the new roles she identified are translator of the complexities of the information world; navigator between the traditional library and the digital, global library; designer of user-oriented, online gateways; and boundary-spanner going beyond traditional organizational units.

Discussion of the digital library began with more input from session participants. Participants identified several features of their vision of a digital library such as full text online, interactive media, images and sound, live help, productivity tools, and usage measurement. Rice-Lively presented a discussion of the definition and characteristics of digital libraries along with several examples of existing digital libraries.

The remainder of the presentation was devoted to sensemaking theory and practice. Simply put, sensemaking is making sense. Rice-Lively stated that sensemaking is evidenced in individual or group efforts to understand or grasp a situation or information based on the physical environment, knowledge and information, recall of past experience, and other frames of reference. Sensemaking theory is the product of theories of communication, information seeking, social cognition and constructivism. She described various examples of sensemaking and discussed them with the session participants. Rice-Lively noted that in the online environment of nonphysical objects, determining how to reduce ambiguity is an overriding goal of sensemaking. She concluded her presentation by asking what can be done to facilitate sensemaking in the current library environment.

Presentation slides are available at:
http://www.gslis.utexas.edu/~marylynn/nasig

2. ***INFOMEDIARIES IN THE INTERNET ERA***
Heather Steele and Philipp Neie, Co-CEOs, Swets Blackwell, Runnemeade, NJ
Reported by Kay G. Johnson

Philipp Neie described the complexities of access in the Internet Era and noted the need for intermediaries. The role of the subscription agent is changing, and cooperation with libraries and publishers is essential. The traditional role of the subscription agent in saving libraries money and staff will continue and trend toward a wider variety of services related to electronic information delivery. New services in the Internet Era include electronic commerce services, consortial services, licensing of information/rights management, one stop shops (agent as department store), expanded outsourcing, services to publishers and third parties, and consultancy for libraries. The subscription model will move towards a content segment model, and there will be an increasing trend to cancel print in favor of electronic media. Pricing will be customized for multi-site use and library consortia. Subscription agents will continue to add value in the traditional core areas of content consolidation, ease of access, and administrative consolidation.

Heather Steele discussed the changes subscription agents face and continued with other future trends. Agents must be flexible, watch trends, and be prepared to repackage services and pricing models. Subscription agents must cooperate with the document delivery providers. Some of the future trends envisioned by Steele include expanded content in gateway and aggregation services, an increase in vertical subject portals, more free and lower-cost information, agents providing further services to publishers, lower prices in developing countries, and an academic backlash against big bundle buying. She concluded by noting that concerns about the demise of the subscription agent through disintermediation are in the past. Agents will need to be more flexible, streamlined, and updated to compete in the complex and ever-changing information environment of the Internet Era.

3. ***UCITA AND FAIR USE: A COMPATIBLE OR COMBATABLE RELATIONSHIP***
Sarah (Sally) Wiant, Law Librarian and Professor of Law, Washington and Lee University
Reported by Kaye Talley

Sarah Wiant began her presentation with background information. UCITA (the Uniform Computer Information Transactions Act) had its beginning as amendment 2B to the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), which is a model law for commercial law and is the most influential source of contract law in the United States. The UCC deals with buying and selling, while UCITA deals with licensing of software and any other kind of digital information. Each state enacts the UCC or the provisions it wants and that becomes the law of that state.

Two entities worked together on the creation of UCITA — the American Law Institute (ALI) and the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (NCCUSL). The ALI is composed of lawyers, judges, and law professors, while NCCUSL is made up of political appointees from each state. ALI withdrew its support of UCITA believing that it was fatally flawed, but NCCUSL has endorsed its enactment.

UCITA is a proposed state contract law designed to standardize the law regarding the licensing of software and all other forms of digital information. According to UCITA, information is defined as data, text, images, sounds, computer programs, databases, literary works, av works, motion pictures, mask works, or the like. Basically, UCITA would change the current rules for purchase and use of computer information.

According to Wiant, there are two types of licenses: mass-market and specific one-on-one contracts. UCITA establishes default rules for all types of licensing and allows unbalanced terms in licensing agreements. Although there is disagreement among federal courts as to the legality of this validation, UCITA validates shrink-wrap and click-on license agreements. Copyright owners under UCITA have the right to restrict uses that would otherwise be protected under the federal copyright law. The question then arises as to preemption, or whether a state UCITA contract can preclude fair use that would be given under federal copyright.

In UCITA's relationship with the copyright act, fair use would probably have to be determined by litigation. The first sale doctrine says that a buyer owns the book but not the copyright, but under UCITA the buyer would not even own the book. The consensus, according to Wiant, is that this provision is only for electronic items but there is nothing to keep UCITA from pertaining to print.

Virginia and Maryland are the only two states thus far which have passed UCITA. The implementation in Virginia was delayed for one year. During that time, the Virginia Library Association pushed through some amendments to the law, but those amendments were limited in their over-all effectiveness. Under the Virginia amendment, libraries can make a copy to lend, a copy for reserve, a copy for preservation, and a copy for the classroom. Without this amendment, nothing could be lent under UCITA even though the copy for preservation and the classroom copy are already protected under federal law.

A UCITA contract prohibits reverse engineering, or figuring out how something was done, such as filtering or encryption. Another provision of UCITA is that reviews of information content in digital form would not be allowed, which raises first amendment and privacy issues. Sellers are permitted to offer software as is, and there is no consumer protection. There *may* be a clause that would enable a vendor to change the terms of the contract after payment with only an e-mail as advisement; the change would be valid even if the e-mail wasn't actually received. Furthermore, in the case of litigation, the vendor has the right to pick the state or country for that litigation and also gets to pick which body of law will hear the case.

If this all sounds confusing, hard to follow, and somewhat frightening, that's because it is! Wiant says that librarians need to understand the real problems that UCITA poses by legitimizing shrink-wrap and click-through licenses that provide no exemption or fair use defenses. Further information can be found at the following Web sites: http://www.law.upenn.edu/bll/ulc/ucita/citam99.htm (the UCITA Web site); http://ucita.com (the Web site for AFFECT: Americans for Fair Electronic Commerce Transactions).

4. *NEW MODELS FOR NEW SERIALS: REDEFINING THE SERIAL AND THE LICENSING ENVIRONMENT*

John Cox, Principal, John Cox and Associates
Reported by Virginia A. Rumph

Many, through time, have said the book is dead, now those who promote the Net say the same. **John Cox** is sure books still thrive, but putting them online has many advantages. Text can be integrated with video, moving and 3D graphics, as well as sound. Material is fully searchable and interactive. Its content is not confined to text. Links can be created to other resources (data tables, etc.), or other publishers' content using CrossRef and SFX. Going the online route also eliminates the publisher's need for paper, printing, storage, and distribution.

Is the Net a brave new world as Stevan Harnad claims, or a better mousetrap? Does the Net change everything (Harnad), or only some things? Cox offered his take on these provocative questions. The Net can support the integration of various types of resources: primary information (peer-reviewed journals, conference and reference materials, databases), secondary information (A&I services), reviews, raw data (*e.g.*, chemical, engineering, clinical), lists of experts and colleagues, and data modeling procedures and techniques.

Cox sees the following trends in the Net world: informal communication will grow; online archiving will develop; sales practices will change; the publisher culture will change radically. For Cox, the high points of that changing publisher culture are: everything becomes content on the Web; product development extends to functionality; sales are direct to libraries or end users; sales are wholly based on licensing revenue; alliances and links to other resources temper publisher competition with cooperation. As an example of an information portal that exemplifies the integration of content online, Cox cited Animalscience.com (CABI/Ingenta) which consists of: abstracts, serials, conference proceedings, theses, reports, a community area, a calendar, job searching, help files, and much more.

Trying to cope with these changes, publishers and aggregators of Web products and services are still exploring various pricing models. Cox mentioned the Academic Press model (a premium plus last year's price), the simultaneous user model, the population-based model, a hybrid population-based model (added costs based on relevant FTE or some other factor), and the OhioLink model (a usage-based model **--** little used titles die and high use titles thrive within each subject discipline).

Cox sees problems and challenges for libraries in this new online world. There are no artifacts for libraries to collect; filtering and navigation become crucial. In this environment the key roles for librarians are knowledge management and training to support users. Librarians need to market their skills as navigators, not as collectors.

Prediction is an art. Cox sees the continuation of the peer-reviewed journal as essential to the health of scholarly communication, however that journal is created or distributed. Access is now more important than title by title selection. He reiterated his statement that in this Net environment librarians have a crucial role in navigation and evaluation.

5. *THREE DIMENSIONAL SERIALS: OR HOW I LEARNED TO LOVE CONTENT MANAGEMENT ON THE WEB*
Debora Seys, Information Consultant, Hewlett Packard Labs Research Library
Reported by Rose Robischon

Debora Seys chose this title for her presentation since we live in a three dimensional world. Written text is considered as two dimensional, being flat and linear. The new process for managing information, loosely called "content management," opens up the potential for radically changing the way we think about written material and is leading us towards what might become the three dimensional serial.

Movement is towards a three dimensional text, one that is assembled rather than constructed. This new text will supply depth and multiple perspectives for individual users. Seys looked at the characteristics of serials and ongoing materials to see how those might provide a conceptual bridge to the three dimensional serial. For an explanation of dimensions, Seys referred to Edwin Abbot's classic, *Flatland: A Romance of Many Dimensions*, in which there are five different dimensions: no dimension (Pointland), one dimension (Lineland), two dimensions (Flatland), three dimensions (Spaceland), and four dimensions (Thoughtland).

Content management attempts to control the life cycle of Web information. This management process deploys, organizes, maintains, and develops Web content. It also supports the collaborative activity of the creators, the users, and the site maintainers. Web materials can be created on demand and requests responded to in real-time through content management. The on-the-fly response can provide the capability of targeting the information to a specific user or group of users. The Web is migrating from static pages to Web content repositories. By storing this data in content repositories, a text can be created at will.

Bibliographic control depends on whether the item is static, ongoing, Internet-based, or content-management-based. There will be certain text that will be excluded from the content management type, *e.g.* annual reports. Catalogs are much more than a collection of catalog records: a catalog is a meaningful, coherent map of the collection. We need to move from the description of individual items toward an intentional map of the knowledge and meaning contained in the content of the collection. Serials embrace the Web technology. All content management materials are serials. Most Web sites are more serial-like than not. We need to take what we are already doing and adapt it to the new environment.

6. *MEXICAN SERIALS: THEIR TITLES, CONTENT AND READERS*

Jesús Lau, Director of Information Services and Accreditation, Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez
Reported by Valerie Bross

Those NASIGers clever (or lucky) enough to select this presentation by **Jesús Lau** were more than repaid for their time. In just an hour and a half, Lau reviewed the history of serials publishing in Mexico, cultural factors affecting serials publishing today, how to acquire Mexican periodicals, indexing tools, and current developments.

Mexican comic books are the most popular mass-market serial publication. Newspapers are also successful in the mass market; Mexico City alone has seven newspapers. Comic book serials and newspapers aside, relatively few serials are published (compared with the U.S. market).

In higher education, textbooks and professors' notes are the preferred means of scholarly communication. Of the scholarly serials that do exist, most are published by universities and research centers or by government organizations.

From a cultural perspective, most Mexican journals do not have a strong economic basis. Users generally expect to receive serials for free or at a minimal cost. In addition, journal publishers do not invest much in marketing and some fail to meet publication deadlines (some serials run over a year behind schedule!). So it is no wonder that 75% of the new serial publications fail within a year.

Despite these barriers to publication, many high-quality scholarly journals are being published in Mexico. When seeking to identify these titles, Lau suggested a number of tools: Conacyt's rated best titles, indexing services, catalogs of Mexican serial distributors (*e.g.*, DOMEXSA), and a few foreign suppliers (EBSCO Mexico, ISI, Swets Blackwell).

The utility of Mexican indexing services is worth special note. Several services are available: Artemisa (medicine), BIVE (veterinary science), Clase (social sciences), INFOBILA (library science), InfoLatina (general/full text + business), IRESIE (education), and Periódica (science and technology). In addition, the ARL table of contents service is useful.

Lau suggested several strategies that would improve the position of Mexican serials in the international market. First, bilingual abstracts would allow librarians to discover and select journals more readily. Second, increased compliance with Conacyt and ISO standards would increase acceptability of journals in the international market. Third, the use of more sophisticated marketing techniques would bring Mexican serials to the attention of libraries and users abroad (*e.g.*, in the U.S.). Fourth, publishers could work to get their titles included in A&I services and in lists for international subscription agencies. Finally, publishers could explore joint business ventures with international partners, to help reduce border/cultural market barriers.

7. *LICENSING E-JOURNALS — UK STYLE*

Hazel Woodward, University Librarian and Director of Cranfield University Press, Cranfield University
Reported by Karen Matthews

Hazel Woodward reported that the United Kingdom has licensing issues in common with the United States but is handling licensing in a different way. The United Kingdom does licensing on a national scale with academic libraries acquiring electronic resources through NESLI (National Electronic Site Licence Initiative). NESLI is negotiated by JISC/DNER (Joint Information Services Committee/ Distributed National Electronic Resources).

DNER is a managed environment for assessing quality assured information resources on the Internet. The eight collection working groups of DNER are: books, discovery tools (subject portals), journals, images, geospatial resources, learning materials, primary data, and moving images and sound. The journals group works with NESLI and databases. This group is a "loose" consortia of academic libraries. It negotiates contracts with the publishers and libraries "opt-in" to these publisher deals on an individual basis. These deals are not based on the number of libraries as many consortial arrangements are in the United States.

NESLI was started in 1999. Librarians through the NESLI Steering Group set its strategic aims. The Managing Agent, contracted by the NESLI Steering Group, undertakes the day-to-day operations. This Managing Agent's role is to: negotiate value for money deals with scholarly publishers, handle subscriptions to e-journals, address the technical issues surrounding authentication, and encourage the widespread acceptance of a standard Model Licence. Some of the items negotiated include site definition covering multiple campuses, provision for walk-ins, electronic interlibrary loan, continuing access to materials published and paid for within the subscription period, and mandatory usage statistics. Electronic interlibrary loan is allowed through NESLI. However, the electronic delivery may be to other libraries, not to individuals. The Managing Agent can say no to a license with a publisher based on cost or on lack of acceptance of the Model Licence. Currently the Managing Agent is the University of Manchester and Swets Blackwell.

DNER has achieved: the establishment of channels of communication with all stake holders via NESLI, e-journal deals with 17 scholarly publishers; 50 institutions signed up for one or more deals; 70 institutions with an interest in participating; acceptance by most publishers of the standard Model Licence; MARC records available through the Managing Agent; and ongoing work on 'subject clusters' of journals. Each publisher has produced a different economic model for its offerings, and many of these deals are complex. The participants have agreed that a single negotiating body for e-journals and a model license are good ideas. DNER has discovered the negotiation phase often is too long and complex. Deals often need a quick response and fit some organizations but not others. Librarians have different expectations about value for money.

In the future the central negotiating body will be retained. To meet the needs of libraries there is a need to provide more flexibility in deals, to investigate new economic models with publishers, to provide one portal or a degree of choice, and to improve communications with all stakeholders.

8. *IS XML IN YOUR FUTURE?*
Art Rhyno, Librarian, Head of Systems, University of Windsor
Reported by Lillian DeBlois

Art Rhyno first provided a definition of XML (eXtensible Markup Language), which is a subset of SGML (Standardized Generalized Markup Language). The basic premise underpinning XML is to generate meaningful tags that are concerned with content attributes for various documents. XML is extremely useful when utilized for textual material to identify content. It enables you to mark pieces you want to bring forward or highlight. The tags are the keys to XML and the vocabulary is beyond a doubt the foundation upon which the tags are built. XML is a shorthand method of classification to enforce consistency. The mark-up in XML is more verbose than MARC but nevertheless clearer. XML has style elements to give more control to the user for displaying elements.
The second point covered in extensive detail was XML for content publication and management. For example, XML opens the door to endless possibilities of retrieving content -- a chapter from a book, a line from a poem, or a score from an opera. XML is the backbone of the up and coming digital library.

Next, Rhyno covered XML for integration of systems. XML can be used to tie systems together or move data between different types of systems. For example, the library system is linked to an external database, and PDAs through XML. The possibilities are endless, both locally and globally due to international standards.

Rhyno then explained metadata and the Semantic Web. Metadata is significant because it "saves bandwidth, allows more sophisticated searching, can define access restrictions, [and] integrates disparate resources." According to the W3C Semantic Web Agreement Group, "the Semantic Web is a Web that includes documents or portions of documents, describing explicit relationships between things and containing semantic information intended for automated processing by machines." In other words, your server and my server know what they are talking about.

The next topic of discussion was XML-enabling MARC. " XMLMARC is an experimental effort from the Lane Medical Library at Stanford to create a flexible retrieval and display mechanism for bibliographic, authority, and other library information using XML."

Rhyno ended his presentation with "The Web Browser as a Global Desktop." What if you could do everything with your browser? "The Global desktop would be a place where library information could be passed seamlessly into many other types of applications. There [would be] complete control over Web interfaces and Web interactions. Metadata [would be] shared with other communities. Library applications and tools [would] use mainstream technologies rather than focus on a niche market." In conclusion, XML is a more precise method of organizing data, as compared to MARC and a more useful method with many global possibilities.

WORKSHOPS

1. *TAMING THE AGGREGATORS: PROVIDING ACCESS TO JOURNALS IN AGGREGATOR DATABASES*

John Riemer, Head, Cataloging Department, Young Research Library, UCLA; Jina Choi Wakimoto, Cataloging Coordinator, California State University – Northridge
Reported by Carol Green

John Riemer, Chair of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging's Task Group on Journals in Aggregator Databases, reviewed the Group's charges, how it addressed the charges, and the recommendations for record creation strategies and maintenance strategies.

Libraries face the challenge of how to provide access to full-text journals contained in aggregator databases. A CONSER survey conducted by the PCC Task Group found that 71% of respondents preferred cataloging records in the OPAC and 75% were interested in acquiring sets of these records. Other issues identified included maintenance of record sets, consolidation of data from all aggregator databases onto a single record, and vendors as the primary source of the records.

Based on two sets of charges, the Task Group identified five record creation strategies. The Group recommends two out of the five: human-created analytics and machine-derived analytics from print-version serial records. Maintenance of records must address at least seven issues: overall record set distribution/delivery, added/dropped titles, changes in volume coverage, completeness of content for volumes covered, URL maintenance, title changes, and cancellation/change of subscription.

For the overall record set distribution/delivery, the Group identified two main strategies: reissuance of the entire set or distribution of records flagged as new, changed, or deleted. While there are advantages and disadvantages to both strategies, the Group recommends the first as the simpler, safer strategy. The Task Group's work can be found at http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/automation.html/.

Jina Choi Wakimoto presented examples of the various access methods currently being used in libraries and discussed the technologies utilized, highlighting the pros and cons of each. She also discussed the pros and cons of single vs. separate record approaches.

The single record approach incorporates holdings for a title in multiple formats on one record, with the main advantage being the single bibliographic record. The primary disadvantage is that it is labor intensive and requires a high level of staff. The main advantage of the separate record approach is that it provides full bibliographic records with all access points for the title in each format. A disadvantage is the need for record-by-record maintenance of multiple bibliographic records. Also, the multiple records in the OPAC can confuse users.

The decision to go with single or separate records depends on the individual library and local considerations such as quality vs. quantity and available resources. It may be more logical to use the single record approach when the library supplies the record, while the separate record approach may make more sense when using vendor-supplied records.

In the future, the OPAC as a single access point may become a reality. The role of vendors will be to provide accurate and complete source lists and preferably free MARC records for their holdings. Resource sharing will play a crucial role.

2. *JOURNAL HOLDINGS LISTS ON WEB SITES: DESIGNS THAT NON-SPECIALIZED STAFF CAN BUILD AND MAINTAIN*

Susan E. Pulsipher, Director of Library Services, Methodist College
Reported by Nancy A. Cunningham

Susan Pulsipher aimed her presentation at staff from libraries with limited resources, particularly those with minimal systems support and restricted control of a Web server. She described the steps recommended to teach support staff, who have little or no cataloging or HTML experience, how to generate and maintain Web-based specialized lists and links to other resources.

Pulsipher's basic objective was to demonstrate how to create a journal list and also how to train a person who would be able to maintain it. In the process, she discussed using the list format to present: journal holdings when the journal record was not in the OPAC, current subscriptions, complete holdings, online journals, newsletters, and newspapers. She also mentioned customizing lists as a way to present information tailored to the particular needs of users.

Through a discussion on the pros and cons of various display options, Pulsipher addressed the need during the development phase to consider the page's accessibility, utility and appearance. She underscored the importance of adequate institutional identification on each Web page and sub page, consistency in design features, plus the use of dates to indicate currency of the information presented. She recommended the use of a "jump list" or "jump load list" carried at the top of each page to help the user navigate through a large list of material.

Pulsipher stressed the use of templates to assist in the creation of new Web-based lists to ensure uniformity in layout, design, and presentation of the information contained in lists. She recommended using a consistent file-naming scheme, as well as saving files on the server for backup and access by multiple users. Establishment of a list maintenance routine for updating using a "when to do" set of criteria was deemed to be essential to maintain accuracy and consistency.

Staff who will be taught to work on these lists need basic skills such as: typing accuracy, general computer use competency, and a liking for projects of this nature. More specialized lists require an understanding of the meaning and use of the material presented in lists. For example, to create and edit a listing of journal holdings, a person should be familiar with journal titles and their changes and the serial holdings format used by their library.

Pulsipher reviewed the stages of hands-on training, detailing a step-by-step method for: introducing each skill to be learned, teaching essential commands for the HTML or Web editor software, allowing time for practice, reinforcing and frequently encouraging the learners as they progress. Provide the staff with a sense of ownership by letting them make decisions and take credit for their work.

3. ***ARTICLES, ARTICLES EVERYWHERE…BUT WHERE? AND DOES IT MATTER?***

Amira Aaron, Director, Marketing and Programs, Faxon, RoweCom Library Services; Johnathan Helmke, Technology/Instruction Librarian, Butler University

[Ed. Note: No reporter available for this workshop]

4. ***LIBRARY CONSORTIA: PENELOPE'S LOOM OR A POSITIVE ADVANCE?***

Joan Thompson, Assistant Director, Boston Library Consortium; Tom Peters, Director, Center for Library Initiatives, Committee on Institutional Cooperation

Reported by Donna Packer

Joan Thompson addressed the general reasons for the rise of consortia. It has been established that consortia can and do negotiate with publishers and aggregators on price, support access through the provision of shared resources, help evaluate new and emerging technologies and other developments, and educate both librarians and publishers on fair use issues and assist with statistical reporting and archiving.

The ultimate goal of consortia should be to benefit our patrons, who want everything immediately and easily and to move among materials in a manner based on their own needs rather than library-imposed structures. There is still much work to be done on access; Thompson noted that Z39.50 was intended to help patrons by providing seamless access to varied library catalogs, but its functionality is being questioned. However, consortia have greatly helped by enabling direct patron-initiated borrowing and shared electronic resource availability. Some consortia are actively studying the new sfx protocol which should allow content-sensitive searching for electronic materials.

Consortia also offer new opportunities, facilitate new avenues of scholarly communication, with new ways of accessing material and extending services beyond the library building or campus. They can help to select and organize materials, offer navigational assistance, help libraries and librarians serve more as guides and teach us how to move ahead, thinking of the library as a knowledge network rather than a physical structure. Consortia also prompt us to address certain questions: in a cooperative environment of shared collections, what is the collection? How is it defined? Should e-resources be cataloged? How do you define holdings when there are no physical holdings? How do you count these materials? What numbers are being used and by whom?

There are, of course challenges and potential drawbacks to consortial membership: some libraries worry about losing their unique institutional identity and in some arrangements have less input about the content of their collections. Consortia can also add new layers of sometimes costly bureaucracy.

Tom Peters focused on the role of consortia in helping to manage electronic databases and journals, expanding on many of the points outlined by Thompson. He discussed the purchasing role, which might include the familiar "off-the-shelf" materials from a publisher or aggregator, or a collaboration with publishers to create clusters of content. Increasingly, consortia may actually develop content, providing an environment for digitizing materials no longer under copyright protection, or may even go directly to the content source (authors), such as with the global e-print archives project.

Peters noted that scholars tend to think the move to electronic resources is about communication, not cost savings, while libraries and their administrators are interested in cost containment. Publishers want scholars to communicate, but they must worry about their bottom line. In line with Thompson's remarks, Peters noted that the goal of his consortium is to expand options and opportunities for their users. He asserted that consortia have helped by creating new pricing models and have been instrumental in developing new publishing models, such as SPARC and BioOne. But there are new ad hoc partnerships for archiving content arising outside the current consortial models: Yale is entering into an agreement with Elsevier, Harvard with Blackwells, Wiley, and the Univ. of Chicago Press. Yet will the content provided by the new publishing models replace established journals, or merely provide additional competing publications for libraries to buy? Will the ad hoc relationships be more viable than our usual institutional structures? What will the cost impact be on libraries who might look to Yale and Harvard to provide them access to archived electronic content?

Peters maintained that consortia have had a tremendous impact on pricing models and licensing terms for e-serials. Consortia have also been involved in developing pilot projects to streamline and improve the editorial, peer review and production processes. He discussed an article by Ken Frazier against the "big deal - one size fits all" package. Consortia, in fact, often facilitate "big deals", and Peters suggested these are part of efforts to reform the publishing system, and not an obstacle to it.

Peters defined three issues deserving current study: 1) we can no longer claim with much confidence that it is possible to know *a priori* our patrons' information needs, hence there is a great need for informative, contextually placed usage statistics; 2) cost/benefit analyses are needed of the value of having trained experts select content literature at the level of individual journal and monograph titles; and 3) consortial collection development activities may be making core collections more homogeneous and less responsive to unique institutional needs.

The title of the workshop refers to Penelope, who, with faith in the survival and ultimate return of her husband Odysseus, put off importunate suitors by stating she would select one of them when she had finished weaving Odysseus' shroud. Then, each night, she unravelled the work of the day. This theme was intended to provoke us to ask questions about our path to our ultimate goal of best serving our individual library patrons. Are we, through consortial collection development and collection access arrangements, unravelling the work of decades of careful, individually tailored collection development efforts? If so, is there a greater and ultimately better end?

5. OUTSOURCING ELECTRONIC JOURNAL LICENSING AND NEGOTIATION; OR, HOW TO MAKE E-JOURNAL ACQUISITIONS AND LICENSING PROCESS AS BORING AS ORDERING PRINT JOURNALS

David R. Fritsch, Vice President, Sales, TDNet, Inc.; Marilyn Geller, Independent Information Management Consultant; Adam Chesler, Marketing Manager, Electronic Products and Services, Kluwer Academic Publishers
Reported by Anne Frohlich

Marilyn Geller discussed outsourcing of licensing and negotiation from a librarian's perspective. Libraries have long used outsourcing to streamline work, such as use of subscription agents. In order to outsource licensing the library must understand its own needs concerning authorized users, authorized uses, access methods, and other issues. Some of the questions that need to be answered are: What categories of users are authorized? Where are the users located? Do authorized uses include ILL, reserves, course packs, etc.? What archiving options are acceptable? What access methods will be needed? Some of the questions the outsourcer needs to have answers to are: Does the library need statistics? What are the restrictions on jurisdiction – must litigation take place in the library's state? Can the library indemnify the publisher for damage or loss? Who is authorized to sign licenses and under what circumstances?

There are two current patterns for getting common licenses and economies of scale: national site licensing programs, such as National Electronic Site Licence Initiative (NESLI) and Canadian National Site Licensing Project (CNSLP) and consortial programs, such as California Digital Library (CDL) and NC Live. Outsourcing by a single library is the third pattern being discussed here. Instead of the library going to the publishers, the library makes the publishers come to it. There are three options: a) assign legal rights to a 3d party who will sign licenses in the library's behalf; b) assign negotiating rights to a 3d party, but the library signs the license; c) put on the library's Web site license terms for the publishers to read. In summary, you need to understand your library's needs, evaluate your options in outsourcing, then let someone else do it.

David Fritsch discussed outsourcing from an agent's/vendor's viewpoint. In the current licensing practices the library/consortium must get a separate license from each publisher. Problems with this model include the fact that the library must negotiate and process each license. Often there must be negotiation over the jurisdiction in which litigation will take place. There is negotiation over indemnification if a third party sues about use of copyrighted material. Many libraries want the library to be held harmless in this situation. The library must negotiate the definition of users and sites. Because the library usually has to wait for review by the legal office or purchasing, licenses can take up to a year for approval.

This is how the future model may work. The library writes its own generic license and sends it to a vendor or to publishers. The library may use the Cox license at www.licensingmodels.com as a basis for its own license. The library engages an agent as an attorney to sign licenses for the library. In this model the library negotiates an agreement with the agent. The library writes a protocol for the license clauses, telling the agent what clauses are non-negotiable, what may be changed, what are not important. Then the library and the agent negotiate the service agreement.

As with print subscriptions the library sets up an order list for licenses with renewal dates or for new orders. The agent sends the license to the publisher. They negotiate and sign the license. The agent places the order, then tests the access. If the publisher refuses the license, the agent may sign the publisher's license on behalf of the library if there is no conflict with the library's license. If the publisher calls the client, in this model the client tells the publisher that the client cannot discuss the license. There is the option for the library to order direct if the publisher will not deal with the agent.

From the agent's perspective, acting as agent for a number of libraries provides economies of scale. Acting as an agent in licensing gets easier, because with practice staff learn how to handle the issues. This is an extension of agents' handling of print.

Adam Chesler spoke from a publisher's perspective. He noted that in North America most third party licensing efforts have fallen through. One has been signed in the U.S. There has been more success internationally.

Using an agent works best when all parties know what they want, need, and expect and share that information from the outset. The publisher and the library must both be willing to allow the third party to act as intermediary.

The library must answer these questions. How will you address subscriptions purchased through other sources, or are you willing to consolidate all your subscriptions through one source? Are you going to put this out to bid? Are you willing to cede negotiating control and let your agent do all the heavy lifting?

Going forward, publishers should be flexible about using alternative licenses (*e.g.*, Cox models) and licensing practices (*e.g*., via third parties) as necessary. They must encourage discussion about all products and services, through different sources. Libraries must decide where to dedicate their resources – and then follow through.

6. *WE'VE MADE IT AVAILABLE, BUT IS IT ACCESSIBLE?*

Cheryl Riley, Associate Professor and Librarian,
Central Missouri State University
Reported by Pat Loghry

Cheryl Riley discussed the need for universal design of Web pages. She indicated that Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act and Section 508 of the Americans with Disabilities Act mandate usability. That there is a large and growing population of people covered under these laws. She talked about dilemmas encountered by consumers with disabilities. Of the higher education sites she surveyed, she noted that less than 22% had accessible front Web pages. If one continues into the Web site, the percentage drops significantly: at one level down only 3% are accessible and at two levels down only 1% are accessible. Riley discussed several myths about Web accessibility, including that accessible Web authoring is expensive and time consuming, that it is too difficult for the average Web designer, and that disabled people don't use the Web.

Riley covered fourteen W3C Web Access Initiative guidelines for Web sites:

Provide equivalent alternatives to auditory and visual content.
Do not rely on color alone.
Use mark-up and style sheets.
Clarify natural language use.
Create tables that transform gracefully.
Ensure that pages with new technology transform gracefully.
Ensure user-control of time sensitive content changes.
Ensure direct accessibility of embedded user interfaces.
Design for device independence.
Use interim solutions.
Use W3C technologies and guidelines.
Provide context and orientation information.
Provide clear navigation mechanisms.
Ensure that documents are clear and simple.

Riley suggested that attendees check Accessibility Icons and use Bobby tools to test your Web site for problems. She ended by recommending that attendees check out the Web Accessibility Initiative Web site at www.w3.org/WAI/ for further guidelines and a checklist.

7. ***CATALOGING WEB-SERIALS ON THE OCLC - CORC: ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN AN EMPIRICAL STUDY***

Tschera Harkness Connell, Serials Coordinator, The Ohio State University Libraries; Chandra Prabha, Senior Research Scientist, OCLC Office of Research
Reported by Gale Teaster

[Ed. Note: Chandra Prabha was unable to attend the conference; Tschera Connell presented their findings]

OCLC Cooperative Online Resource Catalog (CORC) is a catalog of bibliographic records and pathfinders, and it is a system for creating metadata to describe electronic resources. Pathfinders of one institution are accessible to other institutions. CORC is not a separate database, but is a part of World Cat and became available for use by any OCLC cataloging member in July 2000.

Tschera Connell and **Chandra Prabha** participated as the principal investigators in a joint research project of OCLC and the Ohio State University Libraries. The project focused on the resources included in CORC, not on the records themselves, and it examined how libraries were using the records. A scientific sample of 400 CORC records, which had been contributed from July 1999 through June 2000, and the corresponding source items on the Web were studied. The sample included member contributed records only. NetLibrary and InterCat records were excluded from the study.

What are some of the characteristics of the CORC resources? Most of the CORC contributors are academic libraries (67%) with U.S. federal and state government libraries following (23%). Economics, western history, and other social sciences are the predominant subjects covered. Monographs (45%) and integrated resources (44%) comprise the bulk of the resources in CORC. Only 10% of the resources are serials and even fewer (1%) are archival collections.

Questions specific to the Web medium arose as outgrowths of the CORC research study. For example, should serial titles be cataloged at the site, sub site, or page level? What are the guidelines for distinguishing a Web-serial from a Web-integrating resource? Part of the problem in addressing these issues is due to the lack of standardized terminology. It is sometimes difficult to use traditional cataloging definitions for Web-based resources, i.e. the term "analytic" as issues of serials or as plays in a collection, does not transfer adequately to describe a section, part, etc. of a Web site. Some of the definitions provided by Connell and Prabha included: Web page; Web site; Web sub site; Web Collection.

Connell provided an overview of the resources in CORC; however, she also left the audience with food for thought. What are the implications on collection development – for example, the fact that so much of the collection is social science monographs? What will be the affect on workflows? These are questions that each library will need to answer based on its own organizational and curriculum needs.

8. ***NEW FRONTIERS IN REFERENCE SERVICE: ELECTRONIC SERIALS TRANSFORMING PUBLIC SERVICES***

Allan Scherlen, Collection Development Librarian for the Social Sciences, Appalachian State University; Markel Tumlin, English Literature Reference Librarian, San Diego State University
Reported by Tamara Schnell

In the evolving world of electronic serials and technology, traditional reference services, patron use patterns, and serials accessibility continue to change. **Allan Scherlen** richly discussed the issues involved in this ongoing transformation, and **Markel Tumlin** presented San Diego State University's decision-making process and approach to providing access to the library's electronic serials.

Scherlen provided an overview of reference service issues in an evolving technical environment. These included accessibility to materials, increased time spent for each reference activity, re-educating users, helping users evaluate sources, citing sources correctly, and technical problems such as the timely problem of rolling blackouts in California.

He also provided an overview of changes in patron use patterns including the rise of distance learning and providing comparable quality library services, the concern for information literacy and how library research has changed, and higher expectations from users. In his evaluation of user expectations, Scherlen noted that younger people come to the research environment with greater computer literacy. He also stated that, due to the commodification of higher education, students and researchers are viewed more as customers with consumer attitudes.

Scherlen said that electronic manifestations have changed the way research is done, and he posed the question, "Have librarians changed with them?" In response to this question, he analyzed local and remote reference service from both the librarian's perspective and the patron's perspective. He found that the traditional reference interview has shifted more toward the librarian and researcher working together to find an answer to the research question. He also emphasized integrating bibliographic instruction into the classroom and focusing on the research process, rather than an individual database or product.

Tumlin then provided a practical level of discussion focused on San Diego State University's (SDSU) experience with providing bibliographic control to electronic serials. Tumlin expressed a general concern at SDSU about the lack of bibliographic control of electronic sources. A task group was formed to address the issue. The initial charge was to "create a periodicals list," but the task group decided to look first at other options to gain a better perspective.

The group evaluated three options for providing better bibliographic control to their electronic serials collection. The first option was the OPAC approach where all access and bibliographic records would be provided exclusively through the library's online catalog. The second option was a database approach where a separate database would function as the primary access tool yet work in conjunction with the OPAC bibliographic records. The third option was the Chico Project approach. This approach uses consortia database software available through California State University-Chico, which codes records for individual libraries completely separate from the OPAC.

Tumlin reported that the task group was ready to recommend the Chico Project approach when further investigation revealed inconsistent labeling and difficulty for being used as a collection development tool. As a result, the group recommended using an approach where the bibliographic records reside in the OPAC and active/dynamic Web pages are generated using these OPAC records. For the task group's report and full evaluation of each option, see http://libweb.sdsu.edu/gov/serials.html.

In conclusion, Scherlen and Tumlin emphasized that academic librarians still play an important, though changing, role in the research environment and that librarians need to reach outside traditional walls to remote users. They also concluded that librarians need to develop further virtual reference services, integrate the library and its services into the curriculum, and make electronic serials clearly accessible.

9. *THE CISTI SOURCE/SUMO EXPERIENCE AT MCGILL UNIVERSITY: FOUR YEARS AFTER*
Louis Houle, Interlibrary Loan/Document Delivery Coordinator, McGill University
Reported by Bridgette Scott

The soaring cost in journal subscriptions recently has caused budgetary difficulties for many libraries. In this presentation, **Louis Houle** described how the libraries at McGill University implemented a Subsidized UnMediated Ordering (SUMO) service in order to provide access to journals without caving under the weight of enormous subscription costs.

Houle began by explaining how his library brainstormed to come up with alternatives to subscribing to high cost journals. First, McGill considered e-serials, which would eliminate storage, binding, and processing costs. However, they determined that e-serials were still problematic with regard to archiving and conservation, licensing and access, and the availability of a wide range of titles. A second option was to depend more heavily on ILL. However, McGill decided that they could not realistically expect ILL to increase production without increased funding.

Houle then detailed the solution upon which McGill finally settled: to use a Subsidized Unmediated Ordering Service, supplied by CISTI Source. This service allows McGill faculty, staff, and graduate students to follow a link from the library's home page and search CISTI Source, a title of contents database similar to CARL Uncover. Once the patron finds a desired article by searching by author, article title, journal title, ISSN, and journal year, CISTI Source then sends the article directly to the user's desktop via FTP or Ariel software. The benefit of this service is that paying for the articles on an as-needed basis is cheaper than subscribing to the journals. In addition, having the service provided by CISTI Source means that it bypasses the library's ILL office completely.

The bulk of Houle's presentation was devoted to evaluating usage statistics of the SUMO service to determine whether or not the endeavor was economically sound. Houle's statistics for the last four years support his claim that the SUMO service saves McGill from paying the high cost of journal subscriptions, while still providing access to those journals for McGill's patrons. The key to keeping the CISTI Source/SUMO service viable and cost effective is ensuring that the cost of document delivery from any particular title never outweighs the subscription cost for that title. Houle ended the presentation by concluding that buying what patrons *actually* need instead of what they *might* need is the solution to soaring journal costs.

10. *WHAT'S ONE TO DO WHEN VENDORS, PUBLISHERS AND AGGREGATORS DO NOT MEET YOUR USAGE REPORTING NEEDS? DO IT YOURSELF!*

Fannie Cox, Electronic Resources Coordinator;
Weiling Liu, Director, Libraries Technology, both from University of Louisville Libraries
Reported by Gene Gardner

When the University of Louisville libraries hired **Fannie Cox**, she was presented with the challenge of evaluating the use of the University's e-journals. E-journal usage reports are needed to evaluate spending for electronic journals in relationship to their value and improved services. Cox looked at usage reports from vendors but found too much inconsistency among statistics that the vendors actually report, the title list included in the report, and the method in which the report was delivered. Beginning with a pencil and a calculator to collect statistics, this method soon evolved to an intermediate Web page. Still not satisfied with the results, Cox enlisted the help of **Weiling Liu** from the Office of Libraries Technology to develop a method to collect the University's own statistics.

They used the *Guidelines for Statistical Measures of Usage of Web-based Indexed, Abstracted and Full Text Resources*, developed by the International Coalition of Library Consortia (ICOLC) as a place to begin. The ICOLC standard reports include number of queries, number of menu selections categorized, number of sessions (logins), number of turnaways, and the number of items examined. The reports the University of Louisville collects include: access location (library, on campus, off campus), referring page, vendor, title, subject and time.

Information is tracked using AXS software, which includes a tracking key in the journal URL field. These statistics are then loaded into a file using Access 2000, which can generate usage reports by referring page, vendor, title, or subject(s). Thus, the collected statistic reveals what titles are used where, both on and off campus. The statistics collected by the University, in conjunction with vendor reports, give the library the information needed to make decisions for electronic journal collection development.

11. *ART OF CLAIMING*

Kim Maxwell, Serials Acquisitions Librarian, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bob Boissy, Manager, Standards and Interface Services, Faxon, RoweCom Library Services
Reported by Becky Sheffield

Kim Maxwell and **Bob Boissy** discussed the basic elements and philosophy of the serial claim cycle from a librarian's and a vendor's view point.

Maxwell has developed a decision process, as well as information sheets, during the time she has worked with serial claims and with training staff to perform claiming activities. She stressed the need for knowing your own operation. This includes understanding all the elements: the types of orders, publishers, claims, and the payment cycle with which you work. Making this information available to your staff is also critical.

She discussed some of the reasons why claims need to be issued such as orders not being placed on time and inaccurate communications. When trying to gather information regarding whether to generate a claim, Maxwell suggested numerous possibilities to check, *e.g.* internal and external Web sites as well as individual contacts. Determining how long to wait before claiming the first and subsequent times is important. In general, she suggested waiting half as long as the interval between issues, *e.g*. for a bimonthly, wait 30 days.

Maxwell has conducted an informal vendor poll that indicated 85% of claims are satisfied on the first or second claim. The third and any later claims produce far fewer successful responses; therefore, unless you are trying to make a point with the publisher/vendor, it is wise to try to purchase the missing issue at that point.

Boissy reviewed electronic claims by noting the e-claim standards currently available (X12 and EDIFACT with XML a possibility soon) and how issues are identified in an e-claim. He then discussed the characteristics of e-claims as well as similarities and differences of electronic and print claims. He gave several pointers such as: notes on e-claims will slow the claim down; a range of issues being claimed is fine in a print claim but not in an e-claim.

Allowing 6-8 weeks between claims prevents flooding of the system, which in turn enables better claim response. E-claims are faster than the postal service, but not necessarily faster than fax or e-mail claims. If the vendor has a backlog of claims, fax and e-mail claims may well be delayed in being processed while e-claims will be processed the day they are received.

Some of the obstacles to implementing e-claims are unavailability of an ILS option of e-claiming at a reasonable cost; initial time investment in setting up predictions, vendor records, etc.; and developing trust that nothing gets lost in translation with e-claims. Some ways in which e-claims can enhance the library's claim process are reduction of time for e-claim resolution, ability for fine-tuning of parameters, and exchange of publisher claims policies.

12. *USING THE ONIX INTERNATIONAL STANDARD TO MANAGE SERIALS*

Brian Green, Manager, EDItEUR; Katharina Klemperer, Director of Product Development for North America, Harrassowitz
Reported by Valerie Bross

Brian Green reviewed past and current developments related to ONIX International. The unicorn for which we are searching, he began, is a single information stream from publisher to library. At present, publishers have various internal systems for editorial, marketing, and distribution; these systems are not integrated and the information is not easily shared. ONIX would provide an international standard for communicating rich metadata in XML-structured records.

ONIX metadata for serials would be able to support:

- Comprehensive product description and bibliographic detail;
- Structured description at the journal, issue, or article level;
- Text: scope, indexing terms, A&I services (which A&Is index a title), editorial board information;
- Images: jacket, thumbnail, author photos
- Audio, video, and Web sites
- Prices and availability for different markers, subscription ranges, and e-version/print versions
- Promotional, advertising, and submission information.

ONIX for serials is still in draft phase. The next steps in development are to prepare an XML DTD, to put draft materials out for community review, and to initiate pilot exchanges.

Katharina Klemperer followed by presenting four applications. First, elements of ONIX could be used to create publisher or vendor catalogs. In addition to the familiar data elements (title, publisher, frequency, etc.), such an ONIX application would also include current subscription information for a specific subscription period.

Second, ONIX records could serve alerting functions such as dispatch information, journal check-in, and claiming notification. For such an application, an ONIX record would include issue-specific information such as cover date and publication date. Third, ONIX supports multilevel records. As an application Klemperer displayed a diagram for an ONIX record with article-level data such as first page, last page, and type of content.

Finally, Klemperer described an application to support library holdings. In this application, ONIX records would answer the questions: What issues of what titles does the library hold? What supplier provides which issues to the library? Such ONIX data could be used in reference-linking applications such as SFX.

In closing, the presenters suggested that the biggest barrier to ONIX acceptance would be legacy systems and standards (including MARC). The presenters stressed the need for more people to use ONIX; for, as they phrased it, "What good is a [single] telephone?"

The presentations can be found at:

http://www.harrassowitz.de/present/nasig01edi/sld001.htm

http://www.harrassowitz.de/present/nasig01/sld001.htm

13. *MEASURING ELECTRONIC JOURNAL COLLECTIONS: A HOMERIC STRUGGLE*

Christie T. Degener, Cataloging Services/Serials Librarian, Health Sciences Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Yvonne W. Zhang, Catalog Librarian, Cal Poly Pomona
Reported by Sarah George

Yvonne Zhang outlined the impetus for libraries to measure electronic resources and the challenges they create. The rapid growth of electronic information coupled with limited understanding of the use and cost of these resources demand better control, management, and accountability. Challenges in gathering and analyzing the statistics abound and include conceptual differences between established standards and newer ones, the shift in philosophy away from physical collections toward library services, the need for stability in a fluid medium, and tension between user demands versus technology development. To assist libraries with these challenges, several sources provide guidelines for measuring electronic journals. The standards, which include recommendations from the ARL, ICOLC, the McClure and Lopata Principles, and locally defined guidelines, are complementary and do not necessarily supersede each other.

Cal Poly has incorporated electronic journals in its annual statistics report since the 1998-1999 academic year. The library uses its integrated library system for all collection counts and expenditures. Problems encountered when adding e-journal data included the lack of theoretical and practical instructions on how and what to count, the lack of procedures to ensure consistency across years, and the lack of codes for electronic resources. A task force studied the available standards and best practices. An important initial step was to define the terms "aggregator," "full text," and "database." The task force then developed codes and notes for electronic resources that were then input into the ILS. Other projects to complement the ILS coding project will include new instructions for coding, system log analysis, analysis of vendor statistics, a database to track electronic journal licenses, and a general user survey. Data gained from all of these projects provide important information such as the total number of electronic resources titles, the ratio of print and electronic items cataloged, and the percentage of cataloged electronic resources in the overall collection.

Christie Degener started her presentation with the problem she faced: How do you answer the question, "How many electronic journals do you have?" She discussed why a title count cannot and should not suffice and acknowledged the difficulties that arise when communicating with people who are not familiar with the complexities of e-journals. Collection development policies designed to eliminate duplication of formats negatively affect statistics if you do not include e-journals. However, there is not one universal standard for reporting e-journals. Degener compared the "ARL Academic Medical Library Statistics Questionnaire (1999-2000)" and the "Annual Statistics of Medical School Libraries in the United States and Canada (1998-1999)" to determine the range of requested information.

A model for measuring electronic journals must include consistency, accuracy, a wide range of subscription arrangements, a level of complexity that prevents misinterpretation, flexibility to answer diverse requests for data, and transferability of data in multiple formats. The preliminary list of subscription arrangements had seven categories, which included print subscription with free electronic access, print subscription with paid electronic access, free electronic subscription only, paid electronic subscription only, partial payment for electronic access (joint purchase), and electronic access via subscription by another UNC Chapel Hill library. These last two categories were subdivided to indicate whether the Health Sciences Library had a current print subscription. Two additional categories designated titles with duplicate access and off-campus access.

Degener succeeded in generating desired statistical reports from the data and found that the data also provides answers to questions as yet unasked, such as "What percent of our e-journals are acquired through joint purchases?" Current challenges for the system include counting ceased or changed titles that are still accessible and updating codes that change because of new consortial deals, publisher changes, or other factors.

14. PROVIDING WEB-BASED LISTING OF ELECTRONIC JOURNAL TITLES THE LOW MAINTENANCE WAY

Rob Withers, Electronic Information Services Librarian; Rob Casson, Electronic Information Services Librarian, both from Miami University Libraries

Reported by Nancy Cunningham

The need to keep up with all the changes associated with electronic journals (holdings, URLs, titles, new subscriptions) and the maintenance of accurate Web-based lists of e-journals is a time consuming, labor intensive task. This workshop discussed how the Miami University Libraries triumphed over these issues with a redesigned Web site and some creative scripting language.

Webmasters **Withers** and **Casson** developed a series of scripts that dynamically produce lists of electronic journals that in turn generate "on-the-fly" Web-based information from the data. In other words, they discussed extracting information from online catalogs and making that information available via Web pages in real-time.

With respect to e-journals, there were questions to answer. Why are there low usage statistics for e-journals? Can the patrons find the e-journals on the library Web site? How can we keep up with the frequency and rapidity of URL changes for e-journals?

Both patron needs and Web maintenance issues prompted the library Web site redesign. Patron needs to be addressed included variability in patron searching methods and skills, the need to facilitate e-journal usage with more prominent, user-friendly access, and requests for complete electronic journal listings arranged by discipline. Maintenance issues included the difficulty of maintaining two separate areas for URLs and other changes, the need to be able to export from the online catalog (thereby eliminating the need to use a second data source to keep the information consistent), and the need to "avoid overlapping workflow between selectors and Web developers."

The frequency and rapidity of change in URLs makes it difficult to keep both a separate database and the catalog "in synch" without some form of dynamic updating. Casson and Withers, each discussing their own contribution, explained how they used various types of scripting languages to extract information from their online catalog such as for additions and changes to electronic journal records. They also were able to use that extracted information to dynamically update it on the corresponding Web page

In what Casson and Withers called the "geeky part", they encouraged extraction of data in tab delimited format, macros for data clean-up, PHP and Postgres scripts for public displays of subject and title, and subject selectors using password-protected lists to add/delete titles in real time.

15. *MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY'S SERIALS JOURNEY: A MERRY LITTLE SPARTAN TALE OF MARC HOLDINGS*

Wen-ying Lu, Catalog Librarian and Linguistics Bibliographer; Allen Thunell, Manager, Bibliographic Enhancement, both from Michigan State University

Reported by David Sherwood

Wen-ying Lu and **Allen Thunell** described their institution's participation in the CONSER Publication Pattern Initiative. Sponsored by the CONSER Task Force on Publication Patterns and Holdings, the initiative is a two-year pilot project to add publication pattern data to the CONSER database. The first publication patterns from the initiative were added in June 2000; participants included volunteer libraries, OCLC, and RLIN.

In order to participate in the initiative, Michigan State University librarians sought and obtained approval and a financial commitment from their library administration. In addition, because MSU is not a CONSER library, the Michigan State librarians needed special permission to edit CONSER records; they obtained that permission under the condition that they edit only fields relevant to the project. In addition, they needed the cooperation of Innovative Interfaces (their library system vendor), and they needed to open new avenues of communication among the library staff, the vendor's system support staff, and CONSER experts.

Once all of these preparations had been made, the project team members began enhancing CONSER records using all applicable standards. In particular, the project team used the following resources: "Guidelines for Input of Captions/Patterns and Holdings Data," "MARC 21 Format for Holdings Data," "ANSI/NISO Z39.71-1999: Holdings Statements for Bibliographic Items," *OCLC Technical Bulletin* 236 (Mar. 2000), and CONSERHOLD-L. Once records had been modified and updated on OCLC, the MSU team then exported the records to their online system using a custom-written loader purchased from their system vendor.

The actual coding of records for the project involved creating Publication Pattern Data fields. OCLC has implemented field 891 in order to facilitate the notation of current publication patterns. Field 891 embeds MARC holdings fields 853, 854, 855, 863, 864, and 865. Because these MARC fields are embedded within the 891 field, most library systems will need a loader program in order to extract the MARC fields from the 891.

Lu and Thunell emphasized that libraries interested in participating in the CONSER Publication Pattern Initiative should be aware of some significant library system issues. Libraries wishing to participate must have online systems with certain capabilities including the following: predictive check-in, MARC Format for Holdings Data (MFHD) support, and OPAC display of holdings from the 85x/86x combination. Furthermore, the vendor must be able to program a loader to convert 891's for use on the local system. Furthermore, the presenters emphasized the need to communicate clearly with the system vendor and to allow plenty of time to test the way the library system handles both the import of the 891's and the extracted 85x/86x fields.

There are also significant staffing and workflow implications for participants in the initiative. In particular, libraries should be aware that participation involves a substantial commitment of staff time: someone must take time to master the details of MFHD and that person must be able to train others to work with the records. MSU librarians also found that their workflow was affected because, prior to the project, serials acquisitions check-in staff created check-in records. After the project, catalogers were creating the check-in record.

The project also had an impact on public services. The presenters advised libraries interested in participating in the CONSER Publication Pattern Initiative to compare current public display of holdings data with the public display of MFHD. Programming changes to the local OPAC or changes in local practice may be needed before implementation of MFHD.

16. *FROM RECEPTION TO INCEPTION: THE STORY OF THE JOURNAL OF SOCIAL STRUCTURE*

Erika Linke, Associate University Librarian,
Carnegie Mellon University
Reported by Karen Matthews

Erika Linke began with an overview of the growing interest in providing alternatives to traditionally published journals. Many discussions have proposed faculty and universities take responsibility for publishing their research results and not give away copyright to the major commercial publishers. The 1997 AAU Conference on Scholarly Communication also raised some of these issues. SPARC and BioOne are initiatives in response to these suggestions. Both are on a large scale with outside financial backing. The *Journal of Social Structure (JoSS)* [http://www.heinz.cmu.edu/project/INSNA/joss/] is a small-scale publication with no outside funding. At Carnegie Mellon a 1999 Faculty Senate resolution proposed the tenure and promotion process give equal weight to electronic and print publications if they have the same standards. It also encouraged societies to publish.

The new university librarian hired in 1998 supported these ideas and offered library services in partnering with faculty in scholarly publishing. The initial discussions about creating the *Journal of Social Structure* involved two librarians and Prof. David Krackhardt who expressed an interest in starting a scholarly journal. Later discussions involved the IT staff at Carnegie Mellon and members of INSNA (International Network of Social Network Analysis), which sponsors the *Journal of Social Structure*. This is a peer reviewed, electronic only journal with no subscription fees. The first issue was published in February 2000.

There have been some problems including staff turnover. The editor has gone on sabbatical. Staffing in the library is a critical matter since there will not be new staff positions to work with faculty. Editorial work is critical and time-consuming, and this will be added to librarians' other responsibilities.

Other concerns are delays with authors, reviewers, and production. Two important goals are getting more quality submissions and getting titles into indexing services. Expectations need to be outlined at the onset. There have been some conflicts with other organizational priorities so it is important to determine which organizational priorities are most important. There have been technical challenges in maintaining Word, PDF, HTML and WordPerfect documents plus graphics. Other technical matters such as how to migrate to a new version and how to evolve in sophistication and presentation need to be considered.

This partnering publishing model has advantages for the university library. Among the advantages is the involvement in the strategic initiative of the university and strengthening or forming new partnerships with faculty. This type of publishing is important for faculty in providing new modes of scholarly communication. New faculty members are looking for new mediums to publish. Faculty also like the lack of issues and seriality so their work can get out quickly for people to use.

As to the future there are questions of commitment by the administration, provosts, and department heads to scholarly publishing. Usage data is not being collected currently. How will this data be collected? How will this information be provided to the association supporting this journal? Abstracting and indexing services are important to faculty in building respectability for the journal and providing impact information. This journal is new so there are few digital records to be archived. There is also no knowledge of what the long term costs will be. If the staff were to start another journal, they would try to create benchmarks and outline expectations and responsibilities at the outset. There is also a need for realistic ideas of what the library can contribute to scholarly publishing.

17. *BEFORE YOU CANCEL THE PAPER, BEWARE – ALL ELECTRONIC JOURNALS IN 2001 ARE NOT CREATED EQUAL*

Carolyn Henebry, Associate Library Director for Administration; Ellen Safley, Associate Library Director for Public Services and Collections, both from University of Texas at Dallas Libraries
Reported by Carol Green

Carolyn Henebry and **Ellen Safley** presented a brief history of the University of Texas at Dallas Libraries, followed by their experiences with electronic journals. At the University of Texas at Dallas Libraries, a change in library administration brought with it a new mandate to maintain current periodical issues in only one format with no unnecessary duplication while still retaining quality within the periodical collection. This was no easy task considering that the library subscribes to several aggregator databases and also participates in consortial electronic journal purchases such as ACM, IEEE, JSTOR, and ScienceDirect. This mandate, coupled with severe space limitations, led to the proposed cancellation of hundreds of paper subscriptions in favor of electronic format. A project, beginning with individual publishers rather than aggregators, directly compared the content of paper journals with that of their electronic counterparts.

Some of the Libraries' concerns regarding electronic format included print quality, timeliness, color and graphics quality, content accuracy, advertisements, and increased printing demand in the library. The Libraries assumed all paper journals from a given publisher were available online, the color and graphics were equal between the two formats, and all the content (all issues, all articles, all pages, all graphics) was available online.

Quality, timeliness, and selective content of the paper and electronic were compared for the most recent issue and the last bound volume of each title. The decision was made to cancel the paper if the online quality was acceptable with no unreasonable delay of loading content; however, the paper would be kept if the online were not acceptable. If the title was unavailable in electronic format, the decision was made to either bind or toss.

From this project, the University of Texas at Dallas Libraries learned that what you think you are buying is not always what you get. Electronic journals should always be tested on the equipment you plan to use. The quality of electronic journals varies within an issue, within the journal archive, and within a publisher's offerings. Print quality generally is not a problem. Color quality varies or is not present at all. Graphics are not always present or do not load due to broken links. Timeliness is not consistent for any publisher. Content problems include missing issues, missing articles, and missing pages. The demand for color copies within the library increases. Even though a publisher indicates full-text is available, this is not always true, and publishers vary greatly in their response to reported problems. However, electronic format has some advantages over paper such as higher definition of graphics, enlargement capabilities for visually impaired users, keyword searching of the entire text, and remote access.

Henebry and Safley shared the following observations with other libraries that may be considering canceling paper subscriptions in favor of electronic. Decide what elements are most important to your library and your users. It is impossible to review all issues, articles, pages and graphics without additional staff. As a profession, we need to demand higher quality; therefore it is important to report all problems and errors to the publishers.

18. ***TACKLING THE MONOLITH: LICENSING MANAGEMENT AT THE CONSORTIAL AND LOCAL LEVELS***

Jill Emery, Director, Electronic Resources Program, University of Houston; Renulfo Ramirez, Assistant Head Librarian, Digital Library Services Division, General Libraries, The University of Texas at Austin
Reported by Sharon Quinn Fitzgerald

Jill Emery presented her database project to manage licenses conducted in her former position at the University of Texas at Arlington. Emery's group selected MS Access as a platform as it brought many shared "bits" of information together in a secured network environment. The database solution allows decentralized access on a 24/7 basis and takes the pressure off a single staff person maintaining a paper resource. The database was designed for internal maintenance of licensed resources but also as a means of addressing any question that a user might conceivably ask regarding usage. Although the database was developed and is primarily maintained by the information resources group, input was sought from many departments during the design phase.

Emery proceeded to walk though the various sections of a record template that included the following: product uses (most sought after information), product payment, product links and product properties. Under usage a number of checkboxes were set up to specify the parameters of the resource such as allowances for e-mail transmission, electronic reserves, virtual reference, downloading and printing. User groups could also be identified. Links from individual records were available to current payment records, usage statistics and full license agreements in pdf format.

Renulfo Ramirez is at the University of Texas system office where consortia licenses are the focus. He emphasized the two hat role at the Austin campus where the needs of the local community of users as well as the major role played in providing system level resources must be balanced. Coordinating a statewide system of multiple contacts for the 15 different sites is an essential function. The 44 databases currently provided (with seven more pending) serve a diverse user community in urban and suburban environs.

The UT System's office quickly outgrew the centralized paper file approach and elected to develop a Web site solution, which is password-protected for posting of sensitive data. Pages can be updated in minutes by multiple staff. The Web site further allows for consolidation of subscription and licensing data.

Full texts of licenses are available upon request in HTML format. Availability of the licenses online facilitates review of excerpted problem clauses before negotiations are completed. Excerpts are also used to warn subscribers of potential hazards (*e.g.* embargoed data).

Style sheets were developed using the HTML editor Dreamweaver for both Mac and Windows platforms. Initially Filemaker Pro was used for data entry, but developers quickly migrated to what in-house programmers consider a truly relational platform using LDAP. The Web interface was built with a Netscape product.

Ramirez continued by sharing a staff view of an access page. Distance learning support is a key aspect of service. Links to a license tracker and educational links about the licensing process, which is often prolonged, are very popular with the statewide users. Ramirez and his staff are currently looking to refine the user interface that is very powerful but could be more user-friendly.

19. ***CREATING A TECHNICAL SERVICES WEB SITE: FROM PLANNING TO PUBLISHING***

Evelyn Council, Periodicals Librarian, Fayetteville State University; Jennifer Lang, Electronic Resources/Serials Cataloger, University of Cincinnati
Reported by Becky Sheffield

At least six questions need to be addressed before creating a technical services Web site: 1) Why create a technical services Web site? 2) Who will create and maintain the Web site? 3) What tools are available for creating the Web site? 4) Who is your target audience? 5) How will you publish the Web site? 6) What information will be included on the Web site? In answering these questions, **Evelyn Council** and **Jennifer Lang** shared quite different experiences at their respective institutions.

Lang basically developed her Web site on her own. She did not have a committee with which to work; therefore, the Web site is her design, and she "owns" and maintains it. Lack of committee oversight also shortened the amount of time required to prepare the Web site. Her site is currently available only to those within her department (which caused the audience great consternation). The information included on this Web site is specific to the department: brief outlines of the various areas of staff responsibility, documentation (such as procedures, policies and standards, forms), and links to outside resources and search engines.

Council's Web site was developed with committee oversight. She was required to create a Web site under defined standards so that the Web site would be similar to others within FSU. Working within the committee, it took substantially longer to create and make available this Web site. The audience for this site is not limited, and the information within it is varied. Manuals, interactive links, gateways and links to numerous internal sources such as library policies and a public services page as well as links to external sources are included on the Web site.

The two Web sites are similar in that dissemination of information was the impetus for the creation. Another similarity is that, in their infancy, both Web sites appear to be well received.

20. *SERIALS STAFFING FOR THE 21ST CENTURY AND BEYOND*

Faye R. Leibowitz, General Languages Team Leader, University of Pittsburgh
Reported by Lai-Ying Hsiung

Faye Leibowitz focused on how technical services trends, technology and rule changes affect the future of serials staffing. The expectation to do things "more, better, faster" means cataloging has to be up to standards. Outsourcing will be an option, including vendor-supplied cataloging. There is a broader view of the uses of cataloging data, with expanded "metadata" options for increased "interoperability".

Moving technical services off-site is one recent trend in re-organization. University of Pittsburgh (UP) will be doing it next year. This will have a greater impact on serials cataloging staff since they have to be near the material. It is hoped that the van service will bring in the items efficiently. Since UP hires students to perform many serials clerical tasks, being off-site will make it difficult to recruit students. Hiring full- or part-time staff replacements may mean higher cost. On the other hand, to be off-site may not be too bad in the Internet world. There is less need to be near the reference collection. Full text online items can be cataloged off site.

In technology, the electronic journal format is creating revolutionary changes in serials. Unique difficulties exist in the coordination of the entire process from selection to public services. Cataloging titles in new aggregator packages has become a high priority. One FTE staff member has been devoted to this task. This person communicates directly with many different groups, bypassing the direct supervisor. This has been a great cultural change for UP.

With the introduction of MicroEnhancer, students are used more and more in copy cataloging while paraprofessionals concentrate on more complex work. Bibliographers and catalogers collaborate to create bibliographic records while paraprofessionals are trained to catalog, using non-LC and non-standard records. Vendors are supplying holdings data for electronic journals (*e.g.* Serials Solutions) and aggregator "analytics." Rule changes likeAACR2 0.24, NISO holdings standard Z39.71 1999, single record/multiple records for electronic journals, patterns/captions in the bibliographic record, and the new definition of "continuing resources" will affect serials staffing

Changes are evident when some sample job descriptions are reviewed. Serials and electronic resources responsibilities are now often included in one professional position, no matter whether such words appear in a job title. Management and coordination are always an integral part of professional responsibilities. Paraprofessional positions often include professional responsibilities in addition to their paraprofessional duties.

With the rapid changes, continuing education will be important for serials staff. There are plenty of opportunities for training and professional interaction, like CONSER SCCTP, Serialst, ALA, NASIG, and other professional organization conferences.

21. *JUMP START YOUR CAREER IN LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE*

Steven J. Oberg, Systems Analyst, Endeavor Information Systems, Inc.; Priscilla K. Shontz, Librarian, Driscoll Children's Hospital Medical Library.
Reported by Rene Erlandson

At one time or another, individuals in the library and information science field may have reason to evaluate (or re-evaluate) their career direction and goals. **Steve Oberg** and **Priscilla Shontz** gave salient advice to professionals embarking down this road of self-discovery.

One of the first steps in evaluating your career plan is to ask yourself the following questions: what do I want to be "when I grow up;" what is my ideal job; how do I get there; and how do I define success? If you can not answer these larger questions immediately, you should ask yourself a series of smaller questions: am I willing to relocate; am I willing to travel for my job; am I willing to supervise others; what job benefits (non-monetary) are important to me; do I enjoy risk or do I prefer a job that offers stability; am I willing to go back to school or earn another degree if necessary; am I willing to write and publish; what is my ideal working environment; do I want a job that intellectually stimulates me, or do my personal interests fill that need; am I comfortable with ambiguity or do I prefer clear directions? Hopefully, at the end of this question and answer process you will have a better idea of the direction you would like your career to go in the future. Your career goals will emerge from the answers you have made to the above questions.

Now that you have developed your career goals, you will need to assess them. What can you do in the next 2 years, 6 months, or 30 days to move closer to your long-term goals? Talk to other people in the profession and ask their advice in how you might go about attaining your career goals.

Seeking out a mentor can assist you in developing a career plan and in assessing your career goals. Mentors should be people you admire, people you trust, individuals with similar interests, persons familiar with the area you want to learn. Mentors need to be good listeners and supportive but honest. A good mentor will encourage you but will also give you constructive criticism. Often mentors are found in informal ways. Be open to people you meet as you network within the profession and don't be afraid to ask people you respect for advice. Also, take advantage of formal mentor programs (such as the NASIG Mentor Program). Be proactive in networking; find someone you feel comfortable with and ask them questions about their career and their career path.

In the development of a career plan, you will want to assess your skills. Consider job-related skills, personal characteristics or personality traits that can transfer easily from one type of job to another. Spend some time thinking about specific skills you have and what you enjoy. Talk to others and find out what they think you are good at. Reflect on jobs you have held in the past that you have enjoyed or about jobs that interest you and you think you would enjoy. What skills are necessary for those jobs? Are you willing to learn new skills?

Another step in making a career move is careful regular reading of job ads, noting skills you have, or skills you would be willing to develop. Study trends in the job market. Try to match your skills to jobs that interest you. If you find skills you lack but are willing to develop, arrange volunteer work in a particular area of the field to assist you in developing those skills. Talk to people already working in the area you are interested in and ask their advice about skills you should develop.

The permeating theme of this workshop was to develop a career plan, seek out a mentor and actively participate in networking. If you are at a crossroads in your career, be proactive about choosing your next direction. As the profession changes and your personal goals within the profession change, you may want to make adjustments to your career plan. Don't be afraid to step back and re-evaluate where you are and where you would like to be in the future. It is possible for you to "jump start your career" onto a new path, or discover that you are already where you want to be.

22. *TACT AND TENACITY: DEALING WITH DIFFICULT PEOPLE AT WORK*

Naomi Kietzke Young, Head, Serials Cataloging Unit, University of Florida; Josephine Williamson, Head, Acquisitions Department, University of Delaware

Reported by Trina Robinson

Naomi Young began by taking the audience through phrases for identifying difficult people in the workplace and cleverly used serials and serials management practices to illustrate her points. This analogy provided a good reference source to her intended audience and comic relief as well. A sense of humor proved to be the greatest tool in dealing with difficult people.

Young outlined five principles for working with difficult people and serials. Principle #1: Know Your Rules. Principle #2: Abide by Clear Standards. Principle #3: Early and Accurate Claims are Vital. Principle #4: Everyone Hates Title Changes, Cessations, and Cancellation Projects. Principle #5: Sometime the Problem Isn't What You Think. By reviewing the principles by name only, some seem clearly to refer to people, while others seem to refer to serials. Young made it clear how each principle referred to both people and serials.

Josephine Williamson compared the ideal boss to Tony Soprano of the HBO series "The Sopranos." This was done in a thoughtful, caring, comical way. Tony certainly knows how to deal with difficult people. Williamson managed to takes Tony's techniques and alter them with compassion and the confines of the law to make them useful tools in the library arena. She provided the audience with a bibliography of useful tools for dealing with difficult people. She included a list of little sayings you wish you could say at work, as well as a questionnaire to help you understand how other people may be affecting you and your work.

Every member of the audience could relate to the topic. Some have dealt with difficult bosses, or co-workers, or employees or patrons. The presenters focused on their first-hand experiences and their personal successes as well as defeat, which made the audience very open and receptive. They even incorporated their own shortcomings in dealing with difficult people in their professional lives.

23. *MAKING THE MOVE: SERIALS ISSUES IN THE MIGRATION TO A NEW LIBRARY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM*

Bill Kara, Head, Technical Services, Albert R. Mann Library, Cornell University; Lanell Rabner, Periodicals Department Chair, Brigham Young University
Reported by Miriam Childs

The two presentations at this workshop were a study in contrasts. **Bill Kara** first discussed how Cornell University achieved a successful migration. **Lanell Rabner** then related the lessons she and her staff at Brigham Young University learned while undergoing a problematic migration.

Cornell University migrated to the Endeavor Voyager system. Bill Kara explained that, because of the sheer amount of details involved, having sufficient time for planning is essential to achieving a successful migration. The amount of time a library puts into planning directly impacts the success of the migration.

There should be enough time before implementation for appropriate personnel in the library to become familiar with the LMS. It is very helpful to train the key decision makers early in the process, through a combination of documentation, site visits, testing the system, and working in the system's training mode. Testing the system through the training database helps to indicate problems early on. Specific examples of fields and/or data should be selected and tested to highlight any potential migration problems.

During the downtime, staff morale will be very important. Take advantage of the downtime to train staff for the new system, plan new workflows, and identify areas for clean up. Training will prepare the staff for the first day the system is in use. Teamwork, compromise, and flexibility go a long way in promoting a smooth process.

Without communication, a migration cannot successfully proceed. The LMS vendor needs to know about the library's needs, expectations, and preferences. The implementation team must keep each library staff member and each department informed of the progress of the migration. Patrons of the library also need to be aware of the changes ahead. Appropriate staff should be trained to answer the questions that users will have.

Libraries can and should take this trying time as an opportunity to review established policies and procedures; to educate their users about the library; and to recognize the enhancements that the new system brings to the daily workflow.

Brigham Young University migrated to the SIRSI system from NOTIS. Lanell Rabner provided several examples of what went wrong before and after the migration, which had to be accomplished in four months. The problems BYU encountered directly resulted from not having enough time to ask questions and document the process.

BYU had to buy SIRSI off the shelf due to the lack of time. There was therefore no leverage to bargain for the library's specific needs. In addition, there was no overlap time between the old and the new systems. Some of the problems that surfaced after migration were: data that was mapped incorrectly; incorrect or lost locations; missing or incorrect ISSNs; confusing holdings; shadowed information in the OPAC; and lost user messages. This situation demonstrated the need to know what will happen to the data during migration, and furthermore, what it will look like afterwards. BYU had no idea of the outcome, so solutions had to be worked out after the migration. The only way to fix the problems was to go in manually and correct them, record by record.

BYU learned several lessons through this ordeal. Local fields should be documented so that they can be mapped correctly to the new LMS. Though BYU relied heavily on its NOTIS backfile due to its particular situation, it may be a good idea in general to hold onto the old data in case a record needs to be rebuilt. Before beginning the migration, the data in the old system should be cleaned up as much as possible. Staff should get to know the new system by using the training mode. Setting realistic goals and visualizing the end product, along with communication and cooperation, will ensure a successful migration.

24. *HOW TO GIVE AN EFFECTIVE PRESENTATION; OR, PLEASE TAKE THE MICROPHONE OUT OF YOUR MOUTH*

Denise D. Novak, Head of Acquisitions, Carnegie Mellon University
Reported by Virginia Taffurelli

Public speaking has become an integral part of librarianship. Librarians are increasingly called upon to give oral presentations at conferences and seminars and to conduct bibliographic instruction to university students. Many library schools are adding "Librarian as Teacher" to the curriculum. In this workshop, **Denise Novak** addressed common concerns of inexperienced as well as experienced public speakers. Novak began this workshop by demonstrating some of the distracting errors often made even by experienced presenters. Tips for effective speaking include being responsive to the audience, being aware of your own strengths and weaknesses, and practicing techniques that will enhance your talk. How you say it is just as important as what you say. Verbal distractions such as "ummm," "you know," and "like" can detract from your presentation. Non-verbal communication is also important. Posture should be erect, and hands kept still unless emphasizing a point. Some movement adds interest, but too much pacing can be distracting. Novak recommended practicing in front of a mirror and rehearsing with a tape recorder or before three or four friends. Practice speaking with confidence, conviction and enthusiasm. Think about what you will wear and how you will stand. Choose your clothes carefully and wear comfortable shoes.

Essential components of effective speaking include audience, voice, body language, notes, and audio-visuals. Know *why* you are giving the presentation, what is expected, and, most importantly, every aspect of the material you are presenting. Add interest to your voice by changing the volume to emphasize points; do not speak in a monotone. Speak slowly and deliberately. Project your voice to the back of the room or use a microphone. Avoid distracting mannerisms, such as head movements and facial expressions. These can either reinforce the message or be very distracting. Eye contact is like a psychological handshake. Wear a watch and keep track of time, leaving time for questions and answers. Do not read notes verbatim. Instead, prepare an outline on index cards. The most important commandment is to "rehearse, rehearse, rehearse" and practice using a microphone to minimize ear-piercing feedback.

Audio-visuals such as printouts, easels, overhead transparencies, and LTD projectors with animations and sound can act as punctuation points. Novak listed the "ten commandments of media" and suggested following at least seven out of the ten most of the time. Several commandments deal with the format of visuals. Simple designs are more effective than crowded slides with multiple animations. A set of backup visuals can come in very handy when technology fails. Legibility of the visuals is key to reach persons sitting farthest from the screen. Use a readable letter style with no more than three different typefaces. Use capital letters for short words and labels, but lowercase letters for longer captions and phrases. As a general rule, do not include more than fifteen to twenty words in a single projected image.

The last overhead included helpful hints for handling questions. Repeat the question only if you think it was not heard by all. Pause and think before giving your answer, and don't use too many statistics. Most importantly, give your answer to the whole audience, not just the person asking the question.

Throughout her presentation, Novak encouraged audience participation and gave rewards (candy) for each comment or question. Novak's own presentation skills were obvious in this workshop. Examples of good presentation skills were interspersed with common mistakes, and Novak never hesitated to include mistakes she has made in the past. Most of these were common sense tips; many of us have heard them before, but it never hurts to have these basic points reinforced.

POSTER SESSIONS

Reported by Maggie Horn

The even dozen poster sessions were wildly popular – or the room was too small – or both. Your intrepid reporter literally could not get into the room. I picked up a lot of handouts, but I refer readers to the NASIGWeb Conference site where you can read a better abstract than I could possibly write. Kudos to all for creating yet another successful information exchange opportunity.

NETWORKING NODES

CATALOGING

Evelyn Brass, convener
Reported by Steven Ring

This year the Cataloging Network Node offered two discussions. First, Valerie Bross of the University of California at Los Angeles led a discussion of electronic resources. Then Priscilla Matthews of Illinois State University led a discussion of staff training issues.

Valerie Bross began by asking how libraries keep records for electronic resources up to date. The group discussed several strategies but agreed that no single method can sufficiently address the problem. Most agreed that catalogers must have effective lines of communication with staff in acquisitions and public services. Some libraries have set up an internal listserv, an electronic mail reflector, or regular meetings to address this problem.

Turning to the future, Bross offered the possibility of using a shared PURL server to alleviate some of the problems involved in maintaining accurate records for e-resources. By using an intermediary service to resolve URL problems, individual libraries would bear less responsibility for maintaining accurate links.

Next the discussion turned to differences of content between print and electronic versions. Most agreed that there can be significant differences, but the group could not think of an efficient way to identify and convey such differences. Some expressed the opinion that it would be easier to convey them with a "separate records" approach to multiple versions, because a cataloger could batch-load records supplied by the vendor and update them on a regular basis. Chris Blackman of Williams College suggested that this approach might be more appealing if a holdings message (MARC 866) could be displayed in the browsing screen of the catalog.

Priscilla Matthews began the second part of the session with a broad overview of serials staffing issues. On the one hand, she noted, serials work has become more demanding. As integrated library systems create more consequences for errors, the standards necessary to implement such systems become more and more complex. On the other hand, she argued, it has become more difficult to keep qualified staff, because there are no opportunities for long-term career development.

Given these conditions, Matthews asked the group to describe how they train and evaluate new serials staff. Most libraries rely on one-to-one training. Some offer occasional group training to refresh knowledge and skills, or use off-site training offered by professional organizations or consortia. At least one participant offered the opinion that training should focus on concepts, rather than procedures.

The discussion of evaluation revealed a greater variety of practices. Most participants review the work of new staff until the quality of their work is acceptable, but the group could not agree on an acceptable rate of error or other measures of performance. Some librarians continue to look at a random sample of records produced by veteran staff, while others end the review process after the initial training period.

ELECTRONIC RESOURCES LIBRARIANS

Reported by Joan Conger, convener

Standing room only! More than 90 librarians arrived at the Electronic Resources Networking Node, eager for new contacts if not enlightenment. The sometimes newly minted Electronic Resources Librarians shared experiences with licensing, remote access, collection management, and the tempering of vendors' good customer service with interesting pricing structures, to name a few topics. The innocent convener, Joan Conger, eagerly collected 51 suggestions for starting a new special interest group, which she will share via e-mail with meeting participants and the new list, ERIL:

> Electronic Resources in Libraries
> (http://www.topica.com/lists/eril)

PRESERVATION ISSUES

Fran Wilkinson, Marilyn Fletcher, Linda Lewis, co-conveners and reporters

There were twenty participants at this lively networking node that gathered to discuss preservation issues ranging from hand-sewn binding to digitization. The Nicholson Baker article and book on microfilming and the disposition of newspapers and other library materials was a hot topic. Although there have been supporters of Baker's views, there have also been many defenders of preserving newspapers on microfilm. The debate is likely to continue, and it would be helpful to compile a list of articles and Web sites that would present both sides.

Disposition of materials replaced in microfilm or electronic format is a problem for libraries because of the regulations imposed. Most libraries cannot discard or give away materials, even to another government agency. One library has a continuous book sale for de-accessioned books and serials.

Binding was discussed. There was a variety of differing procedures -- one library's journals were bound incomplete if the title was available electronically; in-house binding was done (if e-journals were present) rather than commercial binding. The consensus was that scanning does not "preserve" materials (as does microfilming or preservation photocopying), rather scanning enhances access. A commercial binder in the group said that publishers were using commercial binders more and that publishers were becoming a higher source of income than libraries. Paper copies of e-journals were not discarded by most libraries represented but were sent unbound to an off-site storage site. Libraries in a consortium also stored off-site but were hindered by the lack of a union holdings list to ascertain who has which journals. Keeping only one copy of a title can save storage space, but the work required to identify the best copy of each piece may take more time than is available.

In-house preservation methods include re-casing materials, re-sewing spines, clam shell and phase boxes (which can also be ordered pre-assembled), the use of "cellugel" to soften and prolong the life of leather bindings. The question "At what point is a deteriorating volume repaired?" elicited some discussion. Shelves need to be checked regularly and notes made of the condition of the books. Compact shelving appears not to contribute to deterioration of materials. Usually, the oldest and less-used volumes are placed in compact shelving.

Many libraries have, or are working on, disaster preparedness plans. One suggestion was to have the plan in a loose-leaf notebook so that it can be updated easily and can include excerpts from resources. It is crucial to keep the information on local contacts up to date.

The biggest problems facing preservation in libraries is the lack of money, space, and staff. Preservation falls to the bottom of the list for budgetary needs. Preservation staff are being raided for scanning and digitization programs. Few libraries have full-time preservation officers.

The time passed quickly and all participants encouraged the continuation of the Preservation Issues Node at future meetings. While primary discussions have focused on published materials, perhaps next year some time can be devoted to other formats such as audio and video materials and their preservation. Of course, the day will eventually come for a discussion of preserving electronic information (and, shouldn't we be discussing this already?)

PUBLIC LIBRARIES

Gloria Guzi and Laura Zupko, co-conveners
Reported by Gloria Guzi

The Public Library Networking Node was a gathering of public librarians with both similar and diverse concerns regarding serials. A discussion about the adequacies and inadequacies of certain serials modules, for example, revealed common problems with check-in, pattern set up and also unsatisfactory customer service. One librarian from a large public library mentioned that the library she worked for has no serials module and that check-in is still a manual process. Another librarian found it necessary to utilize Microsoft Access to create brief bibliographical records for periodicals.

A discussion about the purchase of titles in multiple formats (print, microfilm, and electronic) in public libraries revealed that policy in public libraries differs significantly from that in university libraries. While the trend in university libraries is to purchase titles in one format only (preferably digital), public research libraries are often committed to retaining all formats of titles due to the diversity of their patrons.

Another topic of discussion revolved around the role of the serials librarian in the acquisition of electronic resources. In one large public library, the coordinator of electronic resources is a public services librarian, whose lack of expertise in acquisitions and bibliographical control has resulted in less than satisfactory performance. It was agreed that the serials librarian, who generally does have expertise in these areas, should be a significant part of the process of purchasing access to electronic resources.

Some general questions and comments about the purchase of e-journals indicated that public libraries, in general, are only in the beginning stages of this process.

A final point grew out of the concern and interest in encouraging public library participation in the NASIG program. One idea was to focus on the way(s) in which the serials collections in public libraries support those of university libraries.

REFERENCE AND PUBLIC SERVICES LIBRARIANS
Jeff Bullington and Jill Emery, co-conveners
Reported by Marcella Lesher

Jeff Bullington began the session by asking attendees how important they thought knowledge of licensing issues was from a public services perspective. This question brought up several issues regarding the importance of reading the fine print in licensing agreements and knowing how various databases can or can't be used based on licensing restrictions. The issue of fair use was discussed and how licensing agreements may actually negate the provisions of fair use in copyright law.

Courseware such as Blackboard was also discussed, as were the problems reference staff sometimes face when trying to assist students who are using courseware at library terminals. Printing some assignments has been a problem. The "My Library" component of Blackboard was also mentioned as a possible problem, particularly when citations are made to reference materials that the library does not actually own.

The final topic of discussion was how to promote the burgeoning availability of electronic materials. Should libraries continue to maintain a printed list of journal holdings, or should students be encouraged to use electronic lists to find out what their library has? How are students using library computers? Are they actually using library-purchased resources, or are they using general search engines for research? It was noted that it would be helpful if library system software could track how students were actually using the catalog. Language that differentiates library-purchased resources from general sources found on the Web was mentioned as being critical in helping faculty and students understand that print resources and electronic resources may be equivalent. Assignments that direct students to find a certain number of "Internet resources" and a certain number of print resources may not be appropriate when duplication exists between those resources.

USER GROUPS

DRA
Reported by June Garner, convener

Several people met to discuss DRA at the DRA User's Group meeting. Of general interest were all the rumors concerning SIRSI's takeover of DRA. There was plenty of speculation, but no definitive answers on the effect the merger will have on DRA products.

An attendee from a library just beginning to migrate to DRA asked for advice on ways to enter check-in and summary holdings data from kardex cards. Several words of encouragement were offered. There was also discussion on TAOS and its ability to take advantage of MFHD; on acquisitions workflow issues; and on how to get expenditure data for e-journals out of the acquisitions record.

As convener, I wish to thank everyone who attended the DRA User's Group for their ideas and suggestions throughout the meeting.

ENDEAVOR VOYAGER
Maggie Rioux and Bob Persing, co-conveners
Reported by Bob Persing

Twenty-four Endeavor customers attended, as well as two Endeavor staff (Reeta Sinha, Voyager product manager responsible for technical services, and Steve Oberg, systems analyst). Most of those attending had implemented release 2000, with a minority on release 99, and only a few in implementation. This is a significant change from past years, when many attendees were new or prospective customers.

Sinha said the next release (2001.1) will go to beta in July, for a late 2001 release. Oberg discussed the new embedded order data capability, which allows libraries to create purchase orders automatically from vendor-supplied MARC data. Endeavor is still looking for beta sites and testing partners for these new releases.

A general discussion followed, touching on many serials-related topics. EDI functionality was one major topic. Sinha said Endeavor was considering supporting EDI messages in XML format. Many people discussed EDI details, such as the best match points to use and how claim responses are processed. There was general agreement that after the initial setup, EDI processing requires little ongoing work.

Other topics covered included various problems with check-in history and strategies for making new POs for title changes. There was also discussion of the learning curve needed for the new, redesigned acquisitions module. The group's consensus was that the learning curve was not so steep as one Endeavor staff member had predicted at VUGM. Some attendees also praised the training video produced by Endeavor, particularly when used in a hands-on setting.

EPIXTECH, INC.

M. Diane Raines (Horizon User) and Marcella Lesher (Dynix User), co-conveners
Reported by M. Diane Raines

Shelley Neville from epixtech, had originally planned to be the convener, but had to leave early. Raines and Lesher stepped in as last minute co-conveners. Represented were three Horizon libraries and one Dynix library, with all libraries firmly into production use of their respective serials modules. This year's group would like to see more attendees next year and recommends that next year's convener advertise this session on: Horizon_L, Dynix_L, and SERIALST.

One topic raised was communication with expitech. Raines suggested that attendees talk to their System Administrators (SAs) to make sure that they are aware of the ebuzz e-mails: SAs can register for these on the epixtech Web site at http://www.epixtech.com/ebuzz. There are categories for news (that would let them know about the monthly epixtech online chat) and for both Horizon and Dynix Serials and Related Products.

Another topic related to questions on moving from Dynix to Horizon Serials Control modules. 1) How does each look at padding of volume and issue numbers in an ASCII sort? Horizon is more forgiving than Dynix. 2) Both people who had moved from Dynix to Horizon felt that there was a stiff learning curve when it came to the creation of publication patterns. This brought up the question of whether Horizon had implemented any type of pub pattern sharing utilities like the Dynix utility. No one in attendance knew, so contacting epixtech was suggested. 3) How do serial call numbers display in WebPAC? It was reported that this is a problem in the Dynix WebPAC, but not in Horizon.

Helpful Tips: 1) To add retrospective summary of holdings once you have started to check-in a title: In Horizon 6.0 it is easier to cut, copy and paste lines of Summary of Holdings. In 5.3, use cut and paste options under the Summary of Holdings Edit pull-down menu. Horizon does not like a line number zero. 2) Similar cut and paste options can be used to manipulate the order of Routing List entries. 3) If an item is very irregular, manually predict whatever issues you think you will need, and judiciously review claims before sending them. 4) Before utilizing a new status, verify how WebPAC will display it, *i.e.* does it consider it available or not available.

EX LIBRIS USA

Maggie Horn and Michael Kaplan, co-conveners
Reported by Maggie Horn

In a replay of last year's Ex Libris Users Group, about a dozen NASIG members dropped in on the session. Prior to running off to an earlier-than-scheduled flight, Michael Kaplan updated us on new developments at Ex Libris: new staff, the California Digital Library signing, serials functions, EDI progress, GUI redesign, and shelf-ready processing. We then had an open discussion, mostly focusing on the ups and downs of implementation.

Again, almost all the attendees were either in throes of migration or were interested in Ex Libris as a "suitor" for their services. Unfortunately, none of the current (as of May), fully-implemented U.S. customers were represented at this meeting. We hope that next year we will have some "how ALEPH500 works for us" stories to trade.

INNOVATIVE INTERFACES

Reported by Stephanie Schmitt, convener

To an audience of over forty attendees, Ted Fons (Product Manager, III) gave a presentation on III's Millennium Serials product. Millennium Serials is a Java-based client developed for the Windows system that streamlines serials workflow through the use of graphical user interfaces (GUI) for materials processing and management functions like check-in, claiming, routing, and binding. Most of the character-based functionality continues in the Millennium Serials product. Using tool and menu bars, drop boxes, buttons, and keyboard shortcuts, Millennium Serials' latest release provides a stable and enhanced desktop workspace for the serialist. In addition to covering the basic functionality of the product, Fons demonstrated how Millennium Serials uses GUI forms for adding holdings statements that comply with the current MARC21 Format for Holdings Data standard. There are several other product enhancements with the 2001 release. Of note, the routing service now has the added capability of using the patron file to set up routing lists. Requests for enhancements from the participants included the capability of adding fields to the claiming list and the ability to print the claim list.

The discussion included questions and comments regarding the availability of the 2001 release of Millennium Serials; Innovative Interfaces, Inc.'s prioritization of fixes and product development strategies; and workstation technical specifications. Release 2001 was stated to be available to the general user population beginning June 2001. Participants recommended that libraries double the minimum workstation specifications in order to provide ample system resources to the user.

SIRSI

Reported by Denise Novak, convener

Fifteen SIRSI users met on Saturday May 26. Five of the attendees at this meeting were brand new users who will be bringing SIRSI systems up in their respective libraries during the coming months. It was unfortunate that again no representative from SIRSI attended NASIG this year. Since NASIG is the premier serials conference, it is hoped that SIRSI will send someone to the NASIG Conference at the College of William & Mary next year.

After introductions, the meeting was open for questions and comments from those in attendance. Topics covered were loading patterns (Joanne Deeken explained how Indiana U is loading patterns into their system); serials invoicing (should be available by January 2002); possibility of a serials "bootcamp" at UUGI; migrating data from NOTIS (don't assume anything during migration, it's very important to save a back-up somewhere, certain things must be mapped); consortium misadventures (when working with more than one institution there can be problems); holding codes.

There was discussion on sharing information about how institutions use SIRSI Serials Workflow. Training documents would be very helpful. Rutgers has some excellent documents, and the suggestion was made to contact Mary Page for more information. Everyone was reminded that posting to the enhancement Webforum on the SIRSI Web site is crucial. SIRSI will often work on an enhancement request and add it to Unicorn during the year. You can ask your SIRSI Administrator to register your name so that you can access the Webforum.

The SCCTP holdings workshops are very good and people were encouraged to go if they could.

MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING

Meg Mering, NASIG Secretary

1. Call to Order and Welcome

President Connie Foster convened the meeting at 8:15 a.m. on May 24, 2001. She introduced the 2000/01 officers and Board members. JoAnne Deeken was introduced as the Parliamentarian.

2. Highlights from May Board Meeting

Meg Mering, Secretary, presented the following highlights from the May 22, 2001, Board meeting:

- Tina Feick spoke to the Board about the progress on developing the Strategic Plan/Vision Statement 2015.
- The *Newsletter* will only be offered in an online format starting with the first issue of 2002
- Holley Lange from Colorado State University will become NASIG's new Archivist at the end of the conference. The Board thanked Marilyn Fletcher for her three years of service as Archivist. In July, H. Lange will be moving the archives from the University of New Mexico to Colorado.
- Finally, the Board was very impressed with all of the activity of all of the committees.

3. Treasurer's Report

Gerry Williams reported that the budget remained on target even though most committees expend more of their budgets during the second half of the year after the conference. NASIG currently has about 1,250 members. There were a significant number of new memberships. The one-year CD account made $1,856 in interest. A new CD was purchased for $29,000. The mutual fund has begun to increase in value.

4. Awards

A. Outgoing Board members

President Foster presented awards to outgoing Board members Don Jaeger, Dan Tonkery, Pat Wallace, Fran Wilkinson, and Gerry Williams.

B. Outgoing Committee Chairs

President Foster presented awards to outgoing committee chairs Kay Johnson (Awards & Recognition), Beth Toren and Margi Mann (Electronic Communications), Linda Smith Griffin (Regional Councils & Membership), Sandy Folsom (Nominations & Elections), Ladd Brown (Publications), Mary Page and Robb Waltner (Program Planning), Rose Robischon (Database & Directory), Priscilla Shontz (Continuing Education), Diane Grover (Evaluation & Assessment), Marilyn Fletcher (NASIG Archivist), and Steve Oberg (Bilingual Focus Group)

C. 2001 CPC Co-Chairs

Pat Wallace, Board Liaison to the Conference Planning Committee, recognized the tremendous efforts of CPC Co-Chairs Beatrice Caraway and Carol Gill. B. Caraway introduced Committee members: Michael Brown, David Bynog, Jill Emery, Anita Farber, Beverley Geer, Leveta Hord, Danny Jones, Marcella Lesher, Janice Lindquist, Sandy River, Sally Sorensen, and Sarah Tusa.

D. 2001 PPC Co-Chairs

Maggie Rioux, Board Liaison to the Program Planning Committee, thanked Mary Page and Robb Waltner, the two outgoing Chairs, for their service. Lisa Macklin will again be serving as a Co-Chair in 2001/02. Committee members were recognized: June Garner, Rachel Frick, Kate Manuel, Lisa Rowlison, Allison Sleeman, Michael Somers, Jim Stickman, Sharon Sullivan, Kay Teel, and Beth Weston.

E. 2000 *Proceedings* Editors

Donnice Cochenour, Board Liaison to the *Proceedings* Editors, recognized Joe Harmon as 2000 *Proceedings* Co-Editor. Michelle Fiander was unable to attend the meeting. D. Cochenour recognized Kathryn Wesley who served as the Indexer and Lynne Griffin who served as the Web Editor of the 2000 *Proceedings*.

F. Archivist

M. Mering, Board Liaison to the Archivist, thanked Marilyn Fletcher for her three years of service as Archivist. M. Mering recognized H. Lange, the incoming Archivist.

5. Recognition

A. Continuing Committee Chairs

M. Rioux recognized continuing committee chairs: Claire Dygert (Awards & Recognition), Robert Cleary (Bylaws), Evelyn Council (Continuing Education), and Lisa Macklin (Program Planning).

B. *Newsletter* Editorial Board

President Foster recognized the *Newsletter* Editorial Board: Editor-in-Chief Steve Savage, John Harrison, Carol MacAdam, Jim Michael, and Charlene Simser. M. Rioux gave special recognition to Maggie Horn, who will resign from the Board this summer. M. Horn served on the Editorial Board for nine years.

C. Bilingual Focus Group

Don Jaeger, Board Liaison to the Bilingual Focus Group, recognized its members. Steve Oberg served as the Chair of the Focus Group. Members were Robert Endean-Gamboa, Lisa Furubotten, Jose Orozco-Tenorio, Elizabeth Parang, and Priscilla Shontz.

D. Strategic Plan/Vision 2015

C. Foster introduced Tina Feick, the Chair of the Strategic Plan/Vision Task Force. T. Feick recognized the members of the Task Force: Judy Luther, Julia Gammon, Mike Randall, and Dan Tonkery. T. Feick discussed the plans for developing the vision statement. The first goal in developing the statement will be to survey the membership about the directions they would like to see the organization go between now and 2015. The membership was survey in 1986 and 1992.

6. Greetings from Peer Associations

A. United Kingdom Serials Group (UKSG)

Keith Courtney, Treasurer of UKSG, reported on UKSG's 24th annual conference. It was held at Heriot-Watt University in Edinburgh, April 2-4, 2001. C. Foster and S. Oberg attended the conference. Next year's conference will be held in Warwick, April 15-17.

B. Australian Serials Special Interest Group (ASSIG)

Nathalie Schulz, Secretary of ASSIG, gave a short history of ASSIG. The Interest Group has been in existence since 1987. N. Schulz and other Australian serials librarians have been working to revitalize ASSIG since 1999. They have sponsored three seminars in conjunction with other conferences.

C. German Serials Interest Group (GeSIG)

Hartmut Walravens gave a history of GeSIG. The Interest Group started a year and a half ago at the Frankfurt Book Fair. Like ASSIG, GeSIG has sponsored seminars in conjunction with other conferences.

7. New Business

A. Introduction of new officers and board members

S. Folsom, Chair of Nominations and Elections, introduced new officers and Board members. Vice President/President-Elect is Eleanor Cook. Denise Novak is the new Treasurer. The new Members-at-Large are Marilyn Geller, Mary Page, and Kevin Randall.

B. Introduction of 2001 *Proceedings* Editors

D. Cochenour announced that Susan Scheiberg and Shelley Neville would serve as *Proceedings* Editors of the 2001 conference.

8. Additional Business

There was no additional business.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:12 a.m.

NASIG *PROCEEDINGS* INDEXER ANNOUNCED

The 2001 *NASIG Proceedings* Editors (Shelley Neville and Susan Scheiberg) are pleased to announce that Jennifer Edwards will index the 2001 *Proceedings*.

Jennifer has been active in NASIG since 1995 and brings to the task at hand considerable enthusiasm and serials knowledge. We are sure that she will add excellent access to the valuable contents of this year's *Proceedings*.

NASIG AWARDS

2001 TUTTLE AWARD RECIPIENT REPORT

Taemin Kim Park

I received a Tuttle International Grant of $1,000 to attend the 12th International Conference on New Information Technology: Global Digital Library Development in the New Millennium, held May 29-31, 2001, in Beijing, China. At a poster session at the conference, I presented a paper titled, "Library Education in Information Organization and Access of Networked Resources."

More than 200 people from 16 countries attended the conference. The conference was held and sponsored by the world-renowned Tsinghua University, Beijing, as one of the 90th anniversary celebration events. Rapid developments in information technology, including the World Wide Web and Internet, have transformed the way we work, access, and use information. As a result, libraries and information centers can provide information to users far exceeding the previous level of services, including multimedia, multiple languages, and global information access. Due to these incredible opportunities for global information access and distributed digital libraries, there is a need to study how the digital libraries can be created so they can operate in multiple languages, formats, media, and social and organizational contexts. This is crucial to developing an easily interconnected, interoperable, and accessible system. Topics presented in NIT 2001 focused on these issues.

The following topics were covered at the conference:

- Beyond Classical Digital Libraries
- Elements for the Digital Library Development
- Changing Technology and Roles of Digital Libraries
- Digital Libraries and Distance Education
- Knowledge-Based Data Management
- Network Development and DL Architecture
- Content and Knowledge Management
- Metadata Issues, Problems, and Trends

- Digital Library Development--Case Presentation
- Terabyte Scale Multilingual Digital Library Services and Harvesting from Open Archives
- Indexing and Extracting Web Documents
- Multi-Format, Multilingual, Multimedia Retrieval
- Digital Library Interoperable and Other Problems

Those presentations provided rich information regarding the current state of worldwide digital library developments. They examined issues, problems, and challenges tackled by international experts from many interdisciplinary fields, including library and information science, computer science, multimedia, communications, networking, and linguistics.

It was a wonderful conference. I met very stimulated and knowledgeable people from around the world! As a result, I have gained a bigger picture of the developments of digital libraries and of some critical issues, problems, and possible ways to cooperate at the international level. A complimentary all-day post-conference tour to the Great Wall and the Ming Tombs was wonderful. A full paper based on my presentation will appear in *The Serials Librarian*. I want to thank NASIG for awarding me the Marcia Tuttle International Grant, which helped defray the costs of my trip to China.

REPORT FROM 2001 CONFERENCE AWARD RECIPIENTS

Virginia Taffurelli, Awards & Recognition Committee

Once again, NASIG received applications from many worthy candidates and the selection process was difficult. This year, we awarded seven Student Grant Awards, one Fritz Schwartz Serials Education Scholarship and three Horizon Awards. The grants covered the cost of room, board, transportation, and registration to the 2001 NASIG 16th Annual Conference held at Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas on May 23-26, 2001. In addition, the Fritz Schwartz Scholarship winner received $2,500 to help defray Library School tuition costs.

This year's Student Grant winners were:

LILA FAULKNER, University of Maryland
ELIZABETH ROSE FOGLER, University of Kentucky
CHRISTINA L. HESSESSEY , University of California, Los Angeles
YASMIN B. JAMAL, University of British Columbia
KAREN MUNRO, University of British Columbia
LISA SANDERS, University of Washington
PAULA SEEGER, University of Wisconsin, Madison

The 2001 Fritz Schwartz Serials Education Scholarship was awarded to:

PHILIP A. HOMAN, St. John's University

Horizon Award winners for 2001 were:

JEFF SLAGELL, Delta State University
SANDHYA DEVI SRIVASTAVA, Long Island University, Brooklyn Campus
MERLE STEEVES, University of Chicago

Each of the winners was asked to complete a survey about their experience at this year's NASIG Conference. All winners expressed gratitude for the opportunity to attend this year's conference. The following is a sampling of their responses:

Why do you feel it is worthwhile for students to attend a NASIG conference?

I was able to receive career advice, hear a variety of perspectives on scholarly communication, learn about some additional issues in licensing, explore some of the public service challenges of electronic resources, discuss some of the pitfalls of canceling paper serials in favor of electronic, and work through some of the issues in providing access to journals in an aggregator database.

I think it is important for students to attend a regional or national conference simply in order to be shown and reminded of the many different directions librarianship is going today – or at least to laugh with colleagues about how some things are the same no matter what library you come from.

I think that NASIG is a very welcoming group for students and beginners at any level. The mentor/mentee program is friendly and well organized. For a special interest group, the organization is composed of folks with an unusually wide variety of professional interests. It seems that the intersection of serials, online reference, and trends in information technology have gradually created a conference that begins to explain how different corners of the library actually fit together. Students can also get a look at the bigger picture beyond what they've seen in their first library experiences.

The workshops and concurrent sessions are highly instructive and practical, and the plenary lectures help bring the "big picture" into focus. It's also a terrific experience to attend an international conference in the field and get used to meeting colleagues socially as well as professionally.

I have come to expect a mixed bag at conferences: some presentations being very good, others mediocre. But at NASIG, I was pleasantly surprised to find a consistently high caliber. In fact, I am trying to organize visits by two of the presenters at NASIG to my home institution.

Normally, students are on a limited budget and would not be able to afford NASIG. By having Student Grants, this becomes a "once in a lifetime" opportunity to attend this very informative conference on just serials and issues surrounding them.

How did attending the conference benefit you personally?

I was impressed with NASIG members' generous service in the organization and professional accomplishments, I am encouraged to become likewise involved in NASIG committees and workshops and to publish.

I was exposed to the variety of work that libraries do in serials and the numerous interesting intellectual challenges of serials librarianship.

I came away from the conference with a clearer picture of where I am in the library world right now, in relation to the other people in the library field. I also learned what I know, don't know, and should know and where my strengths and weaknesses are.

Of particular benefit was the mentor program for first-timers. My mentor was exceptionally friendly and extremely knowledgeable. At her urging, I became involved with the Electronic Communications Committee and became the scribe for the meeting. This experience allowed me to see committee work from the inside and was just one of the ways I benefited from the conference.

The group was small enough not to be distracted by crowded rooms and events. I've heard that some people go to the ALA conference only to get free stuff at the vendors' booths. That's a distraction that takes away from the true purpose of the conference. The conference allowed me to be re-energized about entering the library profession after library school. That alone helped me more than you will know.

I enjoyed each minute of the conference. The plenaries that discussed the "big picture" of the serials environment and the challenges it faces; the workshops that assured that everyone was in the "same boat" as far as solving problems in the constantly changing serials environment. I felt I had a lot to contribute and by the same token I took back a wealth of knowledge with me.

Did attending the conference influence your career plans? How?

When preparing to take a new career step, it can be difficult to know what questions to ask or even who to ask for help. But being labeled a "mentee" made asking for directions part of my job description. Several librarians and students offered particular and practical help in looking for my next job and getting involved in NASIG. On a very practical level, this help gives me more employment options. This help also gives me the chance to think more broadly about what I might be able to do in collaboration with others – as compared to what I can do just by myself. I have a much more open attitude toward my career future now.

After talking with several presenters, I feel like getting involved in research is a real possibility for me. Sometimes beginners just need to see that someone they know is doing the things that they might also want to try.

I got a much better picture of some of the issues and obstacles that academic librarians must tackle, but I also got a sense of the wonderful camaraderie, generosity, and ingenuity that they bring to their work.

I like challenges, and seeing that though the serials environment is in a state of flux, it has great opportunities and is an exciting period.

What suggestions do you have for the 2002 NASIG Conference Student Grant Program?

One idea might be to offer students a yearlong "shadowing" experience on a NASIG committee. Provide a selection of committees that students might be able to join, such as the *Newsletter* committee, and allow students to participate, or lurk, via the committee listserv or regionally held meetings. Or, set aside a section in the *NASIG Newsletter* to spotlight the activities of past grant recipients.

Pairing students and first-timers with mentors is a terrific idea; even though NASIG is a friendly, informal conference, it's easy to feel a bit out of touch if you have no personal connections with other attendees. My NASIG experience was excellent, and I can't really suggest much to improve it.

I wish there had been an opportunity to meet only with the other students, and maybe our mentors, in order to find out their interests and library school experiences.

Let the students make their own travel arrangement under your directions. Probably is a lot easier at both ends.

Additional comments or suggestions?

I have a new perspective on my options in the library world and the ways that I can participate in library organizations.

I wish there had been more workshops designed for the brand-new serials worker, especially those coming right from library school. A workshop on serials basics, covering common vocabulary, issues, and relationships within the serials department and the rest of the library would have been useful for me.

Our Horizon winners write:

Since the conference is so focused, everyone I came into contact with had similar responsibilities and interests. It was comforting to hear that others were dealing with some of the same problems and issues that I was dealing with at home.

The NASIG conference benefited me on several levels. One would be the networking aspect – simply meeting new colleagues and being exposed to different ideas. Second, the feeling of having a support network of peers who understood exactly what challenges you are facing on a daily basis. Finally, it provided a welcome mental break.

Even though I have attended several other conferences, NASIG is unique in its casual atmosphere and the focus of its programs. It was reassuring to have a "veteran" available to answer questions and provide a friendly face.

It was one of the best organized and by far the most enjoyable conference I have ever attended. I'm sure that this is due to a variety of reasons including: excellent location, active membership, focused and quality programs, casual atmosphere, and great weather!

It is amazing how going to one of these conferences teaches you more and also reinforces what you already believed to be true. The annual conference is a great place to learn and hear from people who are already dealing with or have dealt with these issues. All the sessions: preconferences, plenary, concurrent and workshops provided a collegial atmosphere where people felt comfortable to ask questions. After the conference, I felt I had learned so much.

The conference just reinforced that I made an excellent decision in what type of librarianship I wanted to pursue. As I said above, being a serialist allows us to enjoy the full aspect of librarianship – we have cataloging procedures, acquisitions procedures, serial procedures, and public service/reference procedures.

Other conferences tend to draw a variety of people with different interests in libraries, which is good in many ways, but a conference like NASIG allows people with very similar interests and work related concerns to interact.

I was surprised and glad to see the variety of library positions represented by the attendees. It was not a purely "technical services" crowd. Being a serials cataloger I was interested in the discussions of people from other sections of the library (collection development, preservation, and reference to name a few).

NASIG COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORTS

AWARDS & RECOGNITION COMMITTEE

Claire Dygert and Kay Johnson, Co-Chairs

Committee Members: Kay Johnson (Co-Chair), Claire Dygert (Co-Chair), Randi Ashton-Pritting, Janie Branham, Carol Green, Beth Jedlicka, Joan Lamborn, Linda Lewis, Coleen Molden, Nancy Newsome, Mike Randall, Andrew Shroyer, Reeta Sinha, Philenese Slaughter, Virginia Taffurelli, Kaye Talley, Majorie Wilhite, Sue Williams. Board Liaison: Don Jaeger.

Part I of our report summarizes progress on the issues raised in the A&R committee's 1999/2000 report that was prepared by outgoing co-chairs Markel Tumlin and Pat Frade. Part II lists new issues that have risen since the previous annual report. Part III provides reports on the individual awards.

PART I. UPDATE ON ISSUES RAISED IN 1999/2000 ANNUAL REPORT

Update from 1999/2000 Report

Our 1999/2000 report listed a number of issues that the committee planned to address in the upcoming year. These included:

- how to increase the number of Tuttle Award applicants.
- the appointment of a committee member to serve as liaison to the ECC.
- getting the FAQ pages updated along with the other award announcements and actually posted to the NASIG website.
- proactive methods of reaching out to the Mexican and French Canadian library communities.
- the completion of written committee procedures.
- further ways to enhance the conference experience for winners.
- designing methods to verify the status of the Fritz winner and exploring the possibility of paying out the Fritz in two or more installments, depending on the calendar of the scholarship winner's school.

Increasing the Number of Tuttle Applicants

The 2000/2001 budget included a line item for advertising specifically targeting the Tuttle Award. Dygert worked with Anne McKee, the NASIG publicist, in getting the Tuttle announcement into professional publications. Due to publication schedules, it was determined that *Library Journal* was the best place to publicize the Tuttle Award. (The quarterly publication schedule of *Serials Review* and *Serials Librarian* and the upcoming deadline didn't provide enough lead time to publicize in these titles.) The Tuttle Award announcement was published in the April 1, 2001, issue of *Library Journal*. As of the deadline today, April 30, 2001, no applications have been received.

The lack of Tuttle applications for this award cycle, however, was compounded by many converging and unfortunate factors. No written guidelines currently exist for the administration of the Tuttle Award, which makes planning difficult. Meanwhile, the portion of the NASIG Web site describing the Tuttle Award was not brought up to date and represented the previous rather than current award cycle. To further set the stage for disaster, the administration of the spring Tuttle Award coincides with the co-chairs' responsibilities to receive, copy, distribute, discuss, collect evaluations for, and award the Student, Fritz, and Horizon awards.

The A&R Committee will work on resolving these issues at our upcoming meeting in May. Possible solutions include the reduction of the Tuttle to an annual award, more targeted advertising in serials related publications, and revised announcement wording. Dygert is also drafting award administration guidelines.

Appointment of Committee Member to the Electronic Communications Committee

Mike Randall volunteered to serve as the ECC liaison. Mike has learned to use MS FrontPage, and will be working on developing the A&R Committee site.

Mounting of Award FAQ Pages on the NASIG Web Site

An issue that remains outstanding from our previous annual report was the posting of FAQ pages at the NASIG site for each award. A subcommittee had developed these FAQs, the committee had reviewed them, and the NASIG Board approved them. The FAQs were sent to the ECC but must have fallen through some cracks, as they never made it to the site.

The A&R co-chairs have copies of the FAQs, which will be updated and be posted on the web in time for the next award cycles.

Reaching Out to the Mexican and French Canadian Library Communities

While supportive of the goal to reach out to Mexican and French Canadian library communities, the current and past co-chairs of the A & R Committee had serious reservations about their ability to do so in a substantive way. These concerns were expressed in a letter to the NASIG Board dated August 23, 2000. We never received a formal reply to this letter, and were told that the CEC would assume the responsibility of outreach to Mexico, French Canada, and Puerto Rico. We have only just learned that the CEC has actually developed a new grant and is planning on awarding it at the upcoming annual conference in May. As we write, we are in the process of working with the Board liaison to clarify how this award dovetails with the activities of the A&R.

Completion of Written Committee Procedures

We are making good progress in this area, and expect to have all committee procedures written by fall 2001. Johnson has drafted guidelines for arranging travel to the conference for award winners, and Dygert is drafting guidelines for the administration of the Marcia Tuttle International Grant.

PART II. NEW ISSUES

Evaluate Tuttle Award Cycle

According to the original Tuttle Award guidelines, the award cycle was to be evaluated after one year. This evaluation has yet to take place. The committee will consider the issue this year, and discuss whether the award would be more appropriately administered annually on the same schedule as other awards. We will also discuss the timing of the award, and whether or not it may be awarded retrospectively.

Electronic Submission and Dissemination of Award Applications

We will consider to what extent if it is feasible for the awards to be handled electronically. What physical documents need to exist? Is local printing of materials an issue?

Responsibility for Securing Awards for Outgoing Board Members and Committee Chairs

The A&R Committee was assigned this responsibility in mid-year. In the past this had been the duty of the Past President. Will this continue to be A&R's responsibility, or will it return to the Past President? What are the issues involved if A&R is asked to retain this responsibility?

Degree Qualifications for Student Grant Award

One of this year's applicants had a Ph.D. Does this committee think the award should be limited to Master's degree students? Should the committee propose a separate award for Ph.D. students?

Acceptance Forms for Awards

A form exists only for the Tuttle Award. A subgroup needs to be formed to develop acceptance forms for the other awards.

Award Announcement Schedule and Processes

The earlier NASIG Conference moved deadlines forward. Do we need to have different calendars for May and June conferences? Notices were sent electronically and posted in the *NASIG Newsletter*. Do we need to send printed announcements to library schools for the Student Grant? Are there other award advertisement issues that need to be addressed?

PART III. 2000/2001 AWARDS

All applicants were reviewed and ranked by all committee members. The rankings were then compiled by one of the committee co-chairs. Dygert received and compiled the rankings for the Horizon Award, and supervised the publicity and review of the Tuttle application(s). Johnson compiled the rankings for the Student Grant and Fritz Scholarship. The committee is pleased to list the 2000 award winners for the Horizon Award, the Fritz Schwartz Serials Education Scholarship, and the Student Grants:

NASIG Horixon Award

Jeff Slagell
Delta State University
Sandhya Devi Srivastava
Long Island University, Brooklyn Campus
Merle Steeves
University of Chicago

NASIG Conference Student Grant

Lila Faulkner
University of Maryland
Elizabeth Rose Fogler
University of Kentucky
Christina L. Hennessey
University of California, Los Angeles
Yasmin B. Jamal
University of British Columbia
Karen Munro
University of British Columbia

Lisa Sanders
University of Washington
Paula Seeger
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Fritz Schwartz Serials Education Scholarship
Philip A. Homan
St. John's University

As in previous years, all winners will be assigned a mentor (in cooperation with the mentoring committee) to enhance their conference experience. Also, essays written by the 2001 Horizon Awardees and selections from the post-conference questionnaires completed by the Horizon and Student Grant Awardees will be published in the *NASIG Newsletter*.

The work of the committee could not be accomplished without the support of the committee online discussion list. The strength of this group is in its members and their willingness to participate in online discussions regarding the fine points of the awards process and their willingness to volunteer. Special thanks go to committee members Beth Jedlicka and Philenese Slaughter for volunteering to coordinate all travel arrangements for the 2001 winners.

The Co-Chairs of the Awards & Recognition Committee are very thankful for the hard work and dedication of committee members. We would like to extend special thanks to those members cycling off the committee and extend a warm welcome to the new members who will be joining the committee in 2001/2002.

DATABASE & *DIRECTORY* COMMITTEE

Rose Robischon, Chair

Committee members Mary Ellen Majors, Kevin Randall, Rose Robischon, Frieda Rosenberg, and Christopher Thornton rotate off the committee this year. We appreciate all the work done by each committee member to make the *Directory* as clean and accurate as possible, Kim Maxwell for her work in formatting the print *Directory*, and Pat Wallace's guidance. Continuing committee members are: Karen Matthews, Elna Saxton, Jian Wang, and Kathryn Wesley (incoming chair). We welcome incoming members: Jana Brubaker, Rene Erlandson, Sandhya Srivastava, and Lanie Williamson.

The committee members check the searchable *Directory* for formatting and any other errors that they come across. The D&D procedures are in the process of being updated to cover the changes that affect the *Directory*, i.e. Automated Serial Systems changes and additions, etc. Mailing labels were prepared for the Nominations & Elections Committee and the 2001 Conference Planning Committee. NASIG members have been very good about sending address changes to the committee. This year's mailings each resulted in approximately three pieces of returned mail. We continued to supply Curry Printing with mailing label information in dBase format as an e-mail attachment. We have had a couple of minor problems searching the online *Directory*. Scott Haslip, the vendor who formatted our searchable *Directory*, has been extremely helpful in getting these problems resolved.

Committee expenses to date have been minor since our major expense is printing and mailing the *Membership Directory*. The *Directory* will be published and mailed in June, so expenses will not be known until after the printing and mailing. 2001 year-to-date expenses include $73.93 for office supplies, $717.92 for postage, and $122 for windows envelopes.

The *Directory* information is in the process of being sent to the desktop publisher, Kim Maxwell. Kathryn Wesley coordinated the 2001 printed *Directory*.

The renewal rate for NASIG members was 72% with the first notice; after the final renewal reminder the renewal rate rose to 83%. A courtesy last-minute e-mail reminder went to all non-renewing members March 19. Of the 244 non-renewing members, 47 were bad e-mail addresses, 14 responded with the decision not to renew, and 56 requested another renewal form. If all 56 renew, our renewal rate will be 87%. The final renewal rate was 90%. As of May 22, membership totaled 1,258. Membership make-up by type of institution is: university library: 630 or 50.07%; college library: 99 or 7.87%; community college library: 17 or 1.33%; medical library: 63 or 4.91%; law library: 55 or 4.28%; public library: 39 or 3.04%; government, national, or state library: 53 or 4.13%; corporate or special library: 45 or 3.50%; subscription vendor or agency: 80 or 6.23%; book vendor: 6 or 0.47%; publisher: 53 or 4.13%; back issues dealer: 6 or 0.47%; binder: 6 or 0.47%; automated systems vendor: 9 or 0.70%; library network, consortium, or utility: 16 or 1.25%; professional association: 10 or 0.78%; database producer: 6 or 0.47%; student: 16 or 1.25%; and other: 38 or 2.96%.

PROGRAM PLANNING COMMITTEE

Lisa Macklin, Mary Page, and Robb Waltner, PPC Co-Chairs
NASIG 2001 Conference at San Antonio

The Program Planning Committee began its work in earnest in mid-August 2000. We organized ourselves into two primary sub-committees: Lisa and Robb headed the group that focused on workshops, pre-conferences, and poster sessions. Mary worked with the other group on plenaries and concurrents. We received a total of 51 proposals, about 20 fewer than last year.

Conference Schedule
We liked the relaxed scheduling of the conference at San Diego. Once we read the preliminary report on NASIG 2000 provided by the Evaluation and Assessment Committee, which indicated that most attendees also liked the pace of the previous conference, we decided to adopt that basic framework for NASIG 2001.

Pre-Conferences
Two pre-conferences were selected. The first, based on a proposal submitted by members of the NASIG Publications Committee, is *Getting Published: Surviving in a 'Write Stuff or They Will Fire You' Environment.* This pre-conference will offer attendees the opportunity to learn more about the publication process, and it will present activities designed to start people on their way to writing for publication. The second pre-conference is based on a program created for the Medical Libraries Association, and it has been recast for NASIG as *Licensing for Beginners.* This session will provide attendees with an overview of the licensing process for electronic resources.

Workshops
Attendees at this year's conference will be able to select from a list of 24 superb workshop programs. There is a good mix of topics that should appeal to a broad range of NASIG members. At the Board's fall meeting, it was decided that we should not offer in-depth workshops unless the content clearly warranted this format. The proposals selected were appropriate for the usual 75-minute sessions. Because of the high caliber of the program content, we expect that some attendees may be disappointed that they will not be able to attend more of the workshop sessions.

Plenaries
We have three outstanding plenary sessions on the program. The first two will focus on scholarly publication from different points of view. The final plenary will address the demographics of future generations of library users.

Concurrents
We have eight high-quality concurrent speakers scheduled, who will cover a variety of current issues. As with the workshops, we expect that some conference attendees will be disappointed that they cannot attend more than two concurrent sessions.

Poster Sessions
Following last year's successful introduction of poster sessions to NASIG's offerings, we will present 12 poster sessions right after Thursday's lunch. Again, there is a good mix of topics presented in these sessions, which provide yet another forum for NASIG members to exchange ideas and learn from each other.

The Co-Chairs would like to thank the members of this year's Program Planning Committee. The caliber of the program content can be directly attributed to the hard work and creative input of this talented bunch of individuals:

Workshops Sub-Committee
June Garner, Mississippi State University
Rachel Frick, Virginia Commonwealth University
Lisa Macklin, Georgia Institute of Technology, Chair
Lisa Rowlison, California State University, Monterey Bay
Allison Sleeman, University of Virginia
Kay Teel, Stanford University
Robb Waltner, University of Colorado, Denver
Beth Weston, George Washington University

Plenary/Concurrents Sub-Committee
Kate Manuel, California State University, Hayward
Mary Page, Rutgers University, Chair
Mike Somers, Indiana State University
Jim Stickman, University of Washington
Sherry Sullivan, Swets Blackwell, Inc.

Pre-Conferences
Lisa Rowlison
Robb Waltner, Chair
Beth Weston

Poster Sessions
June Garner
Lisa Macklin, Chair
Robb Waltner

Consultants
Susan Davis, State University of New York, Buffalo
Cindy Hepfer, State University of New York, Buffalo
Judy Luther, Informed Strategies

Finally, we would like to thank our Board Liaison, Maggie Rioux, of the Marine Biological Laboratory/Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution Library, for her good sense and leadership, and for always knowing just when to send us a note of encouragement!

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Ladd Brown, Chair, Publications Committee

Committee members: Agnes Adams, Jeff Bullington, Jennifer Edwards, Kristen Kern, Jonathan Makepeace, Linda Pitts, Jeff Steely, Sarah Tusa , Elizabeth Steinhagen (ex officio), Lisa Furubotten (ex officio).

Before reviewing the year, the Chair would like to congratulate the above members of the committee for all their contributions and hard work, typical of the NASIG membership, but without which nothing is set in motion. Thank you!

The Publications Committee, a relative newcomer in the NASIG infrastructure, continues to shape its character, explore potential alliances, and undertake initiatives within the organization.

Working from the mission statement that NASIG is "an independent organization that promotes communication and sharing of ideas among all members of the serials information chain," the Publications Committee is evolving into a role in which:

- the Committee commences and leads projects, such as conference programs and the maintenance of the Serials Publications: Resources for Authors and NASIGuides Web pages; and collaborates with other committees in furthering the aims and goals of NASIG.
- the Committee has the potential to collaborate with other NASIG committees, such as the EEC on electronic formats of the conference handouts, and the CEC on the *CONSER Cataloging Manual* translation project.

Four major areas of emphasis this past year were:

Program Proposal for 2001 Annual Meeting
A proposal was submitted and accepted for the annual conference. The proposal, classified as either an extended workshop or pre-conference, was selected as one of two pre-conferences for the annual meeting.

This pre-conference is designed to give practical advice to librarians faced with publishing requirements in a tenure or continued appointment environment and also to those members who are interested in library-related publishing.

Translation of the CONSER Cataloging Manual
As reported by Lisa Furubotten and Elizabeth Steinhagen, the translation of the CONSER manual into Spanish is a dynamic project. The status report includes:

- working around file format incompatibilities (from original 1994 version)
- incorporating recent changes in AACR2
- translating all MARC record examples as well as cataloging R&I
- discussion of the project in a presentation at the XXXII Jornadas Mexicanas de Biblioteconomía, Asociación Mexicana de Bibliotecarios, A. C. (AMBAC)

Maintenance of Web Pages
At present, the “Serials Publications: Resources for Authors” Web page is a highly comprehensive source containing submission and general information for nearly 50 library-related journals, style guides, and other manuscript guidelines. The Web page is found at:

http://www.nasig.org/publications/pub_resources.html

Complete information for prospective authors on the purpose, scope, and creation of NASIGuides, as well as any editorial policy and other information, is found at:

http://www.nasig.org/publications/nasiguides.html

Further Development of NASIGuides
The proposed *NASIGuide* on MARC Holdings is hampered by the principal contributor's involvement in other projects. A goal from this committee's 2000 annual report was "create *NASIGuide* from any program that is selected for 2001 conference and post on Committee website." Addressing this goal will be placed on the agenda for the 2001 Committee meeting.

Conference Handout Packets
Following the recommendation that the handouts appear in electronic format, the Committee is now faced with procedural, fiscal, and other organizational decisions.

The topic has not been thoroughly explored by the Committee, although the need for improvement is recognized. Moving the handout packets to the NASIG Web site would:

- enable members to access only the handouts/portions they desire
- eliminate postage (especially costly overseas mailing)
- provide an opportunity for an archival database

This topic has not been thoroughly debated, and no committee consensus has been reached. The major areas of concern remain:

- the need for a "Handout Editor" with established guidelines
- format transition or format options?
- possible involvement/interaction with other NASIG committees: CPC, CEC, ECC, and the PPC

Recommendations
In establishing its niche or areas of highest effectiveness in NASIG, the Publications Committee should continue to refine, maintain, and publicize the two projects on the Committee Web pages, perhaps evaluating and implementing suitable additions.

Acting in a support role for continuing-education-type ventures, the Committee should seek out opportunities to co-sponsor or co-develop programs and projects that involve any type of publishing, whether it be intra- or extra-organizational.

OTHER SERIALS NEWS

ASSIG BIDS FAREWELL TO ALFRED GANS

Nathalie Schulz, ASSIG Secretary

The Australian Serials Special Interest Group (ASSIG) Committee joined with RoweCom staff and members of the library community on July 20, 2001 to bid farewell to Alfred Gans. Alfred has retired as Managing Director of RoweCom Australia (formerly ISA Australia, a company founded by his father in the 1950s).

Alfred was a founding member of ASSIG and was the treasurer for 14 years until his retirement. In recognition of his work with ASSIG and his contribution to the library profession, Alfred was recently conferred with the Redmond Barry Award by the Board of Directors of the Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA). This award is a great honour and recognises outstanding service by a person who is not eligible to become a professional member of ALIA.

The ASSIG committee thanks Alfred for his service and support and wishes him the very best for his retirement.

LETTER

To the NASIG Membership:

Since the 1995 conference, I have been sending out a call for reporters to write session summaries for the *Newsletter*. Every year, the reporter corps has grown, with new names added and "old" ones returning multiple times. With the 1995 conference, the *Newsletter* was able to offer the first "Workshop sampler," as we had enough reporters to start covering workshops in addition to the plenaries and preconferences. This year, I was very pleased to be able to assign a reporter to almost every session and, in addition, actually receive a report (or two) from every reporter!

Approximately 125 individuals have written *Newsletter* conference reports over the years from 1995-2001, during my time as Editor-in-Chief and Copy Editor. To all of you, I say, "Thank you and I hope you will continue to write for the *Newsletter*." To all of you who wish to get your feet wet next year, I say "Go for it! Join the not-so-exclusive-but-oh-so-fun club."

And a "thank you" to all of you for giving me a chance to meet some really great folks.

Maggie Horn
Retiring (but not shy) Copy Editor,
NASIG Newsletter

CALENDAR

Char Simser

[Please submit announcements for upcoming meetings, conferences, workshops and other events of interest to your NASIG colleagues to Char Simser at csimser@lib.ksu.edu]

October 10-12, 2001
Iowa Library Association
Annual Conference
Davenport, Iowa

October 11-14, 2001
LITA National Forum
"Integrating Innovation: IT in the Transformation of the Library"
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
URL: http://www.lita.org/forum01/index.htm

November 14-15, 2001
Information Strategies 2001
Sponsored by the State University System Libraries of Florida and hosted by Florida Gulf Coast University
URL: http://library.fgcu.edu/Conferences/infostrategies/index.html
Contact: (941) 590-7600
E-mail: infostra@fgcu.edu

January 18-23, 2002
American Library Association
Mid-Winter Meeting
New Orleans, Louisiana

March 12–16, 2002
Public Library Association
9th National Conference
Phoenix, Arizona
URL: http://www.pla.org/conf02/index.html

March 13–15, 2002
Computers in Libraries
Washington, D.C.
URL: http://www.infotoday.com/cil2002/default.htm

June 13–19, 2002
American Library Association
Annual Conference
Atlanta, Georgia

June 20-23, 2002
NASIG
17th Annual Conference
"Transforming Serials: The Revolution Continues"
College of William & Mary
Williamsburg, Virginia

[See also the *American Libraries* "Datebook" at: http://www.ala.org/alonline/datebook/datebook.html]

NORTH AMERICAN SERIALS INTEREST GROUP

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS
2002/03 NASIG EXECUTIVE BOARD AND OFFICERS

Vice-President/President Elect

Name:
Affiliation:
Address (if available):
Phone (if available):
E-mail:

Secretary

Name:
Affiliation:
Address (if available):
Phone (if available):
E-mail:

Members-At-Large (Three to be elected)

Name:
Affiliation:
Address (if available):
Phone (if available):
E-mail:

Name:
Affiliation:
Address (if available):
Phone (if available):
E-mail:

Name:
Affiliation:
Address (if available):
Phone (if available):
E-mail:

Deadline: Oct. 15, 2001. Nominees must be current NASIG members.

Mail this form to N&E Chair:

Markel D. Tumlin
University Library, LLA-1101-L
San Diego State University
5500 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182-8050
Phone: (619) 594-6875
Fax: (619) 594-3270
E-mail: mtumlin@mail.sdsu.edu