NASIG NEWSLETTER

Vol. 17, no. 3	ISSN 0892-1733	September 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRESIDENT'S CORNER

Eleanor Cook, NASIG President

I would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone in the universe who has had a hand in making it possible for me to be writing this column to you. Of course, I cannot name everyone, nor will I try. In fact, I probably should not name names at all—if you are one of them, you know who you are. And for those of you who do not know me, you can read about me in the profile that Allison Sharp, NASIG Profiles Editor, has developed for this same issue.

NASIG is all about an incredible spirit of volunteerism and about the need to continue to lead in the exploration and creation of a new age of information access. NASIG's niche in this endeavor has to do with creating an environment where serial publications evolving into digital entities can be as accessible to as many people as possible. The digital age is upon us, and unless some evil act turns off the power for the foreseeable future, this evolution is unstoppable.

I for one am excited about the possibilities, but I know that we live in an era of uncertainty. While there is potential for tremendous achievement, there is also potential for serious regression. To be on the brink of huge achievements is both a glorious and frightening thing. For me to be at the helm of an organization that has done so much for this vital piece of the information sector is downright overwhelming and yet inspiring. I could not and would not have accepted the nomination for this office without the knowledge that NASIG is filled with bright, capable, and dedicated individuals from many parts of the information chain. We must move forward together. Without all of us, these breakthroughs won't continue to happen.

So here's my pitch: Let's keep keepin' on, but let's also change as we need to. Those of us who have been around NASIG for years enjoy invoking the mantra of the "NASIG tradition." We have a plethora of NASIG traditions—and while some of these are silly or endearing, some may be just plain bureaucratic. After 17 years of conferences, are we possibly getting stuffy? No way! NASIG stuffy? This cannot be! (But wait, there's more…)

I want to challenge the NASIG membership to dare to think out of the box, to use that cliché. You will get this opportunity quite soon! The NASIG Strategic Planning Task Force is busy preparing an opportunity for you to provide us needed feedback as we plan for the future (an easy-to-use Web questionnaire, to be exact). Needless to say, NASIG members have plenty of feedback to offer—NASIG-L lit up like 4th of July fireworks shortly after the conference in Williamsburg. It's obvious that we need to take a hard look at conference scheduling—we heard that loud and clear. How we will solve this concern remains to be seen, but the membership has spoken, and I encourage you to continue to give your input when the Web questionnaire is ready.

The other background hum that keeps me and other Board members up at night has to do with the importance of membership diversity. I am not talking about racial or ethnic diversity in this case, although we could certainly use some of that as well. What I am talking about here is that hard-core serialists (and you know who we are: basically serials acquisition and cataloging librarians and their primary vendors and service providers) need to realize that the whole world needs to know about serials these days and that we may need other folks to be part of NASIG. These "other folks" might include database producers, systems librarians, collection development and reference and instruction folks, consortial administrators, Web designers, and dot.com types we might not even understand yet—and others as well. This is just a partial list, to be sure! We already know that we need to reacquaint ourselves with non-profit as well as commercial publishers of serials who have dropped their memberships in NASIG either due to boredom (we haven't provided programming that interests them) or due to frustration because they feel misunderstood or are simply tired of our rhetoric.

Another challenge we face is the tension of how to deal with commercial speech and the like within our community. Traditionally, NASIG has taken a hard line, a unique one to say the least, on banning all commercialism. Membership in NASIG is personal only—no institutional memberships are available—and there are no commercial sponsors and no exhibits at NASIG. Sales pitches are not tolerated. At the Williamsburg conference, there were some sessions where this rule was inadvertently or unknowingly breeched, and the hue and cry against such perceived infractions cannot be ignored. But what does it mean? We need to examine our values and determine what is acceptable, useful, and tolerable. As President, it is NOT my intention to endorse policies that drive our commercial partners away (just the opposite!), yet we need to reaffirm the values that make NASIG special and encourage that "level playing field" mentality that makes NASIG work so well.

Well, I could go on and on, but I suspect the *NASIG Newsletter* editorial team might find that troublesome. However, let me recognize Charlene Simser, the brand-new Editor-in-Chief for the *Newsletter*. What a fabulous lead-in from the wonderful Steve Savage! Char served as a *NASIG Proceedings* Editor in the past, so she is no stranger to NASIG publications. Since she has been understudy for Steve for some time, I suspect the transition will be nearly seamless.

I hope everyone is looking forward to Portland in 2003. This coming year is going to be challenging for many of us with slashed or non-existent travel budgets, so I hope you will choose NASIG as the conference to attend if you have to make hard choices. I am excited about working with the Portland Conference Planning Committee and all the other great committees that make NASIG the effective organization that it is.

One last plug: Please nominate good people to stand for election. Every suggestion helps the Nominations & Elections Committee do their tough job of coming up with a viable slate of people to represent you. I am very fortunate to have such a capable group of people on the Board this year to help me through this next year.

Thank you, everyone, for allowing me the privilege to serve you. I am looking forward to a great year.

NASIG EXECUTIVE BOARD MINUTES

Meg Mering, NASIG Secretary

Date, Time: June 19, 2002, 8:37 a.m. -4:45 p.m.
Place: College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia

Attending:
Maggie Rioux, President
Eleanor Cook, Vice-President/President-Elect
Connie Foster, Past President
Meg Mering, Secretary
Denise Novak, Treasurer

Members at Large:
Donnice Cochenour
Crista Easton
Marilyn Geller
Anne McKee
Mary Page
Kevin Randall

Guests:
Stephen Clark, Co-Chair, 2002 Conference Planning Committee
Joyce Tenney, Co-Chair, 2002 Conference Planning Committee and Incoming Board Member
Beatrice Caraway, Danny Jones, and Bob Persing, Incoming Board Members
Steve Savage and Char Simser, *Newsletter* Representatives

1.0 Welcome and Introductions

M. Rioux welcomed Board members and guests to the meeting. She introduced incoming Board members, B. Caraway, D. Jones, J. Tenney, and B. Persing, and the incoming *Newsletter* Editor-in-Chief, C. Simser.

2.0 Secretary's Report

2.1 Board actions since Midwinter

M. Mering compiled the following Board decisions since the January 2002 meeting for inclusion in the minutes.

a. Approved the minutes from the January 2002 Executive Board meeting.
b. Set registration fees for the two 2002 preconferences.
c, Agreed to provide a meeting room to ICEDIS at the 2002 conference. ICEDIS agreed to pay any extra costs to NASIG for providing the room.
d. Approved printing 4,000 revised membership brochures.
e. Approved making a donation to the American Cancer Society in memory of former NASIG Board President Steve Oberg's father.
f. Agreed to purchase a bonding policy from Duncan Financial Group. The policy will cover the President, the Treasurer, and the Registrar.
g. Accepted the nominees for the Horizon Awards, the Student Grants, the Fritz Schwartz Serials Education Scholarship, and the Mexican Student Grant.
h. Agreed to give free one-year NASIG memberships to the Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico professors who assisted with the selection of the recipient of the Mexican Student Grant.
i. Agreed that local volunteers from previous conferences who have never otherwise attended NASIG are eligible to apply for the Horizon Awards, the Student Grants, and the Fritz Schwartz Serials Education Scholarship.
j. Agreed to give a complimentary conference tee shirt to all members of the 2002 CPC and PPC for their service.
k. Asked D. Novak to revise the Compensation and Reimbursement Policy to be more specific about speakers' expenses.
l. Agreed to add "Retired" as a type of employment on the membership application and renewal forms.
m. Accepted the results of the NASIG Executive Board elections.
n. Approved the 2002 conference theme and call for proposals: "Serials in the Park: Blazing Diverse Trails in the Information Forest. "

2.2 Board roster updates

M. Mering distributed copies of the 2002/03 Board roster. She asked Board members if they had any changes to their contact information.

ACTION: B. Caraway will update the Board roster.
DATE: ASAP

2.3 Revisions for executive working calendar

This spring M. Mering updated the executive working calendar. She suggested that the calendar be reviewed for further updating in the upcoming year.

3.0 Treasurer's Report

3.1 Conference finance report

D. Novak reported that the conference finances appeared to be in good shape. Although most of the conference's expenses have yet to be paid, D. Novak felt a surplus would be made on the Williamsburg conference.

3.2 Annual budget update

D. Novak stated that the financial picture of NASIG remains positive. Committee expenditures are on target for this time of year.

3.3 Membership update

D. Novak announced that as of June 15, 2002, NASIG had 1,233 paid members. This figure is about the same as it was a year ago at this time. D. Novak is still receiving a few renewals each week.

The Board discussed concerns with paying membership dues with credit cards and Canadian currency.

ACTION: D. Novak and the Finance Committee will discuss the possibility of paying dues only in U.S. currency and concerns about paying with credit cards.
DATE: Report at fall Board meeting

3.4 Charles Schwab account

D. Novak stated that she would be collecting signatures of the new officers who will be authorized agents of the Schwab account.

The one-year Schwab certificate of deposit has matured. D. Novak asked the Board to consider moving NASIG investments to Bank of America. NASIG has its checking, savings accounts, and credit card with Bank of America.

ACTION: D. Novak and the Finance Committee will discuss moving NASIG investments to Bank of America and other options. They will make a recommendation to the Board.
DATE: No later than the fall Board meeting

3.5 Compensation and reimbursement policy

The Board reviewed the revised compensation and reimbursement policy and made suggestions for change.

ACTION: D. Novak will make the suggested changes to the policy and send it to the Board via e-mail for final approval.

The Board discussed how many nights of lodging should be provided to concurrent and plenary speakers free of charge and what expectations were for their participation at conferences.

ACTION: The Board will continue this discussion at the fall Board meeting.

4.0 2002 Conference Planning Report

S. Clark and J. Tenney, 2002 CPC Co-Chairs, announced that close to 700 people had registered for the conference. Of the registrants, 237 will be attending a NASIG conference for the first time, and 500 of them are staying on the College of William and Mary's campus. The electronic journal preconference is a sellout. 174 people have signed up for the airport shuttle service. The CPC Co-Chairs expected that a surplus would be made on the shuttle service.

ACTION: The Board thanked the 2002 CPC and A. McKee, Board Liaison, for their work. The 2002 CPC members are S. Clark, J. Tenney, Ladd Brown, Lauren Corbett, Rachel Frick, Sharon Gasser, Diane Hollyfield, JoAnn Keyes, Merle Kimball, Steve Murden, Allison Sleeman, and Beth Weston.

5.0 Publicist

5.1 NASIG brochure on NASIGWeb

C. Foster announced that each 2002 conference packet included a copy of the revised membership brochure. She asked if the brochure should be mounted on NASIGWeb as an HTML or a PDF file.

ACTION: M. Rioux will ask ECC to make the brochure available as both an HTML file and a PDF file under the "Join Us" button of NASIGWeb.

5.2 NASIG brochure French/Spanish translation project

Mariana Baravalle translated the membership brochure into Spanish. C. Foster is still arranging for someone to translate the brochure into French.

ACTION: C. Foster will gather quotes on printing 500, 750, or 1,000 Spanish language membership brochures.
ACTION: The Board thanked M. Baravalle for her work in translating the brochure into Spanish.

6.0 Committee Reports

6.1 Archives

M. Mering reported that NASIG Archivist Holley Lange had begun work on identifying a potential permanent location for the NASIG archives. The archives consist of 11 boxes and are becoming too large to easily transfer to a new location each time a new archivist is appointed.

H. Lange has revised the archives' retention policy, which will be distributed at the committee chair orientation.

6.2 Bylaws

C. Easton reported that there were no proposed bylaw changes this past year. Bylaw changes may result from the new strategic plan and vision statement. Robert Cleary rotates off as the Chair of the committee this year. Alice Rhoades will be the Chair for 2002/03.

6.3 Awards & Recognition

M. Geller reported that A&R Committee members Linda Lewis and Claire Dygert served as liaisons to the CEC subcommittee coordinating the Mexico Conference Grant. The Board discussed whether CEC should continue to coordinate the grant or if A&R should be responsible for the grant. CEC has coordinated the grant largely because of the Spanish language expertise and the knowledge of Mexico of some of its committee members.

ACTION: The Board agreed the Mexico Conference Grant should eventually become the responsibility of A&R.

The Board discussed the possibility of electronically submitting and disseminating award applications. Two concerns about electronic applications are the lack of an actual applicant signature and references only being submitted electronically.

ACTION: M. Geller will ask A&R to recommend how to implement electronic submission and dissemination of awards in time for the spring 2003 award cycle. ECC will assist A&R on working on this recommendation.
DATE: Report at fall 2002 Board meeting

The Board discussed the Tuttle Award's schedule and its low application rate. They also discussed the purpose of the grant. The grant's original intent was to allow applicants from within as well as outside of North America. This intention may not be clear from reading the award's guidelines.

ACTION: M. Geller will ask A&R to review the guidelines for the Tuttle Award and to clarify and to rethink the purpose of the award and its award cycle.

The Board discussed if applications from outside of North America would be considered for other NASIG awards.

ACTION: The Board decided that strong preference would be given to applicants within North America. Outstanding applicants from outside of North America will also be considered for awards.

6.4 Continuing Education

M. Geller reported that four continuing education events had been held since the last Board meeting. Most recently, Lisa Furubotten and Robert Endean presented the SCCTP Electronic Serials Workshop at the Association of Caribbean University, Research and Institutional Libraries' annual conference in Ochos Rios, Jamaica. At the Mexican Library Association's conference, two programs were sponsored by NASIG.

There are 124 people participating in the mentor program at this year's conference. Pat Loghry and Carole Bell are coordinating the program for this year's conference.

M. Geller announced that Paula de la Mora Lugo from the Colegio de Bibliotecología at UNAM was this year's recipient of the Mexican Student Conference Grant. In addition to the two A&R committee members, L. Furubotten, Elizabeth Parang, last year's award recipient Viviano Milan Martinez, and UNAM professors coordinated the grant's application process. E. Parang has written guidelines for administering the grant.

ACTION: The Board will review the grant's guidelines and approve them over e-mail.
DATE: July 1, 2002

The Board discussed the workload of CEC. They also talked about CEC's purpose in relation to other committees. They considered which of CEC's responsibilities other committees could possibly carry out.

ACTION: M. Geller will discuss with CEC and the Publications Committee the possibility of moving the Human Resources Directory from CEC to the Publications Committee. She will ask these committees how this change might be implemented and what concerns they have in making this change.
ACTION: M. Geller and K. Randall will discuss with CEC and RC&M the possibility of moving the mentor program and outreach to library schools from CEC to RC&M. They will ask these committees how this change might be implemented and what concerns they have in making these changes.

7.0 More Committee Reports

7.1 Database & *Directory*

K. Randall announced that the 2002 *Membership Directory* would be mailed in late June. He also reported that the membership renewal rate was 85.2%.

K. Randall asked if an archival copy should be made of the online *Directory* before non-renewing members are purged. Some Board members wondered if the print *Directory* could be seen as the archival copy. Another possibility would be to send a summary of the online *Directory's* content to the Archivist.

ACTION: K. Randall will ask D&D to consider what should constitute the archival copy of the *Directory* and what information to include in a summary about the online directory. D&D will gather input from the Archivist.
DATE: By the end of July 2002

7.2 Electronic Communications

D. Cochenour reported that ECC is working with Bee.net to collect use statistics of NASIGWeb. ECC will conduct a general analysis of the selected data.

ECC is still investigating whole-site searching of NASIGWeb. Pages that have their own search functions are for members only. NASIG Committees' private pages will not be included in an all-site search engine.

NASIGWeb's domain name is up for renewal in February 2003. Bee.net is willing to renew the domain at minimal cost.

ACTION: The Board agreed to have Bee.net renew the domain name.

7.3 Evaluation & Assessment

M. Page reported that Beth Holley replaced Diane Grover as the committee's chair in January 2002. E&A operates on a calendar year basis. The results of the conference's evaluation will be available for the Board's review at its fall Board meeting.

7.4 Newsletter

S. Savage reported that all four issues of this past year were published in record time and well before their target dates of publication, including the large September issue.

The elimination of the print version of the *Newsletter* was the most significant change this year. As a result, the Electronic Production Editor became known as the HTML Editor. The Print Production Editor became known as the PDF editor.

The 2002 conference marks the end of Editor-in-Chief S. Savage's term. C. Simser will become the new Editor-in-Chief. She has been serving as the *Newsletter's* HTML Editor.

Stephanie Schmitt will become the new HTML Editor after the 2002 conference. She will also convert the remaining back issues of the *Newsletter* to an electronic form.

ACTION: The Board thanked Sharon Nahra for her work in converting back issues of the *Newsletter* to an electronic form.

Allison Sharp is the new Profiles Editor. Beth Bernhardt is the new Submissions Editor.

ACTION: The Board thanked S. Savage for his seven years of service on the *Newsletter*'s Editorial Board, the last four years as Editor-in-Chief.

7.5 Nominations & Elections

C. Foster reported that 93 nominations were submitted for consideration as candidates for the

Executive Board election, an increase of 48 over last year. Of those eligible to run for office, 45 individuals agreed to be considered for ballot and submitted nominee profiles. Efforts were made to ensure representation from the different segments of the membership.

C. Foster asked for confirmation that the person counting the ballots to verify the count does not necessarily have to be a member of NASIG.

ACTION: The Board confirmed that the person counting the ballots to verify the count does not necessarily have to be a member of NASIG.

7.6 *Proceedings* Editors

D. Cochenour reported that twenty sample copies of the journal edition of the *16th Annual NASIG Conference Proceedings* would be for sale at the 2002 conference. The monograph edition of the *Proceedings* has not been published yet. Mircea Stefanacu is still working on producing the Web version of the *Proceedings.*

Susan Scheiberg and Shelley Neville, the *Proceedings* editors for the 2001 conference, will also be the editors for the 2002 conference.

All concurrent sessions of the 2002 conference will have a recorder. In the event that a presenter does not submit a paper and the quality of the taped session is not of high quality, a recorder's report may be the best replacement for a presenter's paper.

7.7 Publications

C. Easton reported that the Publications Committee hopes to offer the 2003 conference handouts in CD-ROM format. The committee will also be working on further developing a serials management course that had been maintained and hosted by EBSCO.

7.8 Regional Councils & Memberships

M. Page reported that RC&M were at the beginning stages of discussing a restructuring of the committee and a rethinking of its purpose. In addition to possibly taking over the mentor program and outreach to library schools, RC&M might also absorb the Professional Liaisons.

ACTION: The Board decided that the printing of the membership brochure should be included in RC&M's 2003 budget.

7.9 Professional Liaisons

No report

8.0 Working Group Reports

8.1 Strategic Plan/Vision 2015 Task Force

E. Cook announced that the task force had been reconstituted. Carol MacAdam is chairing the task force. The task force will develop, with member input, the next vision statement: "NASIG 2015. "

ACTION: Each committee has been asked to send to C. MacAdam issues that they feel should be address in the vision statement.
DATE: July 1, 2002

8.2 Vendor/publisher involvement issues

M. Geller led a discussion on vendor and publisher involvement in NASIG. The Board discussed the differences between content and service providers, realizing that different strategies will be needed to attract these groups to NASIG. The Board also talked about types of conference programs that might be of interest to these groups and other NASIG members.

ACTION: A. McKee will talk to PPC about the Board's programming ideas.
ACTION: The Board thanked M. Geller for organizing and leading the discussion on vendor and publisher involvement in NASIG.

8.3 Online Registration Focus Group

The Board reviewed the report of the focus group on conference online registration. Manual registration is extremely time consuming and labor intensive for the conference registration team. The delays in getting payments cleared and confirming the registrations have also been an inconvenience for the conference attendees. Over the past few years, the Conference Planning Committee and the conference attendees have expressed strong interest in an online conference registration system. The focus group was charged with investigating the feasibility of such a system.

ACTION: The Board agreed that NASIG should develop a local online registration system by contracting for its development. The registration system will need to interface with Bank of America.
DATE: The registration system should be available for use for the 2003 conference.

ACTION: M. Rioux will appoint an online registration implementation working group. D. Novak will serve as a consultant to the group.
DATE: June 23, 2002
ACTION: The Board thanked the Online Registration Focus Group for its excellent report and work.

9.0 PPC Report

E. Cook reviewed the final plans for the 2002 conference sessions. Twelve poster sessions will be presented at the conference.

PPC and CPC will be meeting at the conference to establish deadlines for their joint responsibilities in the upcoming year.

PPC will be working with ECC and B. Caraway to mount this year's program proposals on the Internet.

10.0 Other Items and Wrap-Up

10.1 Committee appointments for 2002/03

E. Cook reviewed 2002/03 committee appointments and Board Liaison assignments.

10.2 2003 CPC overview

A. McKee presented CPC's preliminary budget for the conference.

A. McKee reported that hotel contracts had been signed for the 2003 conference at Portland State University in Oregon. Conference attendees will stay in hotels rather than campus housing. The three conference hotels are the Portland Marriott Downtown, Doubletree Hotel, and the Mallory Hotel. Each hotel offers a range of services and is within walking distance of Portland State University and public transportation. A. McKee reported that for a small fee the Portland Oregon Visitors Association would handle hotel selection and registration.

ACTION: The Board agreed to have the Portland Oregon Visitors Association handle hotel selection and registration.

10.3 Site Selection update

A. McKee reported that one proposal for a 2004 conference site had been received. The Board discussed other possible sites for the 2004 conference and beyond.

D. Novak and M. Page will serve as the Site Selection Committee in 2002/03.

10.4 Committee chair orientation

E. Cook reviewed the agenda for the committee chair orientation.

10.5 Review opening and business meeting

M. Rioux reviewed the agendas of the conference's opening and business meetings.

10.6 Date for fall Board meeting

The next Board meeting will be held Oct. 18-19, 2002, at Portland State University.

TREASURER'S REPORT

Denise Novak, Treasurer

As of this Newsletter, NASIG remains in good fiscal condition. Currently, there is a balance of over $328,000.00.

Balance Sheet
(Includes Unrealized Gains)
As of 7/27/02

ASSETS	
Cash & Bank Accounts	
Charles Schwab-Cash	$913.69
Checking-264	$43,497.58
One year CD	$30,834.00
Savings-267	$231,016.12
TOTAL Cash & Bank Accts.	$306,261.39
Investments	
Charles Schwab	$21,935.96
TOTAL Investments	$21,935.96
TOTAL ASSETS	$328,197.35
LIABILITIES & EQUITY	
Liabilities	$0.00
Equity	$328,197.35
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY	$328,197.35

To date, the 2002 conference has taken in over $353,000.00. These numbers will change as the final bills for the 2002 conference are received and paid. We anticipate a surplus from this conference, but its not yet possible to determine how large the surplus may be.

2002 Williamsburg Conference
1/1/02 Through 7/27/02

INCOME	
Conference Registration	$324,927.95
Preconference Income	$7,136.00
Conference Handouts	$5,960.00
Conference – Tours	$4,256.00
Conference – Souvenirs	$5,845.60
Conference – Transportation	$5,800.00
TOTAL INCOME	$353,925.55
EXPENSES	
Conference – Brochure	$3,264.05
Conference – Building Rent	$650.00
Conference – Entertainment	$16,200.00
Conference – Housing	$33,730.31
Conference – Liquor	$400.87
Late Night Socials	$21.56
Conference – Meals	$9,913.93
Conference – Souvenirs	$3,712.32
Credit Card Charges	$2,415.33
Conference – Photocopy& Printing	$4,095.94
Conference – Postage	$175.68
Conference – Signs	$28.35
Conference Supplies	$1,469.52
Conference – Speakers	$6,259.43
Conference – State Fees	$235.09
Conference – Transportation	$8,174.94
Conference – Parking	$16.00
Conference – Travel	$14.00
Conference – Other	$792.60
Conference – Refund	$10,077.00
Conference Planning	$46.46
TOTAL EXPENSES	$101,693.38
TOTAL INCOME – EXPENSES	$252,232.17

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 activities. We continue to monitor MASIG's investments and strive to maintain NASIG's financial viability.

NASIG 17TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE (2002) REPORTS

PRECONFERENCES

1. *IMPLEMENTING MARC21 FOR HOLDINGS: A USABLE REVOLUTION*
Speakers: Ruth Haas, Team Leader, Serial Cataloging Team, Harvard College Library, Technical Services & Head, HUL CONSER Office, Harvard University; Diane Hillmann, Project Manager & Metadata Specialist, National Science Digital Library Project, Cornell University
Hands-On Session Leaders: Rachel Hollis, Serials Librarian/Cataloger, Stanford Law School; Stephanie Schmitt, Manager of Serials Services, Yale Law School
Reported by Maggie Horn

Diane Hillmann began the preconference with an introduction to the "forest" of MARC21 for Holdings, fondly known in the library world as MFHD or "muff-head." She outlined the reasons for a MARC standard for holdings, particularly noting that standards allow for sharing between individual institutions and utilities (and for data migration from one system to another). A quick trip to the ANSI/NISO Z39.71 standard provided us with an overview of the display standard that also exists. In a flashback to SAT analogies, Hillmann noted that Z39.71 is to MFHD as AACR2 is to MARC bibliographic standards.

Following the quick overview and history, Hillman briefly flew through the various elements of the MFHD record, spending more time, naturally, on the fields that permit predictive check-in. She noted that a current pattern for check-in is only as good as yesterday's check-in. The 85x and 86x fields must be distributed together or they are meaningless.

Ruth Haas then had the unenviable job of guiding those of us in the forest through the "trees," but, as she noted, only through the "tree tops." Her presentation consisted of the nitty-gritty details of coding the holdings record. She noted that one could encode almost anything; displaying the coded information, however, can become a problem, particularly with a complicated statement.

Both speakers noted that not all systems handle the MFHD correctly. If an institution is going to spend much time and money in coding information correctly, then it is extremely important to be sure that the ILS can handle the information correctly.

Step Schmitt and Rachel Hollis then led the large group through coding two journals. It was comforting to many in the group to have two neophytes leading the discussion. Schmitt admitted that she had not had much experience with MFHD and was very gracious as her answers were corrected in front of everyone.

This was a very technical preconference with good handouts and plenty of time for questions; unfortunately, there was not enough time for true hands-on practice.

2. *EVERYTHING YOU ALWAYS WANTED TO KNOW ABOUT ELECTRONIC JOURNALS BUT WERE AFRAID TO ASK!*
Stefanie Wittenbach, Head of Acquisitions, University of California, Riverside Library
Reported by Christine W. Blackman

Stephanie Wittenbach has come to realize that there is a definite need for a "new breed of librarian"—one who has a good understanding of the entire information scenario: procurement, organization, access, and public services. She designed this preconference as an introductory session in which she could share her insights gained from four years of work in e-journal management. Although the preconference was designed primarily for professionals new to the field, attendees seemed to range from the curious greenhorn to the confounded "old hand." There was, in fact, something for everyone, as the two main sections of the preconference—the formal presentation and the breakout session—allowed ample time for feedback and idea and resource sharing. Both sections focused on three divisions of e-journal management: acquisitions/vendor issues, processing/online catalog integration issues, and public services/collection development issues. Wittenbach broke each of these down further so attendees could easily understand all of the basics and some of the finer points involved in electronic resource management. Overall, the session was packed with practical information.

Acquisitions and vendor issues

Nearly all publisher packages require licensing agreements that may vary in form. Some are simple, online "click-through" agreements, and some are more formal. No matter the form, the librarian must review the text in detail and be sure to negotiate any needed changes with the publisher; changes to licenses are not to be negotiated with the vendor or aggregator. Wittenbach refrained from delivering too much detail on the topic of licensing, as there are a number of readily available resources on the topic. Two are of note: the online workshop, “Signing on the Dotted Line: Licensing Essentials for Library Professionals,” sponsored by the ALA Office for Information Technology Policy; and the Liblicense Web site at http://www.library.yale.edu/~llicense/.

Many publishers now offer online access to most of their journal titles on a fee basis, but there are many different purchasing options that can sometimes be confusing. Libraries can purchase online journals title by title or in “bundled” packages. A bundled package could consist of all of a publisher’s online titles or additional online access only to your current print subscriptions. Some publishers are phasing out the “print only” package and forcing libraries that want to maintain their print collections to pay the higher price for both formats. Pricing models for packages vary from publisher to publisher and can be dependent on a number of different factors: number of simultaneous users, campus or discipline full time equivalent (FTE) population, IP address, or user name and password.

A library can also purchase its online content through one of many aggregator databases. Aggregators are services that collect online content from publishers, make it available to the user through a single interface, and provide some search capability. They generally make tables of contents and abstracts freely available to all users; some aggregators will also offer free online full-text access to titles for which they are also the print vendor. However, an aggregator will more often than not have an additional charge for full-text access to content; this could be on a per title or per annum basis. The main reason for using an aggregator database is having stable uniform resource locators (URLs) that do not have to be continually maintained as links in the catalog if a publisher changes the address. The resulting savings of technical services staff time, the availability of usage statistics, and the linking ability from indexing databases make them well worth the additional charge.

Each pricing model that was discussed above also has implications for user access. For example, the user name and password model can make it very difficult for a library to control who is accessing electronic content. The pricing model based on IP address with a proxy server is perhaps the most flexible. It allows the user to temporarily assign their “off-campus” computer an address within the campus range and avail themselves of any “on-campus” electronic materials. Many integrated library systems (ILS) vendors offer proxy server products that run in conjunction with the online public access catalog (OPAC) and allow librarians to control patron access more efficiently as well as obtain better title-by-title use statistics.

E-journal subscription decisions are complicated by many additional factors. The librarian must now also consider the quality of content versus the print, the ease of use, and the amount of database maintenance that will be required over time. Additionally, one should also look into the linking ability of indexes to e-journal content via ISSN in full MARC records or via SFX technology.

Processing and online catalog integration issues

It is no surprise that e-journals require more staff, more time, and a higher skill level at the acquisition and maintenance stages than do their print equivalents. An MIT study found that working with e-journals requires a higher level of communication and coordination between the technical services, public services, and collection development staff than print materials ever have. In light of this, it is ideal that each library employs an electronic resources coordinator to oversee the management of e-journals and to field input from all other library departments. Documenting and effectively communicating license restrictions and access details with staff and users is of utmost importance in this new environment. Wittenbach suggested that librarians should look into two different types of databases to help manage e-journal information: one to manage staff-centered license information, and one, such as a commercial e-journal management database, to manage user-centered full-text and holdings information.

Bibliographic records for e-journals can be entered into the catalog using one of two different methods: single record method or multiple record method. The single record method uses one bibliographic record that usually describes just the print version and has attached holdings, or check-in records, for all other formats. Although it is more expedient when dealing with a great number of titles, it does not allow for easy batch addition, maintenance, or deletion of aggregator records. The multiple record method uses a separate bibliographic record for each version. It allows for batch maintenance but is much more time consuming. Wittenbach also stressed the need to maintain holdings information in the 856 field of bibliographic records and the importance of running a link checker on bibliographic records about once a month to check for bad URLs.

Even statistical reporting can be very convoluted for e-journals. Should a title in multiple formats be reported as one title with multiple subscriptions? There is not yet a clear national standard. Nevertheless, the University of California, Riverside (UCR) tries to maintain an accurate account of this information by counting individual check-in records. UCR has also begun to add order records for all e-journals so they can obtain discipline-specific budget information.

Public services and collection development issues

Public services issues with e-journals hinge on good communication with staff and patrons. Staff need to have a thorough understanding of the institution's e-journals if they are to be able to work effectively with patrons. This means that they need to know how e-journals are accessed, and they also need to be able to obtain detailed information about use restrictions when queried by the user. The librarian is also bound by the license agreement to inform patrons of their responsibilities as users. In addition, patrons need training on how to navigate through the volumes of material now available; we need to inform them of what they can expect to find and where they can find it.

As more and more e-journals are acquired and available space and acquisition funds decrease, many libraries are looking more closely at canceling the print versions of titles. The UC system is currently about a third of the way through an 18-month Mellon Grant-funded project to evaluate the use of online versus print journals. Designated "experimental" campuses have removed all journals in print and made the content available to patrons only through the California Digital Library. Requests to bring back print versions and the reasons for the request are recorded in order to keep track of patron satisfaction. "Control" campuses on the other hand, continue to monitor print usage to see if the availability of online versions causes those usage statistics to drop. Wittenbach expects that the resulting print usage will be so low that it will be safe to send the print to off-site storage.

Breakout session and conclusion

The remainder of the morning was spent in a breakout session with attendees dividing themselves into groups, each to discuss one of the three main divisions of e-journal management. The collection development group considered the determining factors for replacing print with online versions. The public services group explored creative ways to promote e-journal usage. Finally, the technical services group shared ideas on staffing structure for e-journals management. Wittenbach concluded the session with some predictions for the future, noting that there will be more and more e-journals available, publisher packages will become more restrictive, and costs will be much greater due to the duplication of electronic content and the need for more highly skilled staff.

OPENING SESSION

Reported by Pam Cipkowski

NASIG President Maggie Rioux officially opened NASIG's 17th Annual Conference, welcoming all the attendees to Williamsburg and the College of William and Mary. Maggie announced that an unusually large number, 237, of the approximately 700 attendees were first-timers. She also asked a series of questions to demonstrate how the much conference experience has changed over the years due to technological advancements: the numbers of people who bring laptops, cell phones, pagers, and Palm Pilots have all noticeably increased. Maggie also noted that she was happily following the lead of her immediate predecessor, Connie Foster, in NOT continuing the tradition of unusual attire for the President during the opening session (Steve Oberg had worn a quilt to honor his Scottish ancestry and Carnegie Mellon's Scottish heritage during the 1999 conference; Dan Tonkery had worn a wet suit and carried a surf board to highlight the San Diego location at the 2000 conference.)

Conference Planning Committee Co-Chair Stephen Clark briefed conference goers on the slate of events planned for the next few days, provided last-minute details about building locations and changes, and informed the crowd of the presence of those ubiquitous red-aproned volunteers eager to lend a hand to conference goers in need of information over the next few days.

Claire Dygert, Chair of the Awards & Recognition Committee, announced this year's award winners.

Pauline La Rooy from Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, was this year's recipient of the NASIG Horizon Award. The Horizon Award is granted to an applicant who has been in a professional library position for no more than three years with the primary responsibility of dealing with serials, and who has not been in a professional library-related position for more than five years.

The Fritz Schwartz Serials Education Scholarship, which awards a $2,500 scholarship to a library science graduate student who demonstrates excellence in scholarship and the potential for accomplishment in a serials career, was given to Angela Riggio of the University of California, Los Angeles.

Winners of the NASIG Conference Student Grants were Denise M. Branch, Catholic University of America; Meg Manahan, Queens College, City University of New York; Vanessa Mitchell, Catholic University of America; Yolande R. Shelton, University of Maryland; and John W. Wiggins, Drexel University.

The recipient of the Mexico Student Conference Grant, Paula de la Mora Lugo of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, had not yet arrived due to visa problems. She was scheduled to be introduced at the business meeting the next morning.

Stacy Gould, William and Mary University Archivist, delivered a slide presentation highlighting the history, architecture, and notable events of the College of William and Mary. Afterwards, the crowd headed over for a dinner with Colonial entertainment in the Sunken Garden on the William and Mary campus.

PLENARIES

1. *THE FUTURE OF INFORMATION ACCESS AND DISTRIBUTION*
Howard Strauss, Manager of Advanced Applications, Princeton University
Reported by Rose Robischon

You need Web portals to assist in navigation of the billions and billions of Web pages that presently exist. The view of the Web today is institution-centered. This view sends the message to the user that "we" are a wonderful place and everyone needs the same information. Web portals change the view to user-centered. The user-centered view gives the user a view of the Web that he wants: Each person will have a different view of the Web using portals. A portal is a hub from which users can locate all the Web content they commonly use. Web surfers only use approximately 1 percent of the Web: The Web portal helps the user get to the information quicker and more efficiently.

Web page development needs to change. Libraries should not have portals, but be a "channel" within the institution's portal. It is really important to understand what constitutes a portal. A home page is not a portal. Home pages are institution-centered. Examples of portals are My Excite, My Yahoo, etc. (the user can specify the information that is supplied on the screen). Right now the web is "My" crazy. If you search on the term "My," you will get a multitude of hits. The "My" sites are horizontal portals. Horizontal portals allow the user to personalize his "site." Another definition of a Web portal is a "gateway to Web access": This is a totally stupid definition since everything is a gateway to Web access. Since portals are user-centered, it is "your view of the world"—not anyone else's view. The purpose of a portal page is to give the user access to what is important to him, and this is going to be different for different people.

There are different ways to design portals. Customized Personalized Adaptive Desktop (CPAD): This method is extremely costly since it is one at a time. Personalization: Portal can be changed to the user's specifications. Adaptation: Knows the user's schedule and workflow patterns to save common things that the user normally accesses (not a perfect solution, but will do the best possible job it can). Desktop variety: Hides the user's operating system. Portals need to be resized based on the type of viewer used, i.e., PDA, desktop, cell phone, etc. Customization will recognize that it is "you," the type of hardware that is in use, and recognize the context in which you are using it. In the past the user was stuck with the way material was presented and organized; the Web portal lets the user present materials to his specifications. Web portals are a collection point of information. Enterprise portals (this is a single portal with a single logon): When you come into the site, everyone sees the same thing, but you are allowed to personalize it and exists within the enterprise, i.e. university. This type of portal does not encompass your entire life, just during the time you are at work. The user is able to personalize this portal and add sites that are outside of the "university setting." With present technology, to access an enterprise portal requires the use of some sort of ID and password. In the future the method of access will properly be some sort of print reading technology or looking into your eyes to verify that it is you. The purpose of a portal is to provide access to all of the information that the user commonly uses. The portal will keep all of the commonly used links in one place, so that the user will spend less time looking for the link than finding the needed information. You only really want one portal for your entire institution, since the user can customize for best usage. You want to avoid building multiple portals since each portal will actually be built on different technology and software. Portals provide access to everything a user needs through one page. Queries are answering by taking bits and pieces of Web pages, databases, etc. and providing the immediate access to the results instead of having to look at the whole list of results. Portals make accessing the Web much more efficient. Portals treat every user differently, so it gives the information the user requests. Portals help to establish some logic to the Web sites linked to it.

2. *SERIAL CHALLENGES AND SOLUTIONS: THE VIEW FROM THE DIRECTOR'S CHAIR*
Emily Mobley, Dean of Libraries, Purdue University
Reported by Gale Teaster

With the rate of serial subscription costs continuing to be twice the rate of general inflation, libraries and university administrations must view this inflationary trend as a "constant state of affairs" and not as a temporary crisis. As Purdue's dean of libraries, Emily Mobley is in a critical position to view the serials inflationary process and its overall affects on the library and the university.

Mobley began her library career in a corporate library where, on her first day, she was responsible for checking in an enormous backlog of serials. Among the positions she has held as she has risen in the ranks of the library profession are library director, engineering and science librarians, and an adjunct lecturer. Mobley has served as president of the Special Libraries Association and most recently was influential in acquiring a comprehensive repository of Amelia Earhart materials for Purdue University.

According to Mobley, the years after the launching of Sputnik saw a proliferation in the number and specificity of journals, especially in the sciences. Graduate programs were developed, and a "connection with big science" was considered "glamorous." This trend in serials development continued through the 1970s, ending in the '80s when the need to tighten academic belts became evident. Within colleges and universities, tuition fees have been raised and cost containment measures have taken place, but these actions have not been enough to offset higher education inflation. Serial subscription costs have remained one of the culprits in the inflation war.

What is the remedy to increasing serial subscription costs? How can the solution be implemented and who can institute any necessary changes? The "players" involved in the creation and maintenance of the serial publications industry include the faculty and administration of the university or college, society and commercial publishers, and librarians. Faculty hold positions on the editorial boards of serial publications and submit articles to these journals for publication. Faculty also sit on university tenure and promotion committees—committees which stress the importance of publication, especially in peer-reviewed journals. In addition, faculty sitting on editorial boards must approve pricing policy initiatives. This includes increases in the publication's subscription costs. Then the university library buys back the research through a serial subscription. As Mobley stated in her presentation, the problem of constantly spiraling serial subscription costs is not the library's problem, but the university's problem. One solution to this cycle of publish and purchase would be placing more emphasis on university presses to reduce prices. As the dean of libraries, Mobley considers the library a business and believes libraries and universities should use the influence they have: For example, not submitting articles or purchasing journals whose prices are considered too costly. One organization which is attempting to offer an alternative to traditional publishers is SPARC, the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition. SPARC is a group of approximately 200 international members. This organization is providing access to peer-reviewed journals in what it considers to be a broad and more cost-effective manner.

Consideration of publishing alternatives creates new questions. Will publishing alternatives move publishers and libraries away from the journal in its current form? Institutions could become responsible for distributing papers produced by their own faculty. How will users outside of the university environment access the information? Who will control and maintain an archive of these publications? How will the archiving be accomplished? Where will the papers reside? Mobley stated that she believes the answer to these questions lies somewhere between the current publishing system and a total abandonment of the process. Collections of papers will still need to be published. Editors and publishers will continue to review submissions. Ultimately, the question is not "if" this revolution in publishing will take place, but "when." In the meantime, libraries will need to survive the transition between the two publishing models.

3. *THE FUTURE OF DIGITIZED MATERIALS: WHERE WE HAVE BEEN AND WHERE WE'RE GOING*

David Seaman, Director, Electronic Text Center, University of Virginia
Reported by October Ivins

After ten years as the founding director of the E Text Center, David Seaman is leaving at the end of July to become the new director of the Digital Library Federation. At the close of the conference on Sunday morning, NASIG attendees were treated to his retrospective and prospective insights about the center's work in a delightfully witty and entertaining presentation. In his introduction, Seaman paraphrased the title of his talk, indicating that he would discuss the future of electronic publishing, or where e-publishing (including serials) is going from a full-text perspective.

The E Text Center at the University of Virginia (Uva) deals exclusively in humanities and social sciences texts and images, with a focus on owning rather than licensing content. When the center started in the early 1990s, they had no other choice than to digitize content themselves as there were few commercial sources in the humanities. Although there are many commercial sources now, in some ways their reasons for digitizing texts are valid again. Initially, they were driven by "ambition, ignorance and lack of money—not by stunning insights and lots of cash." Library time is the inverse of Internet (and publisher) time. Libraries are interested in the long-term and are willing to wait several years to see a payoff on their digitizing investment.

Early on, the E Text Center made a bet that has paid off: to use SGML. It migrates and is nimble and malleable. The significance of these characteristics is coming around again. Early on, their motivator was their inability to support multiple interfaces.

UVa is a successful aggregator, and that experience has yielded two important lessons. The first key lesson is that standardized data aggregates well. It uses standard metadata and is not bound up in proprietary systems. For the time being, Web browsers provide some standardization of format and display. But the Web offers little in the way of cross-database, multi-institution access. It that regard, we are no better off than in the days of CD-ROMs, with too many isolated bits of data. This model is not sustainable: Data must interact as a library. Data must be built, not as a stand-alone product, but to work with other content. As examples, Seaman mentioned slave letters, Salem witch trial documents, and their Early American Fiction Collection. The individual documents in these collections also reside in searchable full-text databases.

Users provide other lessons. While the E Text Center has a firm service mission and is housed in an academic institution, its online users are predominantly nonscholarly. Sharing statistics about their huge usage figures, Seaman speculated that based on e-mail received, their average user is 12 years old. "Whatever you think you are, you're not if your users think you're something else." Different users have different format needs, so the E Text Center's databases contain features that can be turned on or off for different audiences. There is a huge demand for cross-database searching. Within ten years, users will be able to simultaneously search full-text collections in multiple institutions. Even in the short term, a document needs to behave differently in different applications. Consider how a Mark Twain text might differ on a special collections Web site from one created by a faculty member for her undergraduate students.

Looking back, Seaman comes to the realization that the E Text Center is much more than a file management and retrieval system for journal articles, books, etc. In a digital library, the system rarely delivers entire files. Their content is tagged so users can get just pieces—a chapter, or references. The Center is becoming increasingly familiar with providing "gobbets of information." The 70,000 books in their holdings represent millions of chunks of content.

This is the real power of SGML and now XML: To support the creation of products that extract and combine types of information, allowing for repurposing of content in ways not possible in the print world. No one else may want that same combination of pieces, but it doesn't matter. If your data is ready for the future, this is an exciting time.

Seaman shared several anecdotes about the unexpected worldwide demand for digital content. One major initiative is the Early American Fiction Collection. Much of this is not great fiction, but now has the veneer of history and not widely available, certainly there are rarely classroom editions available. The center decided to publish as Web and e-book versions 80 available works from UVa, not just those of well-known authors, and this has produced some dramatic results. An 1830 novel, *Nix's Mate* by Rufus Dawes, was downloaded 2,000 times the first two months it was posted and more than 6,000 times to date. The lesson here is that, "The world finds users for things you would never imagine." In a second example, the center took over the publication of a 40-year-old scholarly history journal. Its content would be appropriate for and should be available to students, including those in high school. In print, this journal had 400 subscriptions annually. Now that it is only electronic, it receives 77,000 document views in a peak month. In March 1994, an article about Jack the Ripper was published and now receives as many as 5,000 downloads a month. (We have to tenure this guy whether he wants it or not!) These examples demonstrate a lot of evidence that if we make information available at an "appropriate cost" (not necessarily free), there is a real market for it.

Which brings us to a third and final major point: Returning to format and data portability considerations. The world of books has changed during the last two or three years, with enormous growth in digital publishing and the advent of delivery media other than the Web. In libraries, we've seen only Web-based publishing in our vision and peripheral vision—although we say "build once and use many," we have really just meant the Web. The acceptance of e-books and e-book readers, however, is growing in the consumer market. In March 2002, Stephen King sold 400,000 copies of an e-book at $2.50 each. Although we should be cautious about assuming that copyright and intellectual property debates will be resolved in the favor of libraries and their patrons (see Lawrence Lessig, *The Future of Ideas: The Fate of the Information Commons in a Connected World,* ISBN 037550584) we can see that the Web is a great finding tool, but not the medium of choice for reading. Portable readers, including Palm Pilots or other PDAs, provide "a surprisingly not terrible" reading experience. Consumer acceptance of e-books is real, but too many producers overprice their products. The value must be in the reader's favor: When Barnes and Noble tried to charge $20 a book, they had few sales.

For a project sponsored by Microsoft and using their e-book reader, the center converted one of its existing digital collections to the e-book format. They were able to convert 1,000 texts to e-books in a week, demonstrating that this is just a new output format for the center, not a labor-intensive new production process. The project was launched in August 2000; by November 2000, one million e-books had been downloaded. Currently, 1,800 free e-books from many collections are available, and 6.6 million have been distributed from the Electronic Text Center.

There are many non-Web electronic readers available. About one-third of the downloads from the site are for Palm Pilots, for those Seaman refers to as having a "high pain threshold." Various manufacturers also produce a Pocket PC, running a pocket version of MS Windows, a device which supports page turning, highlighting, drawing, and editorial marking up. It holds up to 100 books and was used in a pilot study at UVa that preloaded a semesters worth of reading for students. Based on this study, he believes people will buy e-books for pleasure reading, but will not pay more than print equivalents. They don't care that it dies—that is, that the content expires after a set time period. Many other technologies are coming. Another recent example is a Microsoft audio book format that does a decent job of converting text to speech. Several firms are working with print-on-demand technologies that would produce perfect-bound books one at a time.

With the end of the conference approaching all too quickly, there was time for a closing thought: "Libraries are fabulously well placed to (create full text that is standardized and can be repurposed), because we think in the long term." The only negative aspects of this engaging and thought-provoking presentation was the lack of time for questions and that no reactor was built into the program schedule. It would have been interesting to explore the limitations copyright places on such activities and how publishers who handle content that is not in the public domain address these restrictions, or the challenges of supporting innovative technologies on the one hand while cooperating with Microsoft on the other. Perhaps these issues can be explored in Portland at the next conference. Nevertheless, the enthusiastic audience (this reporter included) was happy to close the conference on a note of optimism and high expectations, even without having all the answers.

Selected URLS:
Electronic Text Center:
http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/
Ebooks Collection:
http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/ebooks
Modern English (aggregated) Collection:
http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/modeng/modeng0.browse.html

Early American Fiction:
http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/eaf/
Mark Twain in his Times:
http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/railton/
Salem Witch Trials:
http://www.salemwitchtrials.org/

CONCURRENT SESSIONS

1. *SCHOLARLY PUBLICATION: BUSINESS AND PUBLIC GOOD?*
Steve Black, Reference, Instruction & Serials Librarian, College of St. Rose, Albany; Dr. Keith Seitter, Deputy Executive Director, American Meteorological Society, Boston.
Reported by Donna Packer

Steve Black considered the case for scholarly publication as a public good, using the phrase "public good" as defined by economists. In his view, journals meet the technical definition in that use by one person does not exclude use by another person, making that material available to one person makes it available to all in a defined region or grouping, and they are consumer goods consumed unequally (i.e., the use of a journal article by a researcher is different from that of a member of the general public).

Black then moved on to a consideration of the social value of scholarly publishing, particularly with respect to meeting the educational needs of students. Under our current system, he suggests, student needs are met by a kind of "gift economy" in that libraries make their best guesses as to what students will need. The difficulty is that these guesses are often incorrect. Many students are further underserved if the time and cost (time to travel to the library or the cost of obtaining the means of electronic access from a remote location) are considered.

The "deadweight losses" in our journal supply system are often not considered. Black outlined these as the differential in the form of sales tax between the price consumers pay for a journal and the amount received by the producers, and the loss in terms of time and effort in such activities for the producer of marketing, invoicing, distribution, the library outlay in receiving and making materials available, and the time of the users in retrieving and printing or copying content.

Having considered the inequities and inefficiencies in the journal market, Black proposed a system of journal production that would result in a product freely available to all users. The databases, he suggested, could provide the foundation for collection development. Funding from library consortia, foundations, and government could pay for the peer review process, first copy costs, and the infrastructures for content access and storage. This would take the "public goods" model now partially in place (because journals are partly paid for by public funds now, consortium purchasing already makes material widely available to defined user groups, and state-wide consortia are moving to models which make content available to all library users in the state) to a higher level. However, to arrive at a full "public goods" model for electronic content, there would need to be direct support for first copy costs. This would overcome the current limitations of the ability of smaller publishers to move forward with electronic infrastructure and content provision, the ability of libraries to provide all content that would be of use to their patrons, and the uncertainty of content provision that publishers face in light of unstable revenues.

Black concluded by noting that current trends in journal content aggregation and the development of consortium arrangements are in danger of creating oligopolies which fail to adequately serve the needs any of the players for whom these arrangements are set up: publishers, libraries, and their patrons.

In his response, Keith Seitter argued from his experience as director of publications for a nonprofit society. In this role, he finds that the authors for his journals are also in direct contact with students and have a strong commitment to them. Seitter feels that it is in everyone's best interests if journals are of high quality both in respect to their content and their editorial quality. The current journal infrastructure has been honed over a long time, and while students may not always know what journal articles are best for them to use, the practitioners who interact with them certainly do know. Most libraries, far from "guessing" about what their students need, make their subscription choices in concert with those practitioners.

Seitter noted that statements about the economics of journal publishing and library acquisitions are sometimes distorted. It is frequently asserted that university libraries are "buying back" the research that the faculty of that institution produced at university expense. Seitter said that in the case of grant-funded research, this is clearly not the case at all. What the university library is buying is access to the journal articles needed by their researchers to produce the new knowledge.

The notion of “free” access to information, so often put forward in recent years, ignores many of the realities of publishing economics. Often the models put forward for “free” access imply that publishers, as we know them, are no longer needed. If fact, Seitter says, institutions rely on the publishers to “grade” the work of their faculty (through acceptance rates), and grantors make extensive use of publication records in making their funding decisions. Publishers have found that they save very little by dropping print, and the reality is that there is as yet no clearly stable electronic platform alternative to print for long-term archiving.

In other comments, Seitter noted that the number of quality papers produced for publication has grown enormously in recent years. While some of this growth may be attributable to the tenure review and grant application processes, the growth is still substantial. This growth makes the “grading” system offered by publishers even more important. Also, authors will submit to the highest prestige journals regardless of pricing policies.

Seitter feels that the current publisher-driven model of scholarly publication has the potential to carry us well into the future. In this model the subscriber is clearly in control. Subscribers will demand that material be not only affordable and readable, but also easy to obtain and use. They will insist that the content provide value for those subscription dollars: They must gain new information, they expect more exploitation of the electronic medium through various linking capabilities, and they expect electronic displays will be optimized for each user’s individual platform. But providing value-added features requires continuous investment, and subscribers are best placed to insist that value is indeed added. Stable funding reduces the pressure to push the technology and improve the product. The public good model, he felt, could reduce the impetus for improvement.

Closing on a practical note on access issues, Seitter suggested that consortium arrangements and differential pricing by publishers can help, that publishers can usefully consider providing free access to content after an embargo period during which material is only available by paid subscription. As a publisher, Seitter stated that he would love stable funding; as a scholar, however, he is not certain that that is in the best interests of the scholarly community.

A lively question period followed the presentations. Among the questions and comments: Without market forces, who will determine what gets funded? Would funding of scholarly publishing become analogous to the public roads, where politics drives the decision of what to build and what to maintain? Isn’t demand somewhat inelastic even in our current market-driven model because in some fields accreditation teams expect certain titles to be present, or because in some fields scholarly societies may control access to the best publication outlets? If the number of publication opportunities is reduced, either through market forces or in the public good model, will there be opportunities for ideas not currently accepted to appear? We all know that what is not valued today may become, over time, exceedingly valuable.

2. *CHALLENGING CURRENT PUBLISHING MODELS*
Jan Velterop, BioMed Central; David Goodman, Biology Librarian, Princeton University
Reported by Virginia A. Rumph

Jan Velterop told the story of Vic Nodgudinov whose non life-threatening ailment requires many expensive pills to keep his condition bearable. However, as the financial burden gets worse year after year, Vic is forced to cut back on some of the medicines. He must learn to live with the resulting pain and side effects. Vic's middle name is Tim, and his last name increasingly describes his condition: Not Good Enough. STM publishing is a gold mine for the publishers who acquire the material for virtually nothing and make $5,000 per article. What are the consumers’ options under these conditions? They can negotiate, accept decreases in their collections or access, or think of something else. Besides the cost factor, the present model no longer suits scientific communication.

The wind of change is blowing. The publishing model must change, and it will become more efficient. What characteristics identify this wind of change? From print to electronic, limited access to unlimited access, slow to fast, low usage to high usage, paid access to free access, expensive to less expensive, and output paid to input paid. Infrastructure may have to change from reader paid to author paid, but either way, academia is ultimately paying the scholarly publishing costs. If the criterion we use to determine what share each institution pays becomes articles published, then publication becomes an extension of the research effort. Open access becomes possible. Velterop is sure the time has come for open access because the technology is mature, librarians are losing the budget battle, scientists are waking up to the severe disadvantages of restrictive access, and the old model is no longer suitable. Using BioMed Central as an example, how does open access work? An article is submitted for publication; peer-review is arranged; if the article is accepted, the author is charged $500 (less or free for developing countries); it is immediately published; fully-coded HTML and PDF are available one week later; there are no restrictions on access. Why is open access taking so long to gain critical mass? A cultural revolution is required to change deeply engrained habits. Enough researchers must choose to publish in open access journals for open access to succeed.

David Goodman posed the question "How long can the present STM journal system continue?" Using diagrams, he showed the current flow of money and work in the STM publishing model and the several disruptions that could occur. The public funding agencies that supply most of the money for STM research stop or slow the flow of funds; libraries cancel titles they can no longer afford; university administrations shift allocations from researchers or the library budget; researchers decide to boycott certain high-priced journals. Goodman mentioned several initiatives (Public Library of Science, Open Archive Initiative), facilitators (SPARC, OAI), and publishers (BioOne, BioMed Central) that are trying to change the current model. BioMed Central is a commercial initiative with open access for research papers, 75 open-access journals (and counting), authors paying to get published, and supplemental income from advertising and acting as sales agent for review journals published by sister companies. The Budapest Open Access Initiative is led by the Soros Foundation with the agreed outcome of stimulating self-archiving, open-access journals and funding plausible initiatives over the next three years. The OAI E-Print Archives (ArXiV) model is inexpensive, has rapid publication, is searchable, interoperable, has permanent redundant backup, is compatible with current publishing, is compatible with refereeing, is academically acceptable, and is proven to work.

Goodman examined four factors for change: user desire for e-prints, general economic conditions, desire for change in the academic world, and publisher options. Either article-based servers, or a journal-based system could replace the current model. Based on the results of his analysis, Goodman outlined three potential scenarios. In the case of the exponential e-print growth model, journal usage drops off sharply and sooner. Using the linear e-print or BioMed Central growth model, conventional journal usage decreases gradually as e-print and open-access journal usage rises gradually. The stable publisher strategy model shows the most gradual shift from conventional journals to e-prints and open access journals. However, all the new models predict the demise of the conventional STM journal by 2008. It will happen: Only the when is in doubt. Inertia will not continue indefinitely.

3. OpenURL AND SFX OPEN LINKING

Nettie Lagace, Ex Libris (USA) Inc.
Reported by Jeanne M. Langendorfer

The presenter, Nettie Lagace, began by giving the reasons linking is desirable. Librarians want to link among resources (OPAC, full-text, abstracting and indexing databases, etc.) to present resources to users seamlessly and in a meaningful way, not just the way a vendor might set it up. Linking gets users from one resource to another in a way that librarians control. SFX, a link server, is a product of Ex Libris; there are other link servers.

Traditional linking has been around awhile. Hard linking requires embedding the URL of the item being linked "to" (the link target) into the item being linked "from" (the link source). It is straightforward to set up initially, but difficult to maintain as URLs change. Links depend on the vendor or publisher, so information presented is not usually under the control of the library and is dependent on the specific vendor interface.

OpenURL-aware databases allow libraries to set up links between their resources in ways they determine will be helpful to their patrons, not necessarily as vendors might have designed them. Local librarians link resources available locally in ways most useful at the local library.

To bring this about, link servers or link resolvers are brought in, instead of hard links, to create "target" links and keep them up to date. When an end user clicks on a link from a source database, a special URL, or OpenURL, uses metadata to describe the item or citation at which the user is looking. OpenURLs are not sent directly to the "target." First, they are sent to a link server that determines the "target(s)" the user should be delivered to and the URLs for the "target(s)."

The link server "…receives metadata about items from where users come, and it can reuse this metadata to create new links to where users can be sent. The OpenURL is a way to package metadata in a standard syntax and send it on a URL so that it can be used to create and resolve new links." The library maintains the link server, which contains local data on all the resources (journals, catalogs, databases, document delivery servers, etc.) to which the library wants their users to be able to link. This context-sensitive linking means users of Resource A at one library see links based on their library's resources, but that users in another library using the same Resource A see other links based on that library's resources. In addition, "link servers furnish a single point of administration for the various services for potentially all data sources, and [they] set up standardization of services across resources, as defined by librarians."

OpenURL was developed by Herbert Van de Sompel and Ex Libris and was submitted to NISO in December 2000. A NISO AX Committee then was formed and began work in June 2001. Working on a fast track, the goal is to release Version 1.0 for trial use at the beginning of 2003.

The OpenURL always contains the basic metadata components, though they can be composed in different ways. The required components are a BASE-URL (address of the server to which the metadata is sent, indicated in boldface in the example below) and the QUERY (the contents of the OpenURL). One example, of several given, follows:

http://sfx.aaa.edu/menu?genre=article&issn=1234-5678&volume=12&issue=3&page=11&epage=8&date=1998&aulast=Smith&aufirst=Paul

Many information providers use OpenURL to send metadata from their databases to local link servers, with customers encouraging their vendors to provide OpenURLs. SFX sources, or OpenURL-aware databases, include abstract and indexing databases, OPACs, electronic journals, e-print archives, DOI/CrossRef environment, and local data repositories. The "SFX link server accepts OpenURL as input from the information resources, analyses contents of OpenURL, evaluates appropriate services based on metadata, and dynamically computes links to target services." Examples of the SFX flow with abstract and indexing and electronic journals were given.

The presenter then explained in depth about managing an SFX server. The relationship of three major parts drives it, and these are managed through a tool known to SFX customers as KnowledgeBase Manager. The KnowledgeBase is the underlying database. The major parts are: 1) the definition of potential services; 2) information about the local collections; and 3) rules supporting a decision on the relevance of services. Using a central link server makes it possible to view activity on the server and generate usage reports. Once the KnowledgeBase contains local information, that information can be used in other ways, such as generating a list of full-text journals to which the library subscribes. The information displayed is under the library's control.

The presenter discussed using metadata from DOIs (digital object identifiers) and CrossRef for linking. To do this, libraries must become a CrossRef library affiliate at $500 per year in order to gain authorization to query the CrossRef database. Publishers assign DOIs to articles and put metadata into CrossRef that corresponds to these DOIs. The SFX server can look up DOIs in CrossRef when article-level metadata exists, but there is no article-level link to syntax. The DOI is then used to link to article level at the publisher's site via the DOI proxy server. Also, if the library maintains an SFX server where they store information on access made available through an aggregator, local journal server, or print copy, the DOI proxy server, which is OpenURL-aware, sends the DOI to the SFX server in an OpenURL. Then the SFX server gets the metadata for that DOI from the CrossRef server and resolves it the most appropriate way as determined by the local library.

The OpenURL standard is only a beginning for linking. It "is an important mechanism that enables libraries to 'open up' the databases they subscribe to and make the information contained there available to other databases and applications." Librarians can help vendors know what is useful to users.

Librarians are presenting their experiences with SFX at conferences, and *RLG Focus*, June 2002, included many short articles about OpenURL and SFX in particular. A brief bibliography was provided.

4. *SEIZE THE E!: THE ECLECTIC JOURNAL AND ITS RAMIFICATIONS*
Gerry McKiernan, Science and Technology Librarian and Bibliographer, Iowa State University
Reported by Jean Maguire

Gerry McKiernan is not only an advocate for electronic journals, he is an advocate for electronic journal users. In this session, he demonstrated a variety of innovative multimedia and "eclectic" features offered today by many e-journals, discussed their value and ramifications, and urged librarians and publishers to find ways to improve the bibliographic description of these features and thereby make them more accessible to users.

According to McKiernan, multimedia and eclectic e-journals transcend the limitations of print journals by allowing users to interact with research and not just read it. Many believe these interactive media improve the communication of research and lead to fuller interpretation and analysis.

Though multimedia and eclectic dimensions are prevalent in today's world of e-journals, McKiernan's observation is that library catalogers are generally unaware of them, as indicated by the lack of information about these dimensions in OCLC catalog records. In the few records where information is provided, it has not been entered in a standard fashion. McKiernan sees this absence of information as a disservice to users, who are deprived of a richer research experience. He illustrated the point with some examples of multimedia and eclectic e-journal features.

Not surprisingly, multimedia e-journals characteristically feature sound and moving images. For example, a multimedia e-journal might include audio files of author narratives. It might provide animated images or interactive equations. McKiernan has created a listing of e-journals with such functionalities: *M-Bed(sm): A Registry of Embedded Multimedia E-Journals* (http://www.public.iastate.edu/~CYBERSTACKS/M-Bed.htm). Users would surely appreciate, he believes, the inclusion of information on these features in a catalog record as an aid in deciding the usefulness of a journal for their research. Perhaps most importantly, the catalog record should help off-site users determine if they have the correct setup for using an e-journal.

Some examples given by McKiernan of eclectic e-journal functionalities are dynamic articles, indexing and searching, modeling, reactivity, reader participation, supplemental data, and font, format, and display control. For instance, in some eclectic e-journals, the user can change the temperature data in an article from Celsius to Fahrenheit or vice versa or even to some other unit of measurement. There are also e-journals that include interactive programs for the user to download. Again, McKiernan asserts, such a characteristic seems to warrant mention in the catalog record. To see more examples of current eclectic offerings, see McKiernan's *EJI(sm): A Registry of Innovative E-Journal Features, Functionalities, and Content* (http://www.public.iastate.edu/~CYBERSTACKS/EJI.htm).

Although their innovative features may bring benefits to research interaction, multimedia and eclectic e-journals also raise technical and professional issues if they are to be used and described effectively. One issue McKiernan cites is the lack of adequate bandwidth in many libraries to provide multimedia access for a large number of users. Another is the need to equip public and cataloger workstations with the appropriate plug-ins or helper applications, and components such as sound cards, haptic mice, and speakers or headphones. Not only, says McKiernan, must libraries be able to provide any and all necessary plug-ins and equipment, but librarians must also be prepared to maintain them and assist patrons in their use.

McKiernan returned to the question of the challenges these innovative e-journals present to catalogers who attempt to describe them. What terminology should be used in the description? Where in the MARC record should the description be entered? How does one deal with the changing nature of these e-journals? If catalogers are not alerted to new multimedia formats as they are added to an e-journal during its lifetime, they need to revisit it periodically to look for changes.

McKiernan offered several potential responses to these cataloging challenges. He stressed the benefits that a standard for e-journals could provide. For example, cataloger description would be far easier if publishers noted interactive and multimedia features in an explicit location within the e-journal. However, McKiernan noted, given the checkered history of publisher compliance with the serials presentation standard that already exists (ISO 8: 1977), the future of an e-journal standard does not seem promising. McKiernan also suggested using "eclectic strips" similar to the bibliographic strips that once appeared at the bottom of print journal covers and supplied a summary of bibliographic data. This solution would be a fine one, but McKiernan asks, would publishers implement it? He continued his sometimes lighthearted musings by pondering the potential of an "eclectic initiative" or an "eclectic markup language" suggested by such efforts as STM-ML (a markup language for scientific, technical, and medical publishing) and METS (LC's Metadata Encoding and Transmission Standard).

In sum, McKiernan believes that things are starting to change. The library world has recently witnessed the creation of *Bibliographic Control of Web Resources: A Library of Congress Action Plan* and the revision of AACR2 Chapter 12 to improve treatment of dynamic resources. In addition, this summer brings the publication of a *Serials Librarian* issue devoted to “E-Serials Cataloging” (available at http://www.public.iastate.edu/~gerrymck/SLv41n3-4.pdf). However, McKiernan believes there is still much to be done to open up this new world of research to users and we should seize the moment, or to use a phrase from his final words to the audience, “Seize the E!”

5. MANAGING ELECTRONIC SERIALS: OUTSOURCING AND BRINGING NEW PRODUCTS TO THE MARKET PLACE
Presenters: Peter McCracken, Serials Solutions, and Michael Markwith, TDNET
Reported by Gwendolyn Halford

Managing electronic collections is no small task. Using the online catalog to maintain or track the accuracy of the titles’ full-text status as well as their availability within a database(s) or electronic collection(s) has often proven to be an unwieldy activity for which libraries often cannot provide the needed manpower or technical support. This session allowed its attendees to peer or gain insight into how two companies assist libraries in managing these varied types of collections. Given that there are many salient issues/questions to consider when managing an electronic collection, seven of these were addressed by Peter McCracken of Serials Solutions and Michael Markwith of TDNET. They expounded on their companies’ perspectives and approaches in addressing these issues, avoiding efforts to forge a sales pitch on the attendees. The questions were:

1. Is There a Need for an Electronic Management System?
2. In-House or Outsource, Librarians Perspective on Outsourcing?
3. Options Available for Outsourcing?
4. What Do We as Vendors See?
5. Risks for Librarians and Libraries?
6. How Can the Library Access the Value of the Vendor?
7. What's Next?

Addressing the first question, both presenters agreed that there is a need for an electronic management system (EMS). McCracken expounded on the growth of e-journals. Markwith acknowledged the growth phenomenon; however, he talked about what he coined “The Convenience of Confusion.” This model presents the players in the e-journal world and how they are interrelated in providing a product and/or service for the end user. Summarizing, you have the following:

The Convenience of Confusion:

- Publisher interacts with: aggregator/database producer, subscription agent, academic library, consortium and corporate library.
- Aggregator/Database Producer interacts with: academic library, consortium, and corporate library.
- Library/Consortium interacts with: the end users.

Absent in this model is that critical element which functions as a tool that helps merge the players as they strive to meet their ultimate goal; that is, providing a product and service that meet the end user’s stamp of approval. Maybe this is why it was coined with this phrase. It is this management or tracking system which merges the product and service of the players by facilitating the process which allows the end user to navigate the OPAC and get an accurate status report on the product (e-journal), such as its coverage, and exact location and full-text status for each database or e-collection where it appears. In addition, it may even link the end user directly to the exact location.

This model shows the important role that an EMS plays in the e-journal world, and it serves as a good precursor to the questions dealing with managing e-journals with in-house resources or outsourcing the service and what vendors see. However, with the growth of e-journals, in the eyes of many within libraries, outsourcing the service has become a resource that cannot be ignored. Markwith provided statistics on how e-journals have grown over the past few years. At the onset of their arrival, circa 1995, there were 200. Seven years later, in 2002, there were 39,000. In the next seven years, this number could double.

Acknowledging that the growth of e-journals has been a major force in the advent of an EMS, should libraries create their own EMS or outsource the service, and what commercial options are available? Given that both McCracken (Serial Solutions) and Markwith (TDNET) work at companies that would fall in the outsourcing category, one would probably expect them to expound more on the advantages of using an outsourcing service. However, they both agreed on some strengths of in-house EMS, e.g., knowledge of the collection, full customization of the collection, local control, and consistent look and feel. McCracken also pointed out that the decision to outsource depends of the size of the collection. Basically, they agreed on the advantages/options of outsourcing this service, e.g., saving staff time spent trying in-house solutions, reducing costs for interlibrary loan, document delivery, and the acquisition of duplicate journals, and providing software capabilities beyond what libraries can often provide.

Other options expressed by McCracken included:

1. Completing all available data in the OPAC;
2. Single record approach;
3. Multiple records;
4. Dual records approach, development of MARC records for OPAC;
5. Customization for institution;
6. Update records monthly or bi-monthly;
7. OPAC maintenance;
8. Develop relations with ILL staff.

Markwith expressed these options:

1. Data only A to Z list;
2. Outsource development of requested services and maintenance of A to Z;
3. Open url linking technologies;
4. ILS modules;
5. Subscription agents.

As with any service, commercial services have their weaknesses as well. Markwith identified some of them as:

1. Perception of local look and feel;
2. Perception of lost control;
3. Inability to update OPAC in real time, i.e., same day.

Having expressed their company's perspective on outsourcing e-journal management, the following was shared regarding views on the librarians' perspective. McCracken's view is that librarians are still the decision makers. What an EMS is doing is taking the grunt work away from them. E-journal management is something that libraries have not done in the past; therefore, it is not accounted for in the budget. Outsourcing services have figured out how to do e-journal management and therefore do it better. Markwith's position on the librarians' perspective is that the decision to outsource is not an easy one to make. There must be an evaluation of the local needs and staff resources. Outsourcing is an issue that goes beyond just serial or just cataloging, but is a library issue where the top leadership must be involved. Finally, there are those sentiments that there will be a reduction in jobs. In 1975, when cataloging services (e.g., OCLC) came on the scene, many librarians felt that they would either lose their jobs or see a reduction in hiring for select positions. Some may also feel this way about an EMS.

Expounding on the fourth question in this group, "what do we as vendors see," in addition to what have been expressed above, McCracken and Markwith shared some varied views. McCracken sees an EMS as a replacement for Jake, which was designed for this purpose; however, no one wanted to download or maintain it. He also sees an EMS as a tool that helps vendors and aggregators correct errors in their database or e-collection and relieve libraries of the grunt work while still allowing them to make the decisions. Markwith sees vendors as relieving user pain points, which he identified as:

1. Volume and velocity of change data, i.e., url and "is title in or out";
2. Poor quality of data, e.g., incorrect coverage and/or embargo dates;
3. Redefining the traditional subscription agent/vendor role, e.g., individual subscriptions.

As with any service whether in-house or outsourced, its value must be assessed. McCracken suggested that that could be done by librarians looking carefully at what services are provided through an EMS and talking back to the vendor. Serials Solutions views users opinions importantly. Librarians have to be candid with the vendor. Communication is the key. Services improve when there is communication. Markwith feels an assessment can be done by the relationship of librarians (customers) with the vendor, a relationship that allows them to be service partners. Communication is also important, and one way to retrieve this is to get their feedback on the e-journal management page. Another good measure is assessing usage statistics by provider, title, and from all other appropriate sources.

Having discussed the need for an EMS and the benefits derived from outsourcing this service and how librarians can assess vendor's value, McCracken and Markwith shared their views on what they see as risks to librarians and libraries. Although there was not enough time to discuss all of the risks, McCracken focused on reliability and control. Reliability will reveal itself in the EMS they choose and how the data will be used. Library control (not local control) is lost because in-house resources are not being used. Also, librarians will have to make decisions based on limited resources. Markwith identified three areas as risks: losing value of economies of scale, loss of familiar work patterns, and lost time to help resolve "The Confusion of Convenience."

The final part of each presentation looked at what's next. McCracken said that Serials Solutions would always be evolving. Lots of cool stuff is in the works, e.g., a partnership with Ulrich International. Linking will continue to be important, and journal and article linking will increase. In all, Serials Solutions will continue to explore services in this area. TDNET will explore content integration, said Markwith. Content integration is not the same as aggregation, for it occurs at the customer level, not the vendor level. Traditional forms of format are changing in term of scholarly information. The OPAC is not necessarily the answer. There will be an integration of e-content as portals and vortals (a customized vertical portal of e-journals, e-books, e-docs, e-mails, etc.).

To reiterate, managing electronic collections is no small task. If the growth of e-journals continues at a fast pace, it is imperative that some mechanism is permanently employed to track them with precision. Although much attention is directed toward the management of e-journals, it is only a matter of time before e-books and other e-documents join the collection in astounding numbers. With this projection of the future, electronic management systems will become a permanent fixture. Whether a library goes with an in-house EMS or outsources it from a commercial business will be a decision that must be given much consideration. If the move is in the direction of outsourcing, reflecting back on some of the comments of the presenters, libraries may be able to take some comfort in these two:

1. A strength of a commercial service is, by definition, that it is designed to manage (Markwith).
2. Serials Solutions will always be evolving (McCracken).

Adding to the latter, this writer thinks that most EMSs would take this position.

6. *HISTORICAL MESSAGES IN THE DIGITAL MEDIUM*

Roger Matuz, Product Manager, Historical Periodicals, Proquest Information and Learning;
Nancy Godleski, Kaplanoff Librarian for American History, Yale University
Reported by Christie Ericson

This session addressed the ongoing effects of technology on scholarly communications and serial publications, specifically the digitization of serial archives. Topics covered were the manufacturing process (how digital archives are created), the librarian-patron relationship (what librarians and users expect from digital archives), and means for evaluating digital archives (from an academic view).

Roger Matuz, who develops databases of historical periodical content for Proquest, began by discussing the reasons for digitizing archives. The content of primary documents can be shared among a wider audience while preserving fragile original sources. Unlike microforms, digitized text and images can be searched quickly and efficiently.

Matuz then went on to discuss the actual digitization process. At the beginning of the project decisions must be made as to how the content will be displayed and searched. Collaboration with subject specialists is vital in assuring that the finished product will meet the expectations of the user.

Matuz also discussed the various methods of capturing the data and the costs and features associated with each one. One can rekey the text, scan the original source, or scan the microfilm/microfiche. One drawback of rekeying is the loss of the original context and is best for text only. Scanning the full-page original document retains the context, but loses searchability. Matuz then went into detail on how microfilm is scanned and digitized. Articles and images are “zoned”—separated, tagged and then returned to their original position on the page. While this method is costly, it allows the highest level of searchability by allowing the patron to search a document by text and also by image.

Nancy Godleski then followed Matuz’s presentation with a discussion of the criteria used in selecting and evaluating databases. As a historian, she stressed the importance of realizing that a digital database is just a research tool—it is not the “real thing.” Librarians need to determine the value of the content and how it would enhance their collection. Usability, accessibility, and costs must also be evaluated. Some questions that need to be asked about the database are: What does it offer the user? Does it have an intuitive search engine? Does it have indexes and full-text searching? What are the equipment requirements? Are MARC records available? Can it be used as a pedagogical tool? What is the pricing structure?

Both Godleski and Matuz stressed the importance of communication between the librarian and the vendor in the development of historical periodical databases. As a reference librarian, Godleski knows what kind of research tools her patrons want and need and works to convey this information to the vendors.

Librarians need to work closely with vendors to ensure a useful, cost-effective product without all the fancy “bells and whistles” that merely drive up the cost of the database. Vendors need to solicit feedback from librarians and their users as they develop their products to ensure customer satisfaction. As technology improves and costs decrease, more historical archives can be digitized which will allow libraries to offer even higher levels of service to their patrons.

[Ed. Note: Concurrent session 7, “Managing Turbulence” was cancelled.]

8. *GET HIP TO E-JOURNALS AND FORGET ABOUT THE PRINT?...INCITING A FACULTY REVOLUTION!?*
Janet Palmer, University of Michigan
Reported by Patricia A. Loghry, University of Notre Dame

Palmer discussed selected research results from a recent study with Mark Sandler, collection officer, University Libraries, University of Michigan. They examined faculty access to, and use of, print and e-journals in economics, sociology, and anthropology. Their research agenda was based on dual format commitments leading to collection budget concerns and burgeoning scholarly production adding to storage space concerns. It was timely to consider faulty opinion in future collection development decisions, and social sciences seemed a middle ground from which to select participants. Palmer and Sandler conducted qualitative, semi-structured, face-to-face interviews because they wanted in-depth exploratory discussions and felt there would be a better response rate and a better quality discussion. Sixty-one ½-1½ hour interviews (20 economics 20 sociology, 21 anthropology) with tenure and tenure-tracked faculty (17 women, 44 men) were conducted during the fall/winter of the 2001/2002 semester, exploring general and specific faculty needs relating to academic journals. Questions asked focused on discipline and research methods used, how faculty published and disseminated their work, the journal/book ratio that they depended on, how faculty accessed and used current journals, how they accessed and used journal back files, three hypothetical scenarios regarding choice of electronic or print journals, perceptions about current mode of access that colleagues/students are using, projections about future mode of access and use by graduate students, an index of computer cosmopolitanism, and finally if there was anything that they wanted to let the library know.

Who were the faculty? 2 emeriti, 28 full, 17 associate, 14 assistant professors. Year of degree: 25% in the 1960s, 11% in the 1970s, 23% in the 1980s, 36% in the 1990s, and 3% in the first decade of the 21st century. Their methodology: quantitative 46%, qualitative 44%, mixed 10%. Results of the survey were broken down into: P = prefers print overall, PE = prefers print will use electronic, EP=likes electronic current and print archive, E=likes all electronic but is concerned about archiving for other colleagues. Results: 6% were P all senior rank, qualitative oriented, degrees in ’60s; 15% were PE all senior rank, majority qualitative oriented, degrees in ’60s/’70s low familiarity with searching skills, 6% were EP all senior rank, range in research methodologies and searching skills, and 69% were E.

Some faculty concerns about the loss of print: Print is still the best archive, still most direct data source, will always be needed for more obscure non-English materials, electronic doesn’t look or feel like a print volume. They want e-access, but they really want both—only if it can be printed out, if they have a fast modem/computer/printer/IT support, and if they don’t have to deal with e-books. Projecting access modes for their graduate students, faculty said that 90% would be E, 5% would be EP and 1% would be P.

Conclusions: The majority of faculty expect their graduate students to be accessing and using e-journals, with exceptions in disciplines relying upon obscure or non-English language print journal titles; they appreciate the convenience and immediacy; and the value of print and concerns about its potential loss are evident even among some who are most appreciative of e-journals.

9. *CATALOGING: THE GOOD, THE BAD, AND THE UGLY*
Regina Romano Reynolds, National Serials Data Program (U.S. ISSN Center), Library of Congress
Reported by Frieda Rosenberg

Regina Reynolds’ presentations are always eagerly awaited at NASIG, as much for her candid insights and clarity as for her unfailingly dynamic and entertaining delivery (and slides enlivened with “critters” expressing her central metaphors). In today’s talk, the three cinematic gunslingers personified “things cataloging does well” (short list), “things needing improvement,” and “complex, downright ugly challenges” (long list). Far from resting with a statement of intractable problems, however, Reynolds sketched the outlines of various solutions, offered examples of improved displays, and paused occasionally to ask for "your input" with Clint's six-gun as the persuader. Her premise: Though cataloging is costly, sometimes cumbersome, and increasingly in competition with other, nimbler, ways of organizing information, from Google to Amazon.com, it is also a critical library function that we would dispense with at our peril. Improving cataloging involves shedding outdated assumptions, extending its reach through the incorporation of modern metadata, and partnering with technology and others in the information community to achieve varied options for presenting bibliographic data.

Under the "Good," cataloging's achievements include authority control, classification, standardization, and the positioning of "The Catalog" as portal to the library. With regard to the catalog, Reynolds expressed her conviction that the catalog needs to remain the primary access point to a library's collections. Otherwise, a library's wealth of non-digital resources might never be discovered by those who bypass the catalog in favor of Web pages or online lists. To exploit cataloging's advantages, the speaker prodded the audience with suggestions for partnering with Web developers and publishers. Suggestions from the floor emphasized the need for cooperation and mutual education among public and technical services staff.

"Bad" traditions include opaque notes, cryptic abbreviations, inscrutable terminology, rules prescribing time-consuming transcription, abbreviation, and bracketing, lack of accommodation to new formats, and the primacy of "catalog card" organization over a more elastic approach to descriptive data. The speaker suggested that catalogers might better focus on what a resource "is" in essence rather than simply what it "says," although she acknowledged that to do so can present some new challenges. The cataloging community also needs to exorcise the "ghost of the 3 X 5 card" and help conceive and lobby for better displays. She held out hope for the continuing AACR revision process, including the Joint Steering Committee's study of catalog record terminology and conventions. In particular, she suggested that MARC's structure of individual data elements, more easily redesigned than AACR rules, could point the way to a more flexible methodology, and might even outlast AACR.

"Ugly" challenges include situations that lead to having either a single very complicated record or multiple fragmented ones. These included multiple versions, latest vs. successive entry, titles in aggregations, multiple ISSN for multiple formats, and conference proceedings. The basic choice, "lumping vs. splitting," presented tradeoffs: Multiple separate records are expensive and more confusing to patrons and reference staff, while single records are difficult to share among libraries (impossible to share if holdings records carry the distinctive data) and have their own source of confusion in that they become long and complex—and, for titles changes in serials, can conflict with ISSN practice.

Here the potential solutions include "expression level cataloging" (this year's buzz word), which sounds good but is difficult to implement in practice, since it involves deriving information about the "work" and its "expression" from one or more incomplete, and changing, manifestations. Reynolds pointed out the work being done by the ILS vendor VTLS in automated derivation of expression-level records. At the 2002 ALA Annual Conference, sample records were available for books and musical performances, but those for serials were more problematic.

Reynolds pointed out that "lumping vs. splitting" problems to date have resulted from the need to choose between the two alternatives. In fact, both levels of granularity are needed for different purposes. She speculated that technology could help us and indicated that it is easier for technology to "lump" together separate things rather than "split" one thing where all versions/titles are amalgamated without sufficient identification of what information goes with what version or title. Reynolds advocated separate records in both national and international databases to facilitate record sharing and maintenance. Separate records would also best suit local needs for ordering, claiming, and check-in. However, for OPAC displays, Reynolds showed a mock-up of an OPAC display where separate records are combined, helped by links and markers placed by the cataloger. Reynolds further stated that the "multiple versions" or "format variation" problem is two-fold: multiple records are confusing to patrons and reference staff as well as involving extra effort to create. While many working on this problem are trying to solve the first part of the problem by devising ways to lump records together for display, Reynolds indicated she also had a potential solution to the second part of the problem by showing a slide with a mock-up of an input screen for creating records for multiple formats at the same time. Variations on this theme were offered to fit the diverse "challenges" she had described.

Projecting into the future, Reynolds envisioned cataloging systems that will make more and better use of templates and links to tables of standardized forms, perform reciprocal linking automatically, be capable of incorporating searchable access to Web pages carrying listings of items in series or data on individual conferences, and contain “virtual records” from a shared database with the possibility of overlaying or adding local information. Beyond that, XML and other technologies may inspire us to invent new bibliographic models: How can we follow up? Desperadoes were replaced by beloved NASIG personalities as the rosy cataloging future emerged and the session ended to great applause.

10. *THE INFORMATION RESOURCE TREE: A REVOLUTIONARY METHOD TO PRESENT RELATIONSHIPS AMONG ONLINE SERIAL OBJECTS*

Carol Casey, Head, Cataloging Dept., Washington State University; Mark Jacobs, Cataloging Dept., Washington State University

Reported by Janice M. Krueger

The Information Resource Tree, a relational model created by the presenters, visually integrates serial objects for their relations, context, and depth of access. Casey and Jacobs presented an approach to organizing bibliographic information in a new way that would maintain the depth of knowledge and relationships among parts of the bibliographic record that surpasses present methods of electronic databases and resources. They emphasized the magnitude of information organization in print records, such as indexes, abstracts, and card catalogs that has succeeded in years past. The challenge now is to successfully move this same organization to the electronic format without losing the relationships among the objects, or parts, and to overcome the sometimes overly literal, polarized, and limited visualization of electronic resources in both software and hardware components.

Jacobs commented on how several information objects, such as title or author, could be viewed together in the old card catalog by merely using the appropriate drawers simultaneously or by spreading out print resources, such as indexes and abstracts, over a desk to view information objects together to establish the relationships. The Information Resource Tree matrix could visually and simultaneously present these relationships, the distance between objects marking the strength of the relationship. Both he and his partner stated that the challenge is to have the digital environment view and display the “big picture,” permitting users to organize their own information environment. The electronic formats need to expand on the successes of print formats and to do so in such a way that allows the user to sift through fast amounts of information meaningfully and rapidly.

Unfortunately, the presenters were limited by technology when their laptop computer could not connect to the data projector due to an incompatibility of ports. When finally transferred to a compatible computer, the lack of one software program hindered the presentation of the movie that illustrated their lecture points. Casey and Jacobs were only able to present some of their work to the audience.

WORKSHOPS

1. *E-JOURNAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS AND BEYOND*

Louise Pierce, Serials Specialist, and Greg Szczyrbak, Reference Librarian, both from York College of Pennsylvania

Reported by Michele Pope

Louise Pierce presented an historical perspective on how the York College of Pennsylvania has grappled with the management of online journals. Correcting the library catalog for each title was manageable until the increased acquisition of aggregator databases overwhelmed staffing resources. Buying an electronic management system became a viable option in order to maintain control of holdings information within the library’s collection.

E-journal management systems track and report on full-text journals in aggregator databases, individually subscribed e-journals, and a library’s print and microform collections. Data that is tracked may include dates of coverage and additions or deletions for thousands of titles subscribed to in an aggregator database. Qualities of the end product are similar. The set-up process consists of providing the EMS with a list of individual titles and full-text aggregator databases to which the library subscribes. The end product is a linkable, searchable database. Serials Solutions, JournalWebCite, and TDNet produce the three systems evaluated.

A comparison was made between the three systems: technical requirements, display/organization, updates to the list/database, usage statistics, management reports, searching functionality, cost, and special features. Concerns consisted of whether the database or list of titles could be hosted locally and easily integrated into the library's Web environment; what formats were available for the product, including the updates and reports generated; currency of updates; availability of reports, such as usage statistics or cost analysis; how strong is searching functionality; cost structure; and special features.

Going into more detail, Pierce described some of the special features of the Serials Solutions product. Serials Solutions delivers a flexible product, allowing the customer to choose a desired format and amongst a variety of data tracked. Serials Solutions can provide MARC-ready data that can be cut and pasted into the library's catalog at a 35 percent increase in price. Of interest is their inclusion of embargo dates and an online client center where the library can securely update account information.

Greg Szczyrbak continued with profiles of JournalList by JournalWebCite and TDNet. JournalList comes in a standard form, encompassing a full-package product and the "lite" package, a stripped-down version without such management tools as usage statistics. Setting up your list of titles may be done online by choosing the databases you subscribe to, and from that JournalWebCite will generate a database to track titles. JournalWebCite will customize its interface to better integrate its product into a library's Web environment.

York College had no idea how many full-text journals were available to them through their subscriptions to aggregator databases until they began using an EMS. EMSs can serve the library not only by tracking title holdings, but also by assisting library management with evaluating their serial collections and acquisitions. Reports on usage statistics, the cost per title, and title overlaps between two or more databases can simplify the comparison of databases and streamline acquisitions. JournalWebCite stands out by the range of reports offered in its standard package.

TDNet produces the final product discussed and the one chosen for York College. Two special features made them stand out. TDNet has an increased search functionality because of their addition of current-year table of contents pages for 90 percent of the titles they report on. Another feature is a selective dissemination of information service called My TDNet. My TDNet allows you to set up a profile, and then as TDNet updates their table of contents information and if your profile matches, the content pages are e-mailed to you. This would only include the titles to which you subscribe.

The cost structure for all these products varies, although all offer consortia pricing. For Serials Solutions, the number of full-text journals determines pricing. Fewer than 7,000 journals will cost $900. The price increases incrementally and caps at $3,000. JournalWebCite determines pricing by full-time enrollment. For JournalList-Lite, the cost varies from $660 to $1,980, and JournalList-Standard costs from $2,000 to $6,000. Academic institutions with over 20,000 FTE are asked to call for pricing. TDNet pricing depends on the number of unique titles reported. As the number of titles increases, the cost decreases. Costs can vary from $5,000 to $30,000, with larger collections paying less for a per-title cost.

Szczyrbak advises libraries to consider the options available to them. Libraries may decide to continue updating their own library catalogs or create a "home grown" tracking system, such as the University of North Carolina at Greensboro's Journal Finder.

EMSs can certainly help, but they may also add responsibilities. Learning and teaching a new system to staff and patrons is additional time for which management should be prepared. If patrons are used to accessing the catalog to find information or databases to find articles, now they will have to be directed to another access point. Promotion will be necessary to orient users to any new system enhancements or else they will be underutilized. How can your institution attain accurate usage statistics? EMSs will undoubtedly create a second point of access, and you'll probably have several points of access when you consider all your databases. These are further practical points to consider when evaluating an e-journal management system.

2. *CONDUCTING SERIALS SURVEYS: COMMON MISTAKES AND RECOMMENDED APPROACHES*
Presented by Susan Gardner, East Carolina University
Reported by Sandra A. Beehler, Lewis & Clark College

This session centered on a survey of ARL libraries conducted by Gardner which sought to measure the effect on library staff of managing electronic journals. The audience was first invited to take a true-false quiz relating to serials surveys, and a few moments were spent going through the quiz questions and correct answers. Gardener discussed acceptable survey response rates, the correct way to pre-test a survey, free-response vs. multiple choice questions, Web vs. paper surveys, and Web survey design. She gave hints for formulating survey questions as well as mistakes to avoid—all backed by examples from the survey instrument. There were three handouts: a true-false quiz, a copy of Gardner's survey, and a copy of the PowerPoint presentation. The presentation handout included Web addresses for Web survey software and a brief bibliography.

3. *ILS CONVERSIONS AND THE PREDICTION PATTERN CONUNDRUM: WHAT DO YOU DO ON DAY 1?*
Michael Kaplan, Director, Product Management Ex Libris (USA), Inc.; Kim Maxwell, Serials Acquisitions Librarian, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Reported by Connie McGuire

Many of today's integrated library systems use serial pattern and caption data to create predictive check-in records. The patterns are used to pre-build check-in records and to provide data for claiming missing issues. When a library migrates to an ILS that requires predictive check-in records for all active serial titles, a prediction pattern must be established before a title can be checked in. Since serials will be arriving in the library from the first day a new ILS is implemented, and check-in data does not always easily migrate from one ILS to another, libraries are looking for ways to minimize the task of creating these patterns.

In response to this situation, CONSER initiated the Publication Pattern Initiative to determine the feasibility of sharing the creation and distribution of pattern and holdings data in CONSER records. Since 1999, selected libraries have been adding MARC 21 holdings data for field 853 (captions and patterns) and field 863 (enumeration and chronology) to CONSER records. OCLC, host of the CONSER database, has designated field 891 for embedding the publication pattern data coded in MARC 21 fields 853 and 863. During the course of this pilot project, approximately 3,000 patterns have been added to CONSER records. In addition, Harvard contributed 40,000 seed records. However, the Harvard records have been of less value since they were not created to predict issue receipt and lack frequency and regularity coding.

Another approach to assisting libraries with the task of creating patterns for all of their active serial titles is the Ex Libris ALEPH 500 conversion pattern database. Michael Kaplan described the database and how Ex Libris customers use it. The patterns are stored in separate files by institution. There are currently over 12,000 unique patterns in the database. Ex Libris is planning to refresh these files on a regular basis. A library in need of patterns determines a preferred order of institutional files and searches the database by one or more of the following fields: ISSN, system generated control number, or title. Libraries are able to retrieve several thousand patterns from the database with the hit rate varying by type of collection and size of library. Boston College, for example, used the database to load 2,154 new patterns.

Kim Maxwell described the process followed by MIT when they migrated to Ex Libris. At the time of MIT's conversion, the Ex Libris file had patterns from four libraries. MIT matched their serial titles against the database by OCLC control number and ISSN with a hit rate (excluding book-like serials) of 55 percent. The major benefit for MIT was the time saved by editing other libraries' patterns instead of creating all of the patterns needed to check in their active titles. Challenges faced by MIT included: learning the MARC holdings format, not knowing who had created a pattern or when it had been modified, and differences in how institutions had implemented the MARC holdings standard. Future directions for MIT include adding local free-text explanatory notes to coded pattern records and moving pattern data to their holdings records.

4. *WRITING FOR SERIALISTS IN THE WORK ENVIRONMENT*
Bob Schatz, Manager of North American Sales, Everetts
Reported by Nathan Rupp

Bob Schatz opened his talk on effective writing in the workplace by distinguishing between good writing and effective writing. He stated that even though a piece may be well written, it might not achieve the goals it was intended to achieve; only those pieces that achieve their goals can be considered effective.

Schatz pointed out that an author may be writing with any one of a number goals in mind—he or she may be trying to influence, inform, describe, summarize, evaluate, record, confirm, or sell. These goals can be communicated in a number of written forms, including e-mails or letters, employees' evaluations, reports, announcements, newsletters, RFPs, policy statements, or brochures. Some of the most difficult problems authors encounter occur when they are writing to influence another person's decisions or getting that person to change his or her behavior. This type of writing is similar to making a presentation in person; the only (substantial) difference is that a written piece becomes part of the permanent record, while a presentation does not.

Schatz went on to describe the proper method of beginning the writing process. First, an author should never begin a writing project by putting pen to paper: He or she should always begin at "the end," or determine the reason why or the objective for which he or she is writing. There are four types of objectives: public, private, personal, and composite. The public objective is the stated reason for writing. This may differ from the private objective, which is where the most effective writers concentrate. Here, effective writers determine the needs, goals, or objectives of the members of the audience with the most authority and highest stake in the outcome—even though these "stakeholders" may not have expressly stated their interests, writers need to ensure that they are communicating to them. The personal objective refers to the fact that at the same time they're trying to satisfy the goals and interests of these "stakeholders," authors must also write in such a way that they're not compromising their own objectives in writing. In writing for the composite objective, an author tries to combine writing for the other three objectives.

In addition to determining the various objectives they want to meet, authors should keep in mind their audience and determine how much background information it has, its level of understanding, and its skepticism of the material presented. It can be difficult writing for a heterogeneous audience; authors may find themselves having to balance simple and complex writing for an audience with varying levels of knowledge about the topic being presented. Authors should also keep in mind that their writing may be used for purposes other than the original purpose for which they are writing and at least attempt to take those other purposes into consideration.

After determining the objectives for which they are writing and evaluating their audience, authors should *still* not begin writing. They should create a logical outline by moving backwards from the stated objective and using key points to support it. Once the outline is finished, an author is *finally* ready to begin actually writing. Authors should distill their thoughts about the purpose of the piece they are writing into an actual statement of purpose—even if they don't include it in the final draft. Authors should make sure their writing follows the outline to ensure that the objectives detailed in their statement of purpose have been met. Depending on the audience, authors may wish to use buried leads to "set the scene" for the rest of their document or to provide some context for their argument, illustrations or charts to illustrate a point being made, or other devices to "flesh out" their presentation. In writing the document, authors should also use language they can understand and shouldn't let their writing get away from them. They should always be aware of writing that they like or dislike and create their own work with an eye towards these different styles.

Once authors are done writing, they should ensure their writing is proofread. They should proofread the piece themselves, and they should get others to read it as well. Readers who have no connection to the document can provide objective feedback, while readers for whom the document is being written can test the piece to provide an idea of whether it satisfies its goal. Documents should be proofread in their final form; if a document will be made available in print, the author should print it out before proofreading it. Authors can further proofread their work by reading it aloud.

After proofreading their work, authors should spend time rewriting it and shouldn't be afraid to rewrite it several times if necessary to achieve the objectives they have in mind. After delivering their work, authors should determine whether or not their objectives were met and ask if they influenced the audience the way they wanted to. Authors should apply any information gathered from this evaluation to their next writing project; in doing this, they can determine why their objectives weren't met and how they can change their writing style so their objectives are met in their next writing project.

5. *MANEUVERING YOUR SERIALS TROOPS THROUGH THE MINE FIELDS OF CHANGE*
Rene Erlandson, Senior Cataloger, Illinois Newspaper Project

[Ed. Note: No report for this session.]

6. *TEACHING ELECTRONIC JOURNALS: FINDING, USING AND CITING THEM*
Stewart Brower, University of Buffalo Health Sciences Library; Janice M. Krueger, University of the Pacific.
Reported by Karen Matthews

This presentation provided information on teaching patrons how to locate, use, and document electronic journals for use with research and writing. It was split into two sections: The first discussed building a library workshop to teach access features and formats, and the second discussed citing electronic resources.

When designing the workshop, Stewart Brower believes it is necessary to review the perceived need and to develop the course objectives to answer user questions. Among the questions users may have are: Why can't they access e-journals from home? Why aren't e-journals in PDF? Why does the library not have the user's favorite e-journal? Aren't e-journals cheaper than print, or aren't e-journals free? Doesn't the e-journal come out before the print copy? Where can the user find a list of the e-journals the library subscribes to? Why are some e-journals listed twice in the online catalog? Which version of the e-journal is better (InfoTrac, Science Direct, etc.)?

When teaching accessing e-journals, the different methods of finding e-journals should be included. These various methods include through indexing and abstracting services—such as ABI Inform or Infotrac—through publisher or society Web sites, or through third-party aggregators and vendors, such as Journals@OVID. Access may also be provided through the online catalog, which has the advantage of informing the user if the journal is available in another format such as print. Access may also be provided through an e-journal list that would be simple to use, would be regularly updated, but doesn't tell the user what other format is available or the actual holdings.

Teaching how to access e-journals also may include the features the e-journals share. Among these features are table of contents, archives, search forms, e-mail capability of table of contents, and instructions to authors. Teaching may also include discussing the different formats, such as HTML and PDF, and their strengths and weaknesses. HTML's advantages include capability to be saved as text and ability to be copied and pasted into other documents, whereas PDF's advantages include its resembling the original printed article.

Some advice from Stewart included timing of the workshop—keeping it to an average user's attention span of about 40 minutes. Also, do not overfill the workshop and do not underestimate your audience. Figure out what you want to focus on and what technical issues the users need to know (IP addresses, passwords, proxy servers). Also, determine what the users will need to know about indexing and abstracting services, aggregators, and publishers. The presentation may include information about the selection policy.

Stewart Brower's presentation:
http://ublib.buffalo.edu/hsl/ime/ejournals/

Instructions to Authors:
http://www.mco.edu/lib/instr/libinsta.html

Janice Krueger discussed citation styles for print and electronic sources emphasizing APA (*Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*) and MLA (*MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*). Handouts were provided including both print and electronic sources. APA's form for electronic resources found in library databases also includes the retrieved date and the name of the database. For Web sites, APA's form is retrieved date and URL listed at the end of the citation. For e-journals that are identical to the print versions, the phrase [electronic version] is all that is required in the citation to distinguish it from the print version.

MLA has a more inclusive policy for journal citations. It also includes the title of the database underlined, the aggregator that produces the database, where the database was viewed, the date viewed, and the URL. For Web sites, MLA also includes the date viewed and the URL at the end of the citation. However, neither APA nor MLA have addressed how to handle DOIs (digital object identifiers).

Another handout listed the sections of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* and the *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers* for citing electronic sources. In the *Manual of the APA*, section 4.15 covers Retrieval Information: Electronic Sources. The important subsections are: 4.16 A: Periodicals; 4.16 A #22: Citation of a Work Discussed in a Secondary Source; 4.16 B: Books; 4.16 I: Electronic Media; 4,16 I #88-95: Aggregated Databases; and 4.16 I #71: Internet Articles Based on a Print Source. For the *MLA Handbook*, section 4.9 covers Citing Electronic Publications. Important subsections are: 4.7: Citing Articles and Other Publications in Periodicals; 5.4.7: Citing Indirect Sources; 4.6: Citing Books and Other Nonperiodical Publications; and 4.9.2 ff: An Online Scholarly Project, Information Database, or Professional or Personal Site. For aggregated databases go to www.mla.org and look under MLA Style first, then Frequently Asked Questions.

7. THINKING AND WORKING OUTSIDE THE (LIBRARY) BOX: FROM A REVOLUTIONARY IDEA TO STRATEGIC ALLIANCE

Dana Walker, Electronic Resources Librarian, University of Georgia; Carol MacAdam, Associate Director for Library Relations, JSTOR; Sharon G. Sullivan, Regional Sales Manager, Swets Blackwell; D. Ellen Bonner, Coordinator of Technical Services, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; and Merrill Smith, Account Services Manager, EBSCO Information Services

Reported by Carol Green

More and more librarians have left libraries in recent years for opportunities with publishers, book and serials vendors, automation or electronic resources vendors, and dot.com companies. In these organizations they hold various positions in sales and customer service, product development and marketing, consulting and technical advising, and training. In this workshop, five librarians who left libraries—and sometimes returned—discussed their career choices, how and why they found positions outside of libraries, how similar or dissimilar the jobs were, how library training and experience benefited their new jobs, and why they continue to work outside the library profession.

The library backgrounds of panel members included acquisitions, serials, cataloging, administration, and systems experience in all types of libraries. Their backgrounds with publishers/vendors included sales and customer service, library relations, management, buying, marketing, product design, and training positions with various publishers, book and serial vendors, ILS vendors, and producers of electronic resources in addition to private consulting. Like library positions, jobs outside libraries can be found through ads in professional literature, networking, interviews at conferences, listservs such as SERIALST, and employer recruitment. Boredom, impatience, career plateaus, and the need for a change or challenge were reasons given for leaving libraries. Panel members listed job security, concerns over salary and sales commissions, lack of experience, and relocation as factors keeping more people from moving outside libraries.

Library and non-library positions are similar in that both tend to focus on service. Non-library positions are different because there is little or no committee work, a greater speed of change, more opportunities for decision-making and entrepreneurial thinking, more chaos, and the ability to work from home or a remote office. The differences between library and non-library jobs seemed to be the reasons panel members gave for staying in one or the other.

Library training and experience was considered to be valuable when working outside libraries. The panel agreed that the credibility of an MLS degree is significant. Of course, experience with acquisitions, cataloging, serials, systems, and electronic resources proved useful in working for those types of vendors. Outside of libraries, acquisitions and serials experience also translated into management and analysis skills. Bibliographic instruction and reference experience translated into interpersonal and communication skills as well as the ability to think on your feet. Producers of online databases often look to hire librarians or people with other specific degrees and backgrounds to perform abstracting/indexing or compile bibliographies. Vice versa, experience working with publishers or vendors can help librarians communicate with them more effectively.

8. *SUCCESS IN SEARCHING FOR SERIALS: WHAT IS THE* MAGIC *SOLUTION?*

Mary Jo Zeter, Latin American and Caribbean Studies Bibliographer; Allen Thunell, Bibliographic Enhancement Team Manager, both from Michigan State University

Reported by Betty Landesman

Zeter began the workshop with an overview of the characteristics of our patrons. “Serials illiteracy” is the norm. Patrons expect convenient, quick access to information, and their Internet searching experience provides their frame of reference. The proliferation of electronic indexes has increased the demand for journal articles. Title searches constitute the predominant retrieval technique in the OPAC. MSU Libraries’ patrons have two major pathways to access serials: MAGIC, the Web-based catalog, and Erasmus, a locally created, subject-based browsing list of electronic resources.

Thunell gave an overview of Erasmus. It provides access to all electronic databases, journals, newspapers, books, research guides, and trial resources. Databases are arranged by subjects assigned by selectors. It is not MARC based. It does not contain records for all electronic resources. The title search capability is very limited: The exact title must be entered, and a wrong letter or punctuation mark will prevent retrieval. The number of titles and subject categories has grown very large. However, Erasmus’ browse capabilities aid many patrons in attaining a successful search. Easy subject browsing allows faculty to keep up to date with titles they monitor. It is easy to find known titles, as exact spelling is not required and patrons don't have to learn search strategies.

Zeter reviewed the strengths of the OPAC. The catalog is the closest thing to one-stop shopping for journals, as all formats (including print!) are included. It provides multiple, controlled access points; added entries; index screens; and automatic search re-directs. However, the catalog also presents some access issues for electronic journals. Not all are cataloged. For example, titles that are "free with print" only have links added to the print records, as cataloging priority is given to paid-for material. When there are print and electronic versions of the same title, it is difficult to clearly convey differences in holdings and coverage. MSU has formed a Database Advisory Committee to focus on display and access issues in the OPAC, including improvements in holdings and location information.

Thunell concluded with recommendations for the future. At MSU, both Erasmus and the catalog will be needed for some time. Erasmus is very good for single, known searches. However, it does not provide the complex history of title changes, indexing, and cross-references contained in the catalog. In order to avoid allocating competing resources to the maintenance of two systems, public catalog displays must be improved. Continue to improve serials searching pathways by providing simple and direct answers. Patrons will not go to a second screen to find holdings. We need to adopt national CONSER serial holdings standards to be more consistent in our public record displays. More patron bibliographic literacy training is required, going all the way back to the K-12 level. We do not yet know enough about how to provide services to remote users. We cannot compete with other Web information sources and Internet search engines simply by copying them; what can we do better than Google, and vice versa? We know our patrons and what they need. The MARC system is undervalued and should be promoted as a rich metadata language. We need to understand our patrons in order to use MARC to its best potential.

9. *E-JOURNALS AND CITATION PATTERNS: IS IT ALL WORTH IT?*

Kathleen Bauer, Reference & Nursing Librarian, Cushing/Whitney Medical Library; Kimberly Parker, Electronic Publishing & Collections Specialist, Yale University Library

Reported by Lisa S. Blackwell

The systematic acquisition of e-journals by libraries can be traced to about 1996, when publishers began to market attractive packages of titles to academic institutions. These packages dramatically increased access to titles not previously collected by a particular library while potentially impacting usage rates of print holdings. Collection managers must employ usage analyses based on imprecisely (vendor) supplied download counts and hit-rates for e-journals and notoriously imperfect manual reshelving counts for print copies to justify difficult subscription/budget decisions in libraries. Ease of access and searchability of e-journals provide the basis for the common assumption that patrons will prefer electronic to print where available. A citation analysis study was designed to test the validity of this assumption with respect to a select group of patrons (i.e., Yale researchers actively engaged in publication) and to possibly provide an alternative method for justifying local access decisions.

The authors chose to examine two sample sets of citations included in the ISI Web of Science Social Sciences Citation Index for 1991 and 2001, with the midpoint (1996) being the advent of active e-journals acquisition at Yale. The goal was to obtain a good picture of the usage changes wrought after the introduction of e-journal acquisition by comparing the citation patterns prior to easy e-journal access. The sample sets were created by a random letter generator to select authors whose names began with C, L, or W, and institutional affiliation listed as Yale. Duplicates were eliminated for all citations gathered, and co-cited authors were weighted equally. Resultant citation sets were exported into an Endnote 5 file to be converted into a text file and then imported into an Access database. As part of the clean-up process, some citations were eliminated (e.g., in-process books, etc.). The citation data was then analyzed in relation to a student-compiled Excel database containing titles from four major e-journal packages to which Yale subscribed between 1991 and 2001, with dates of coverage noted for print and electronic formats to those journals.

The results of this study created more questions than conclusions and highlighted areas requiring additional research data. Strikingly, in the sample group from 1991, the oldest citations were to literature from the 17^{th} century, whereas the oldest citations in the sample group for 2001 were to literature from the 19^{th} century. A significant decrease in the number of citations to literature more than 50 years old suggests a major change in scholarly research patterns. What is not clear is whether or not this observation would prove to be true across all disciplines.

In 1991, 89.8% of the citations were to titles held in print by the Yale libraries, and the remaining 10.2% were to titles not owned. By 2001, only 43.2% of the citations were to titles held in print only by the Yale libraries, and 5.9% were to titles not owned. The majority of the cited references were to titles held in both print and electronic format. It is difficult or impossible to determine exactly which format is being cited for this majority where both formats are easily accessible to Yale researchers.

To determine the growth in citations to titles now available via electronic format, citations were tabulated to titles that became available between 1991 and 2001 through subscription to the Blackwell Science, Ideal, or Wiley electronic packages. In 1991 there were 128 cited references to 40 of these journals held by Yale in print. In 2001, those figures increased to 407 cited references to 78 unique journals held by Yale in print and/or electronic packages. The actual growth rate of citations to these materials is much higher than would have been projected, given that overall, the articles cited in any format by Yale authors increased by a factor of 2.02. Again, it is unclear if this observation would prove true across all disciplines.

The authors concluded that further studies need to be completed to identify additional citation patterns and factors contributing to any changes noted. Additional studies may provide the data necessary to impact the journal format decision-making process at Yale.

10. *CATALOGING SERIAL REPRODUCTIONS*
Keiko Okuhara, Japanese Catalog Librarian, University of Pittsburgh

[Ed. Note: No report for this session.]

11. *REVOLUTIONARY RELATIONSHIPS: CATALOGERS' LIAISON ROLE AS METADATA EXPERTS IN THE CREATION OF THE K-STATE DIGITAL LIBRARY*
Char Simser, Chair, Technical Services, Kansas State University Libraries
Reported by Holley R. Lange

Catalogers as revolutionaries? Not the traditional view of catalogers, to be sure, but Char Simser reported on a new and perhaps revolutionary role for catalogers involved in Kansas State University's Digital Library. This project began with the formation of a Digital Libraries Task Force in 2000 that included not only librarians, but also staff from the university computing center, administrators, and teaching faculty. This approach, the creation of a university-wide group to research and establish a Kansas State Digital Library, began the revolution in cataloger involvement in the university's digital library.

The task force was compelled to act quickly to demonstrate the potential of the digital library concept. They first sought an appropriate search engine and selected Endeavor for their project. The group also identified resources to include in their digital library: research and extension materials, the library catalog, video and audio collections, the index to the university student paper, an agricultural citation database (ISSA), and a local wildflower collection. The goal was to create a "library" that could be searched once and that would pull information from a variety of resources, regardless of format.

To move their work forward, the task force formed two groups: one focusing on training/oversight, the other on collections. Catalogers played a significant role in this latter group, working with content and computer specialists. Catalogers as metadata experts, as well as experts in organizing information, were in a position to guide each project on metadata and access decisions, and each demanded different levels of cataloger involvement. For example, the research and extension material had been organized using Dublin Core, so little additional cataloger input was needed; the ISSA citation database had involved catalogers in its creation, so conversion to MARC was quite smooth; the video and audio collections required more cataloger input, since individuals overseeing these collection were not familiar with Dublin Core nor with conventional record creation; the university newspaper used a locally created thesaurus that had not included Kansas State University as a subject term in the index, so this had to be added.

A key element in this digital library project was the university-wide participation of faculty and staff, including catalogers. Although different projects required different levels of cataloger involvement, creation of the Kansas State University Digital Library demonstrated the need for cataloger input. As a result, catalogers' job descriptions now include a digital library component. While some issues related to software development and rights management have delayed full implementation of the digital library, the concept and approach is considered a success. A user will be able to retrieve local materials, commercial databases, and more traditional library catalog resources with one search. The project has also provided for cataloger involvement in campus-level projects, made the university more aware of just what catalogers do, and provided the impetus for rethinking the work done by catalogers.

12. *CATALOGING SERIALS FOR CONSORTIUM CATALOGS*

Wendy Baia, Head, Serials Cataloging/Assistant Head, Cataloging Department; Paul Moeller, Serials Cataloger, both from Colorado at Boulder
Reported by Jill D. Yaples

This workshop focused on Prospector, the Colorado unified catalog. Paul Moeller discussed display issues and decisions that need to be made when developing a consortium catalog. Wendy Baia talked about cataloging aspects.

The Prospector catalog includes 16 academic, public, and special libraries in Colorado and Wyoming. The consortium members use a number of different library systems to catalog local collections, such as Innovative, CARL, and Endeavor. However, Prospector only displays one master record. One can search Prospector to see who in the consortium owns an item, then go to an individual library for local information, or one could search their local library catalog and expand their search to include all Prospector libraries if they're unhappy with their original results.

Issues that need to be addressed when developing a consortium catalog include: master or multiple records for a title, individual library practices versus consortium cataloging standards, patron needs and preferences, and retrieval practices. Decisions that need to be made concerning print/e-journals include: successive versus latest entry, separate versus single record approach, where and how 856 should display, and how the holdings should display. Problems with using a master record in a consortium catalog include loss of access points found in some local library records, loss of notes, and no updates added. Multiple records may allow for differences in local treatment but can make browsing for an individual item more difficult. Separate e-journal records are easier to maintain and do a better job at describing a resource, but patrons seem to prefer looking at one record for a title, and fewer catalog records need to be created.

Prospector uses the one-record approach for print/e-journals, and the master record indicates what format can be found at individual libraries. It uses successive entry cataloging for serials, though there is some dissension on this practice. It also has a maintenance agency to periodically review cataloging practices and to resolve problems.

When cataloging for a consortium, catalogers should "consider the impact of their decisions upon the consortium catalog." They should refer to the consortium catalog before making complex cataloging decisions, especially title change decisions. They should also consider patron needs when consulting the catalog.

For additional information on the Prospector catalog refer to:

http://prospector.coalliance.org/screens/mainmenu.html

13. *WHAT TO DO WHEN DISASTER STRIKES: THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE EXPERIENCE*

Susan E. Parker, Associate Dean, University Library, California State University, Northridge; Don Jaeger, President & CEO, Alfred Jaeger, Inc.
Reported by Kitti Canepi

Susan Parker described how the library dealt with the aftermath of a magnitude 6.8 earthquake in 1994 that caused massive structural damage across campus. The Library's automated storage and retrieval system (AS/RS) located in the lower two levels of the building's east wing was not damaged, but library services were relocated into the central portion of the library building, constructed in 1973, while the east and west wings, added in 1991, were studied for structural damage. In mid-1997, the decision was made to raze both wings down to the top of the AS/RS and reconstruct them. That's when the real trouble began.

In September 1997, reported Parker, a heavy weekend rain leaked into the unroofed storage area, resulting in major mold growth. Handy tip: Mold forms on wet books and paper within 24-48 hours. In consultation with the campus Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety Office, an environmental health emergency was declared and the AS/RS sealed off. Parker stressed the importance of doing this quickly to avoid both health risks and the spread of mold to other areas. A disaster remediation firm was brought in to access the damage, operate the AS/RS on behalf of the library, and treat salvaged materials. Northridge lost more than 5,000 volumes, including more than 4,000 bound periodicals. Alfred Jaeger, Inc. was contracted as the replacement vendor for the journals.

Parker pointed out that the recovery process was a joint effort by library staff and faculty, campus administration, risk management agencies such as the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and outside contractors. In creating a recovery plan to address inventory, treatment, salvaging, and discarding, she stressed the importance of specifying standards and definitions (e.g., what "clean" means). During the Q & A session afterwards, Parker said the success or failure of the experience could depend on the FEMA representative assigned to work with the library, since they control the money. She also emphasized the need to practice your emergency plan, not just write it, including preparing staff to go get things when the building is going to be sealed off (e.g., special collections).

Don Jaeger explained how FEMA had to approve every step of the process for replacement of all Northridge's non-salvaged journals. The company first worked on appraising the list of replacement journals at the request of FEMA. They generally use three methods to evaluate journals: replacement value of lost, irreplaceable journals (for disaster recovery and insurance), fair market value (for donors), and cumulative sum (increasing inventory values for insurance coverage). Alfred Jaeger started with its own inventory and then collected materials from secondary vendors, publishers, and reprint companies before shipping everything to Northridge.

Jaeger noted two essentials for successful disaster recovery: Have a disaster plan with critical staff identified and their duties spelled out, and have the collection evaluated regularly so that you have a creditable figure from which to figure replacement costs.

14/15. *TRANSFORMING AACR2: USING THE REVISED RULES IN CHAPTERS 9 AND 12 (DOUBLE WORKSHOP)*
Jean Hirons, CONSER Coordinator, Serial Record Division, Library of Congress; Leslie Hawkins, CONSER Specialist, Serial Record Division, Library of Congress.
Reported by Virginia Taffurelli

Close to 300 enthusiastic participants attended this double workshop. Although some had attended a similar workshop at ALA or other venues, more than half were hearing this for the first time. After the introduction and highlights, the workshop was divided into four parts: Part 1: Concepts, Definitions, Sources; Part 2: Description of Integrating Resources; Part 3: Descriptive Changes for Serials; and Part 4: Major/Minor Changes. The entire PowerPoint presentation is available on the CONSER Web page at: www.loc.gov/acq/conser.

The 2002 amendments to AACR are due in August. The most notable change is the names of these chapters, more accurately reflecting the content of the rules in these chapters. Chapter 9, formerly called "Machine-Readable Data Files," is now called "Electronic Resources," and Chapter 12, formerly called "Serials," is now called "Continuing Resources." LC plans to implement these changes by Dec. 1. Rule Interpretations will be published this summer. The *CONSER Cataloging Manual* and *CONSER Editing Guide* will be ready by the end of the year. Major MARC changes, such as leader code I for integrating resource, will be implemented in 2003.

New definitions for bibliographic resources have been added, and the definition of a serial has been changed to accommodate the concepts of integrating resources, tangible versus intangible, and finite versus infinite. Integrating resources include updating loose-leafs, updating Web sites, and updating databases and will follow the rules for "latest entry" cataloging. "Descriptive rules (for serials) include more provisions for minor changes over time and allow more flexibility," reducing the need to create new records due to title changes. Hirons discussed criteria for when to catalog as a serial and when to catalog as an integrating resource as outlined in LCRI 1.0A. The sources of information for title proper and description have also been redefined.

Hawkins then discussed the description of integrating resources. When cataloging for *all* integrating resources, use Chapter 12 *plus* any other chapter relevant to the predominant type of resource content, such as Chapter 9 for updating Web sites and Chapters 9 & 3 for updating cartographic Web sites. Hawkins then reviewed rule changes relating to numbering, date of publication, physical description, series statement, various notes, linking fields, standard numbers, main and added entries (including changes), and uniform titles. He then gave a preview of the new MARC coding which will be implemented next year.

After a short break, Hawkins demonstrated the changes for serials. One major change involves the use of full form versus an acronym or initialism. Other title information can now be entered in the title and statement of responsibility area, as a quoted note, or ignored altogether. Hawkins then described other changes affecting the edition statement, numbering publication statement, physical description, and notes. One significant change is the addition of Rule 12.7B23: Item described. The "description based on" note has been expanded to include "latest issue consulted" and "viewed on."

The last portion of the workshop was devoted to what constitutes a major versus a minor title change. New terminology, adopted from ISBD, has been added. Major changes require new records. Minor changes can be recorded as notes. "Do not use 'title change' to refer to major changes!" These new rules were developed to reduce the number of new records, reduce creation of new ISSNs, and to harmonize efforts among AACR, ISSN and ISBD. The basic principle is, "Only those changes indicating a new *work* should result in a new *record*. Some major changes include: main entry changes, change in corporate body, major change in title proper, and change in physical format. Hirons presented examples of both major and minor changes in each of these categories. A significant change is for words in a list. A list must have three or more terms, and change is only considered major if there is a significant change in subject matter. Words indicating type of resource which are added or dropped are considered a minor change: For example, Organic chemistry review becomes Organic chemistry. Changes in representations of words, such as television to TV, Saint Paul reporter to St. Paul reporter, are minor changes. Other examples include changes in edition statements and numbering. Hirons stated, "If in doubt, consider the change to be minor!"

This presentation was followed by a lively question-and-answer period, mostly regarding clarification of major versus minor changes. The number of questions and the confused looks on participants' faces as they left the room indicate the need for continued dialogue, training, and more workshops of this nature. Hirons announced that the SCCTP would be revised to incorporate these changes. Sometime in the future, an advanced serials course will be offered. Even as some conference attendees were gathering to line up for the buses to Busch Gardens, many lingered to get just one more jot of clarification from Hirons and Hawkins.

16. *HOW I LEARNED TO STOP WORRYING AND GIVE UP JOURNAL CHECK-IN…OR, HOW TO HORRIFY YOUR STAFF WITHOUT REALLY TRYING*

Rick Anderson, Director, Resource Acquisition;
Steven D. Zink, Vice-President for Information Resources and Technologies & Dean of Libraries, both from University Libraries, University of Nevada, Reno
Reported by Allison Mays

Steven Zink gave a brief overview of the University of Nevada-Reno and the University Libraries. The libraries are part of the Information & Technology division, so they tend to think and act differently—with a focus on technology and bringing information services to their constituency. Instead of trying to improve the users, they would rather spend more time changing and improving library services to meet the users' needs, and he felt one place to start was by making some big changes in the way the print journals were handled.

Rick Anderson then set the stage for their decision to stop checking in current print journals. He asked: What does check-in give us? Answer: The status of the current issue, publication patterns, title changes/mergers/splits, claiming mechanism, and bindery management mechanism. In his opinion, these are only useful and important if the journal collection is primarily print and if the focus is on managing information that few patrons use or care about. At Nevada, the journal collection is no longer primarily print, and they do not have sufficient staff for close management of what Rick considers irrelevant information, i.e. print journal check-in. Rick pointed out that the print journals are only 20 percent of their total journal collection.

The two questions he asks are: Is check-in worth the trouble? If so, why do we only check in the least-used 20 percent of our collection? At Nevada, they have decided that the answer to the first question is No. Addressing the second question: Even if the current issue is checked in, it may not be on the shelf anyway. Library users do not care about publication patterns. Titles/splits/mergers are now caught as "problems" as the mail is sorted (see below). Claiming is a huge waste of time and money, since 80 percent come in with no problems, and many of those that get claimed would have come in anyway, while some will never come in no matter what you do. Claiming also generates a significant number of duplicate issues, which cause lots of unnecessary work. Binding is also a waste of time and money, since bound issues are so infrequently used; plus journals are gone to the bindery for weeks, which does not help the user.

So what are they doing instead? Students apply a property stamp to all incoming issues and then shelve them in the current periodicals stacks; only popular titles get tattle-taped. (They used to tattle-tape everything, so this is another big savings in time and money.) Those journals that do not have a place in the current periodicals area get sent to the "Problems" pile to be sorted out by library staff.

Low-use journals are claimed as student workers shelving them notice gaps; high-use/high-cost journals are still checked in and claimed (Nevada still creates check-in records for new titles to use for claim generation). Instead of binding, older issues get put in pamphlet boxes and are shelved in the main stacks; only high-use and graphics-intensive titles are bound. Another thing Nevada did was beef up their document delivery, because while they do not have money for more staff, they do have money for document delivery and will get a copy of whatever the patron needs from one of several document delivery services.

The results so far have been good. Rick maintains that the patrons don't even know that most journals are not checked in and don't care. He pointed out that Nevada started very early with e-journals, and their patrons are used to them. Print journal issues get to the shelves faster. The issues never leave the building for binding. The bindery versus boxing issue is a wash; they were originally concerned that reshelving journals in the boxes would be a problem, but they're rarely used. Instead of spending $20,000 on binding, the boxing costs $4,000. The staff has been able to spend time on more important matters, such as management of the online journals.

Another important consideration in making such drastic changes was: How do you get the staff to go along with this? They had a meeting for all of the staff to explain the new procedures and to address any concerns. Rick wanted to make sure that he did not create problems in other departments and made a point of checking with them before and after these new procedures were put in place. The only comment was that the reference staff said that about once a week they wished they had check-in information; ILL was having no problems with it.

This was an intriguing session that generated some heated discussion. The presenters certainly gave us some food for thought, and it would be interesting to get an update on this topic at a future NASIG conference to see if it is still a success at Nevada.

17. *USE STUDIES: TOOLS FOR UNDERSTANDING CHANGING PATTERNS OF SERIALS USE*
Philenese Slaughter, Technical Services Coordinator, Austin Peay State University
Reported by Lisa Plymale

Driven by the rapid changes in usage of their print journals brought on by the availability of online full-text titles, workshop presenter Philenese Slaughter and the serials department at Austin Peay State University decided to scrap the paper version of their usage studies and create an online database to keep a more accurate count of their use statistics.

Two years ago, a network services librarian was hired to help them create a simple to use database that included department, title, use, and dead or alive tables. Students entered titles into the database as they reshelved each journal. The statistics were collected each semester.

The use-study database was put to the test last spring when budget cuts necessitated a journal cancellation project. In order to do this, it was felt that the database needed to be expanded to include the following tables: charges, fiscal year, standing orders, standing orders charges, vendors, and core titles. Library personnel then contacted each department to explain the cancellation project. Slaughter stressed the importance of having the support of the library director and administration and in setting firm deadlines. The list of proposed cancellations were posted on a Web page, and the use-study statistics were only provided to faculty requesting it.

As a result, the library was able to successfully cancel 45 percent of their current subscriptions and keep on good terms with the majority of their faculty. Today they are planning to again redesign the database to include cost analysis, track annual inflation rates, and create a way to link title changes.

18. *JUST IN TIME VS. JUST IN CASE: REEXAMINING THE BENEFITS OF SUBSIDIZED UNMEDIATED ORDERING (SUMO) VS. JOURNAL SUBSCRIPTION & ILL*
Louis Houle, Head, Serials and InterLibrary Loan/Document Delivery, McGill University; Chris Beckett, VP Library Services, Ingenta
Reported by Gail Julian

Louis Houle provided a follow-up to his presentation from last year's NASIG conference where he introduced McGill University Library's approach to providing swift access to journal articles through SUMO, subsidized unmediated ordering. McGill had canceled journal subscriptions due to budget constraints and needed to provide faculty, staff, and graduate students with access to needed journal articles in a prompt and efficient manner. SUMO allows the end user (excluding undergraduates) to order articles from CISTI Source without library intervention. Houle provided detailed statistics indicating cost savings of using SUMO over traditional interlibrary loan and over purchasing print and/or electronic journal subscriptions. In addition to cost savings, SUMO allows "one-stop shopping" with a 1-2 day turnaround on requests. Normally, titles owned in print or online at McGill are blocked so that filled requests are for articles not available locally. The overall average fill rate since the inception of SUMO is 92.5 percent. Articles are faxed or supplied through Ariel. A member of the audience contributed that electronic transmission of articles would likely increase user satisfaction. Houle concluded that document delivery could well be a replacement or a complementary service to traditional ILL and journal ownership, especially when dealing with the cancellation of journals.

Chris Beckett from Ingenta elaborated on the relationship between document delivery and journal ownership and explored the question, "Is document delivery used in practice to replace journal subscriptions?" Beckett cited several studies conducted from 1975 to 2001 that found no direct correlation between document delivery requests and decreased journal subscriptions. Often, document delivery requests are made by institutions that hold a subscription to the title requested. The title may be unavailable at the time of request due to binding, nonreceipt of an issue, or usage by another patron. The studies seemed to conclude that document delivery requests represent only occasional use that does not endanger publishers' subscription income. Beckett further indicated that the widespread availability of electronic access to journals through site licenses has resulted in the decline of document delivery requests.

19. *PRINT JOURNALS: OFF SITE? OUT OF SIGHT? OUT OF MIND?*

John P. Abbot, Coordinator of Collection Development, Appalachian State University; Amy K. Weiss, Coordinator of Cataloging, Appalachian State University

Reported by Ellen Simmons

In the process of building a new library, Appalachian State University (ASU) librarians began their collection renovation and reevaluation with the question of print journal storage. John P. Abbot presented the ASU experience of visualizing a modern "information commons" concept, seeing new building dollars and square footage shrink during planning time and meeting faculty resistance to bin or off-site storage.

Abbot explained how the umbrella term "library" carries user expectations, particularly in academe, of an almost icon-like repository of all print information, such as those of large Ph.D. granting research institutions. This ideal impacts how faculty expect a new library to look and act as far as storing materials. A survey found that most ASU students wanted a comfortable building with places for group and quiet study, more technology (networked computers, scanners, copiers, fax), and e-journals. Faculty wanted open stacks, wired carrels, and more print journals. ASU felt that at least two library concepts were at work: the "Just in Case" library, which faculty love and most students do not understand, and which is no longer affordable; and the "Just in Time" library, which most faculty and directors do not understand, but which makes perfect sense to undergraduate students.

Storage systems in use at other universities were looked at, including bin storage and off-site systems. However, faculty became alarmed at the bin idea and exerted pressure against it. Ultimately, the staff decided to use on-site compact shelving to house the entire print journal collection. The current periodical display shelving and reading room were eliminated. The journal collection was placed in the lowest reach of the building, de-emphasizing the print format and reflecting staff feelings that electronic access and document delivery service must, by financial necessity, replace the importance of large collections for smaller libraries.

Amy K. Weiss discussed technical service issues for stored materials. With no way to browse items held in storage, intellectual access must take place through the catalog or library Web page. Ideal remote storage provides bibliographic access and inventory control, utilizes a convenient way for users to request materials, provides delivery (including free copies or faxing), and is both secure and climate controlled. This results in a paradox, articulated by Nitecki and Kendrick (2001), that for the user, it is easier and cheaper to use low-use materials than the main collection.

Most libraries have to deal with "the only storage around" rather than the ideal situation. Users still need to know what is where and how to access it. Taking inventory, updating location changes in the catalog, and reconciling discrepancies between holdings records and the physical materials are technical services processes involved in ensuring access to stored materials. Arrangement of stored items can be done by accession number, size, or by classification paralleling the main or old collection. Weiss presented the pros and cons of alphabetical and classified shelf arrangements for compact shelving used in open collections, as ASU plans to do. Weeding materials, discarding, and recycling decisions also have a major impact on technical services processing time. Attempting to gift another library with your discards requires storage and sorting areas.

Weiss closed by raising several issues in the "print vs. electronic" debate that impact workflow for serials check-in, shelving, archiving, cataloging, statistics gathering, and staff training. Determining the role and importance of print journals for each library will continue to challenge serials librarians in the coming decade.

20. *DON'T TREAD ON ME: THE ART OF SUPERVISING STUDENT ASSISTANTS*
Jeff Slagell, Head of Serials and Interlibrary Loan, Delta State University
Reported by Daisy T. Cheng

Supervising student assistants is an art, not something you learn at library school. It is something you learn on your own, as Jeff Slagell well knows. Slagell has supervised more than 200 student assistants and has found that you can't be prepared for everything, but you can utilize general principles and develop your own supervisory style.

Slagell began this workshop by addressing some of the characteristics of student assistants: Students are at times like children, they test their boundaries, they want to see how far they can push you until they hit your limit. When they do hit that limit, many of them will respect it, but you need to be prepared for those who don't. You need to be very clear about your expectations and the type of performance you want from your students. This might be their first job, or some of them might have worked in a different type of position, so many will require a lot of supervision. Always follow up on their assignments and give immediate feedback. It's important to understand the student's perspective. An education is their top priority. You need to maintain an appropriate balance between their work schedule and their school schedule. Students will appreciate your awareness and will be more likely to be more loyal and work harder. Students should also feel that they are a part of the library. Let them not only know what they are doing, but also why they are doing it. Give them a rationale for their job tasks and how they fit into the "big picture." You also need to be aware of cultural differences and physical disabilities. People are used to certain ways of interacting because of their culture or upbringing. Something you say may be a compliment to American students, yet students from another culture may be offended by it. By being aware of their preferences and adapting to them, you can make them feel more comfortable and willing to go the extra mile. Also, you need to accommodate within reason the student who has physical difficulties. Keep in mind that student assistants' roles have changed over the years. They have become more and more important. Many students are doing what full-time staff used to be doing in the past. Several articles suggest that the first two weeks for a student is a crucial period. Again, it is important to establish your clear expectations. By doing this, they will know what to expect, and you will know what to expect from them. This will allow students to immediately know their boundaries and give them a greater sense of responsibility.

Employment status, hiring, scheduling, sign in/sign out, payroll, policies/procedures, and evaluations are the basics of working with student assistants. Slagell stressed the significance of standard sign in/sign out procedure to keep an accurate record of the time students worked. Written policies/procedures must be established and updated frequently. These can also be used as a checklist for new students and even staff members for orientations. Keep in mind that the evaluation is an ongoing process that can involve informal verbal communication on a daily basis and formal written documents every semester. Both policies/procedures and evaluations should be signed and dated by student assistants, providing documentation to follow in case some misunderstanding or problems develop later.

Slagell further suggested using a "trident approach" *to train, supervise and motivate* student assistants. Consistency is the most imperative principle to follow. Students talk to each other, and inconsistent treatment can cause confusion, complaints, and problems. General library orientation, utilizing policies/procedures as a foundation, creating a training checklist, and continuing education/testing were among the topics discussed for training student workers. He also emphasized again the importance of establishing clear expectations, following up after duties and assignments, and the use of a student contract when supervising students. Raises, recommendations, and evaluations can be used to motivate students.

A lively discussion from the audience then followed on how to express appreciation to students for their contribution to the library. Different ways proposed by the speaker that libraries can reward students are through verbal and written notices of appreciation, other small tokens, and fringe benefits.

By talking about his personal experience with problem students, Slagall also discussed the domino effect, disciplinary action, and the importance of documentation when dealing with difficult students. The audience also offered some practical solutions to the problems.

21. *THE REPORT OF THE DEATH OF THE CATALOG IS GREATLY EXAGGERATED: THE E-JOURNALS ACCESS JOURNEY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE.*
Kay Johnson, Cataloger and Geology Librarian, University of Tennessee at Knoxville; Maribeth Manoff, Systems, University of Tennessee at Knoxville.

[Ed. Note: No report for this session.]

22. *WEB-BASED TRACKING SYSTEMS FOR ELECTRONIC RESOURCES MANAGEMENT*
Robert Alan, Head, Serials Department, Pennsylvania State University; Lai-Ying Hsiung, Electronic Resources/Serials Librarian, University of California, Santa Cruz
Reported by Tonia Graves

Although both solutions are Web-based, Alan and Hsiung present different approaches to the issue of electronic resource management in their presentation. Alan, who represents Pennsylvania State University (PSU), discussed a solution designed to serve PSU's 23 campuses across the state. Hsiung represents the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC), and Hsiung's solution was designed for her library.

PSU has had an electronic resources management system in place since 1999 called ERLIC. ERLIC served its purpose well, but changes in electronic resources required changes in ERLIC. PSU determined that a successful electronic resources management system would provide information about the following: status of requests or orders, delivery issues, funding and costs, status of invoice payments, product content and coverage, proposed and finalized license agreements, and access to e-journals and databases. With these information needs in mind, ERLIC2 was designed.

Favorable features of ERLIC2 include enhanced access to licenses and sales agreements and access to current information on new trials and problem resolution. Challenges and future issues involve complying with standards and determining roles and relationships among publishers, vendors, and commercial e-journal management services.

UCSC's library, a member of the California Digital Library consortium, was considering options for managing issues related to electronic resources within its library rather than taking a multi-campus approach. Their present system of relying on individually saved e-mails was deemed undesirable, especially if an employee was absent for an extend period of time or a position was vacated. The option selected by UCSC is free software that organizes e-mails by attaching subject tickets to individual e-mails. The subject tickets are organized into e-mail threads, which are accessible by the necessary library staff.

Favorable features of the software include cost, improved communication, swift response time, simple interface, and reduced paper back up. Challenges and future issues involve archiving subject tickets for use as part of collection development decisions such as product evaluation and negotiating renewal decisions.

23. *A IS FOR ACRONYMS: LIBRARY AND INTERNET STANDARDS FOR SERIALISTS*
Shelley Neville, Library Systems Analyst, epixtech, inc.; Howard Rosenbaum, Assistant Professor of Library and Information Science, Indiana University
Reported by Sarah E. George

The rise of the Internet has caused acronyms and standards to proliferate. Shelley Neville took "the snooze out of standards" by explaining how serials standards are created and why we should care about standards and the development process. Howard Rosenbaum then led us through a web of Internet acronyms most used in libraries and industry.

Most serials-related standards are created under the jurisdiction of the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) and fall into four main groups: identifiers (e.g., ISSN), electronic data exchange (e.g., Edifact), bibliographic data exchange (e.g., MARC), and search and retrieval (e.g., Z39.50). These standards facilitate communication between publishers and suppliers, arrange data for citations, link information sources, identify a specific item or title, and simplify ILL procedures. A few de facto standards are not covered by NISO; examples include 3M circulation interchange protocol (CIP) standard for self-checkout, extensible markup language (XML) for electronic data interchange (EDI) transactions, online information exchange (ONIX) for transmission of bibliographic metadata, and open archival information services (OAIS) for long term preservation of digital information.

The process of developing a new standard is typically slow and arduous. Volunteers serve on NISO committees; feedback is sought on every proposal, and draft statements must be tested in the field, which requires two parties willing to work within similar implementation schedules. After final approval, implementation of new standards in integrated library systems may seem random, but often differing development timelines and priorities significantly influence which standards are implemented and how quickly.

Internet standards develop through formal, noncommercial structures and less controlled commercial initiatives. The Internet Committee for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), the Internet Society (ISOC), and the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) are key organizations using formal procedures to create and approve Internet standards. Their areas of influence include coordinating domain names (ICANN), facilitating the development of technical standards (ISOC), and developing common Web protocols (W3C). Industry also influences standards in an ad hoc fashion: for example, Netscape and Microsoft influenced the development of HTML in the early 1990s by creating specialized tags only used by their own browsers.

A variety of technical and metadata standards exist for Internet communication and architecture. Communication standards include transmission control protocol/internet protocol (TCP/IP), hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP), Internet Protocol Version 6 (IPv6, which theoretically would provide enough IP addresses for everyone in the world), Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers 801.11b (IEEE801.11b, which involves wireless networks), and top level domains (TLD). Architectural standards include document object model (DOM) and Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP). Metadata standards include the W3C's resource description format (RDF) and OCLC's persistent URL (PURL).

Applications standards include basic markup languages (e.g., SGML, HTML) and basic programming languages (e.g., CGI, Perl, Javascript, Java). Rosenbaum concluded his presentation with an overview of extensible markup language (XML), which he says is the application standard that is "most likely to show up on your desktop someday soon." A copy of his presentation is available: http://www.slis.indiana.edu/hrosenba/www/Pres/nasig_02/index.html.

24. *DOES A CORE EXIST? ELECTRONIC PERIODICALS AVAILABLE IN SELECTED FIELDS*

Ellen Safely, Associate Library Director for Public Services and Collections; Carolyn Henebry, Associate Library Director for Administration, both from University of Texas at Dallas

Reported by Carol Green

The University of Texas at Dallas Libraries undertook a project focusing on the selected subject areas of business, the sciences, and the social sciences to determine if the library was subscribing to core titles and if the titles were available electronically. They also wanted to find out if they were subscribing to core titles through aggregators, directly from the publisher, or by some other means.

The first step was to define "CORE." The library did this by looking at a number of standard sources that included titles for both academic and public libraries. They also looked at many standard indexes that included full text. Ultimately, if a title was included in *Magazines for Libraries*, 10th edition, 2000, and if the full text was included in *Business Periodicals Index*, A*pplied Science and Technology Index*, *General Science Index*, or *Social Sciences Index*, then the title was CORE. The sample consisted of 515 journals across multiple disciplines under the three subject areas. Disciplines not taught were excluded based on curriculum.

A number of other questions were asked. Were academic titles more available online than popular titles? Was there an online archive with the most current issues and back issues? Were articles available without a subscription through article delivery? Was any of the content free? Were CORE titles included in aggregators like EBSCO, INFOTRAC, Dow Jones, OCLC ECO, Academic Universe, EMERALD, ProQuest, Project MUSE or JSTOR?

The journals fell into four categories: current online which comes with a print subscription or can be purchased as an electronic subscription, free complete issues online, selected free issues/articles online, and no online at all from the publisher. There were major differences in current content across the subject areas. In business, only 32% of titles could be purchased as an electronic subscription, 22% were available free, 7% had selected free access, and 39% were not available online. In the social sciences, 56% could be purchased as an electronic subscription, 9% had free or selected free access, and 34% were not available online. In the sciences, 71% could be purchased as an electronic subscription, 14% had free or selected free access, and only 15% were not available online. The library found that the presence and depth of archives varied by subject area. The sciences provided archives three-fourths of the time. Business archives were available only 1/3 of the time and social sciences archives were present about two-thirds of the time. Science archives averaged about 12 years, and business archives were more in-depth than social sciences.

Content in aggregators was not found to be stable: Titles are added or removed frequently, and the content was not guaranteed to be there forever. The quality of articles varied, with electronic content from publishers often being quite different from that of aggregators. Aggregator content could be embargoed for several months, whereas this usually was not the case with publisher sites. Aggregators did not provide many CORE titles in the sciences or social sciences, so access would probably have to be purchased directly from the publisher.

Individual articles could be purchased in a variety of ways through numerous suppliers such as Ingenta/Catchword, InfoTrieve/Factiva/HighWire Press, the INFOSOURCE database, individual publishers such as ACS, and more recently through EBSCO and Elsevier ScienceDirect. The percentage of articles available for purchase proved to be fairly low across the subject areas: 30% for the sciences, 10% for business, and 33% for the social sciences.

The library concluded from the study that no matter how CORE is defined, some content is not available electronically. To get the CORE, direct subscriptions and aggregators are needed. Archives are growing but are not often deep. Document providers are numerous, and availability varies by subject area. Finally, aggregators have both pros and cons, so "buyer beware."

25. *WE HAVE MET THE ENEMY, AND SOMETIMES, HE IS US!*
Nancy J. Chaffin, Metadata Librarian, Colorado State University
Reported by Karen Jander

Nancy Chaffin first presented some of the problems of journal publishing as discussed by librarians. These problems include continuous price increases, faculty signing away copyright to publishers who then sell it back to libraries in the form of journals, and the slow production time it takes to print journals. One solution is to cancel subscriptions, which leads to higher prices and more cancelled subscriptions in an ongoing cycle. E-journals are another solution, but they have not driven down pricing and come with complicated pricing models and a complex management system. This all leads to user dissatisfaction. SPARC (Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition) and TRLN (Triangle Research Libraries Network) have published *Declaring Independence: A Guide to Creating Community Controlled Science Journals* (http://www.arl.org/sparc/DI/). Stage 1 is a diagnostic guide. Stage 2 explores alternative options such as university presses, scientific societies, academic digital initiatives, government projects such as PubMed Central, and departmental hosting. Stage 3 is evaluating the options.

Chaffin wanted to answer the question: How do library and information science journals compare to other subject areas? Do these same problems and solutions apply? Her study reviews pricing increases, copyright assignment, and publishing alternatives. She compared three subject areas: library and information science (128-139 titles), physics (91-94 titles), and sociology (33 titles). Titles with only U.S. imprints were surveyed, and prices were compared for 2000-2002. A bar chart was presented for the average price of the three subject areas for each of the three years. Library and information science increased from $119 in 2000 to $143 in 2002. Physics increased from $1,507 to $1,770, and sociology increased from $246 to $297 over those same years. The percentage price increases from 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 were 6% to 9% for library and information science. Physics stayed at 9%, and sociology stayed at 10%. Library and information science also compared similarly to physics and sociology in copyright assignment. Chaffin reviewed titles to see if the publisher retained full rights, if the author retained some rights, or all rights remained with the author. 58% of library and information science authors gave up their full rights, compared to 68% of physics and 62% in sociology. 38% of library and information science authors retained some rights, compared to 40% in physics and 36% in sociology. Only 2% of authors retained all their rights in sociology and library and information science, while none retained any rights to their work in physics. Current alternatives in all three disciplines are free Web journals, low cost subscriptions, and preprint services. These services are funded by subscribers, author subsidized, institution supported, government sponsored, or funded by societies.

Journal publishing in library and information science is not showing any significant difference than either physics or sociology. We are still exploring alternatives and still handling copyright the same.

Chaffin is still developing this study and would like to hear any thoughts on its usefulness and any ideas that would make it more useful. Her e-mail is nancy.chaffin@colostate.edu.

26. *ELECTRONIC JOURNALS AND AGGREGATED DATABASES: NEW ROLES FOR PUBLIC SERVICE LIBRARIANS*

Jeanie M. Welch, Business Librarian, University of North Carolina, Charlotte; Melissa Holmberg, Electronic Resources/Science Librarian, Minnesota State University, Mankato
Reported by Donna Packer

Jeanie Welch provided a provocative subtitle for her portion of the presentation: *"Hey!!!! What about us?!? Transformed roles of subject specialists and reference librarians in the age of electronic resources."* Welch reported that her first inspiration for this presentation came from a session she had attended at ALA, where some reference librarians had reported feeling their roles as materials selectors and subject specialists have somehow been diminished in this electronic age. The traditional pattern of reviewing subscriptions and recommending new titles based on a given title's relevance, quality, relationship to the existing collection, the curriculum, potential use based on the availability of indexing and abstracting, and cost seems to have been swept aside in this era of bundled subscriptions and aggregator packages. Long-established evaluation patterns such as use studies, interlibrary loan requests, and citation analyses based on content needs seem to have been replaced by technical evaluative criteria such as networking demands, licensing negotiations, and consortial agreements.

In her lively talk, Welch impressed upon us that the subject specialist role is still much needed; indeed, the role is perhaps more important than ever as the criteria to be considered grow ever more complex and the purchasing power of our acquisitions budgets continues to decline. Now, as so many libraries must make hard choices about their subscriptions, all the traditional evaluative points must be considered, with the added criteria regarding electronic availability, and whether access will be title specific or through some database aggregation.

Welch turned her experience in reviewing subscriptions for an upcoming accreditation and necessary cancellation project for one of her university's business departments into a case study. She began with an analysis of the subscription list against the Harvard University Baker Library list of core titles and the list of titles indexed in the *Business Periodicals Index*. She created a spreadsheet for circulation to the faculty showing where titles were available both in print and electronically. She found she could not trust the aggregator title lists of what is full text and for how long; she checked every single title. In negotiating with her faculty she found she had to be clear about the total dollar amount available to spend, and to reach compromises on some issues: For example, new titles had to be indexed in a database, so articles would be accessible to students.

Welch found checking the accuracy of data to be entered into the spreadsheet extremely time consuming. She found it difficult to know how exactly to factor in embargoes and moving walls of access. Reaching compromise and balancing the sometimes-competing needs of faculty researchers, graduate students, and undergraduates was often difficult. And perhaps most difficult of all was handling the fear of "going bare"—of deciding to rely on an aggregator database for access to full text of a title, only to have the contract dissolved and the title vanish from the database.

Melissa Holmberg described a very different role, that of electronic resources librarian as it is evolving at her library. Minnesota State University-Mankato offers more than 14,000 electronic serials (with some management help provided by Serials Solutions software) from more than 100 different electronic resources, including indexes and other electronic reference materials. Holmberg's assigned mission is to "provide leadership in developing and integrating electronic resources into the library's reference and instruction programs," which clearly provides her with considerable scope. She provides, as a matter of routine, instruction on major database changes for the library staff, tracks license agreements, collects and utilizes usage statistics, serves as the primary contact person regarding purchasing and other points for all electronic resources, gives notifications on service interruptions, monitors consortium arrangements, and so on.

Holmberg has forged a wonderful partnership with the instructional technology unit on her campus. The IT group gives workshops for faculty in incorporating technology into the classroom, and they wanted to involve the library. During 90-minute sessions, the non-librarian instructional technology person talks about the how and why of using "push" technology to get journal articles and other information to students, such as by e-mail and the use of Web sites. Holmberg, speaking for the library, talks about the "what" to make available this way and some of the considerations such as durable links and how the proxy server works. She demonstrates some of the differences in the available resources. During these sessions she is able to introduce the legal issues, particularly with regard to copyright and the necessity to authenticate users. She also provides the faculty who attend with a list of databases which freely permit linking to full text, and notes on which databases have specific requirements around linking, such as those that have links that automatically expire after 30 days, or those which require that links be deleted at the end of a course or assignment.

Holmberg reported that there is a lot of interaction at these sessions, and they provide wonderful opportunities for faculty to get answers to their questions about the library in general and its electronic resources in particular. There is a considerable investment of time in preparation, participation, and follow up for these workshops, but Holmberg has found this investment provides a tremendous return. The faculty who attend have a much clearer understanding of the issues surrounding electronic access and the ramifications of various choices both with regard to acquiring content and to making it available to students and faculty. It also leads to significantly increased use of those electronic resources. Perhaps best of all, it has promoted much better and more informed relationships among the library staff, instructional technology staff, and the teaching faculty.

27. *THE BATTLE AT THE DUMPSTER AND OTHER STORIES: PROCESSING THE CENSORSHIP*

Stephanie (Step) Schmitt, Manager of Serials Services, Yale Law Library

Reported by Denise Novak

Schmitt began her workshop with several slides of the covers of "controversial" books including *Turner Diaries* (found in Timothy McVeigh's car), *Meet Us at the Sign of the Fiery Cross*, part of an unprocessed collection from the University of Mississippi, *The Anarchist Cookbook*, and the covers from various periodicals: *Playboy*, *The Advocate*, and the *Sports Illustrated* swimsuit issue.

She related some of her personal experiences in the area of censorship and went on to explain that censorship exists in libraries, is present in all areas of a library, and that it may be carried out by anyone no matter what the position or rank.

Some of the methods and types of censorship occur in acquisitions and cataloging. Examples include neglect in placing the order; adding processing notes that dictate location, security level, or special handling; neglecting to receive/process the order; returning the material to the publisher; throwing out, discarding or stealing the material; or refusing to process the material. In serials receipt and binding there can be censorship by throwing the material away, neglecting to check in items, stealing issues, or refusal to process the material.

Schmitt presented true scenarios from the workplace as examples of censorship. A couple of illustrations from the scenarios given:

In a special collections and archives department there are several boxes of Ku Klux Klan pamphlets, recruitment flyers and other materials, which have been received and collected over decades. They've been left unprocessed because of content, "repulsion" that they exist, opinions that they should be destroyed, emotional distress complaints, and general embarrassment.

The library receives a particular issue every year as part of a weekly subscription. The clerk is told to do her best to preserve the issue, as it is routinely lost, destroyed, or left in pieces among the stacks. She attempts to clothe a few of the main photographs by using tattle stickers placed strategically throughout the issue. Within two days of receipt, the issue is "lost" and never found.

Several members of the audience offered their own experiences to corroborate Schmitt's stories.

The presentation moved on to management's obligations. These obligations include clear policy; library-wide application of that policy and consistent, clear enforcement; library-wide understanding of expectations; fair and equitable judgment; open debate; and accountability. There are also legal responsibilities that must be considered. The workplace must prevent and punish harassment, workers have a right to be protected from harm, and minors (students who are underage) must be considered.

There are solutions to these issues, which include allowing staff to state their objections, implementing alternative workflows, keeping appropriate groups and persons such as higher administrative personnel aware of all situations, and being accountable to policy and your own expectations.

NETWORKING NODES

CATALOGING
Reported by Evelyn Brass, University of Houston

More than 100 persons were in attendance at the cataloging node, which Evelyn Brass of the University of Houston convened. First on the program was Regina Reynolds of the Library of Congress and Becky Culbertson of the University of California, San Diego. They presented the idea of creating only a primary record in OCLC for cataloging e-journals instead of a new record each time the aggregator changed. Regina stated that using one primary record for each e-journal in OCLC would suffice and not cause such a proliferation of records. By using one primary record for each title, each library could edit the record by adding local information, including the URL, and, if necessary, the aggregator.

Next on the program were Anne Mitchell and Jill Emery of the University of Houston who shared their practices for cataloging e-journals. Their decision to use a separate record for each online version was motivated by the complexity of their multi-campus catalog and the necessity of adding and deleting records in batch. Anne and Jill went on to discuss their upcoming plans for turning tabular coverage data from their e-journal management system (TDNet) into customized MARC records that can be replaced at intervals with an entirely new data set, eliminating the need for record-by-record updates.

Last on the program was Sharon Saunders of Bates College who spoke on cataloging procedures for e-journals at Bates College. They fully catalog e-journals, which appear in stable aggregator databases, such as JSTOR. They use the print version of records, if they own the print issues, adding the URL. Otherwise, they use the online records for cataloging their e-journals.

PRESERVATION ISSUES
Facilitated and reported by Fran Wilkinson, The University of New Mexico

The preservation issues networking node had ten participants in attendance, mostly serials or acquisitions librarians with preservation responsibilities. Fran Wilkinson introduced herself, shared a little about her background, and asked attendees to do the same and to identify their interests. Topics of interest included staff and user education campaigns, binding in general, bindery modules of integrated library systems (ILSs) and commercial binder systems interfacing with ILSs, disaster preparedness planning, book repair vs. buying a copy from an out-of-print dealer, digitalization, getting support from the administration for preservation activities, and what other libraries are doing in preservation in general.

The small but enthusiastic group shared their concerns and knowledge on these issues and gave each other tips on where they have found helpful resources. Most libraries represented do not have a preservation officer or a separate preservation unit, so this type of information sharing is invaluable. A couple of libraries represented have conducted small staff and user education campaigns, with one having a “Preservation Awareness Day.” The long awaited *ANSI/NISO/LBI Standard for Library Binding*, replacing the *Library Binding Institute Standard for Library Binding*, 8th edition, with its “stress test” information for different binding types, was briefly discussed. Concerns about the usefulness of ILS binding modules vs. commercial binder-provided systems was touched upon, with no definitive answer being reached. Many libraries have or are working on disaster preparedness plans. Plans should cover non-paper (MFM, audio, video, photographs, etc.) as well as paper recovery. All agreed that it is crucial to keep information on local contacts up to date and to either register with or have information readily available about a disaster recovery service before a disaster happens. The perennial question, “At what point is a deteriorating volume repaired?” elicited some discussion. At least one library often finds it less expensive to order a replacement copy from the many out-of-print dealers’ online services. Disposition of materials replaced in microfilm or electronic format continues to be a problem for libraries because of the regulations imposed. Most libraries cannot discard or give away materials, even to another government agency. Preservation of various formats, including audio and videotapes, LPs, and photographic collections was discussed. In some cases these media can/should be reformatted, but budgets rarely provide for this. Several digitization projects were discussed. All agreed that the biggest problems facing preservation in libraries are the lack of money, space, and staff—the same problems facing most organizations and departments. Preservation often falls to the bottom of the list for budgetary needs. The importance of properly educating the library’s administration, including the development officer, regarding raising funds for preservation activities was stressed.

Once again this year, everyone enjoyed the preservation node and agreed that it should be repeated next year!

PUBLIC LIBRARIES
Reported by Gloria Guzi, Serials Librarian, Cleveland Public Library

The public library networking node consisted of librarians from several large and medium-sized libraries, along with representatives from a major subscription vendor. Electronic issues dominated the discussion.

The first issue discussed was the apparent reluctance of certain publishers to permit remote access to public libraries out of a concern for overuse or misuse. This led to a discussion about alternative pricing models and the need for public libraries to set provisions that restrain them from saying "yes" to a product too quickly if those provisions are not met.

Another issue discussed was the time required to negotiate licenses. Two librarians stated that the majority of their time is now spent working on the access and licensing issues involving electronic products, with much of the work involving print titles being delegated to other staff members. One vendor representative stated that his company offers assistance in negotiating licenses to libraries. One way is for the library to outsource its license negotiations to the vendor to whom the library signs over power-of-attorney after defining critical issues. The other way is for the library to write its own license and allow the vendor to negotiate on the basis of that license.

A third issue discussed was system migration. Most of the libraries represented were either in the process of selecting a new ILS or actually migrating to a new one. The librarians described difficulties they were experiencing in looking for the level of functionality to which they have been accustomed. It was suggested that librarians should attend the NASIG user group meetings where vendors take in information and set priorities.

Finally, while all public libraries represented purchase subscriptions to many online databases, and while a few research-oriented public libraries purchase subscriptions to JSTOR and Project Muse, public libraries, in general, have yet to make the leap in purchasing large electronic journal packages. The consensus was that, to some degree, public libraries would always have a need for print as well.

REFERENCE AND PUBLIC SERVICES LIBRARIANS
Convened and reported by Jeff Bullington

The reference and public services networking node discussion centered on the topic of electronic journal management systems such as Serials Solutions and TDNet and how they are impacting reference services. To start discussion, participants were asked to identify whether their library had already implemented a system or were in the process of selecting one. Roughly half of the participants indicated that they had implemented a system, and the majority of those remaining were in the selection process. Most participants named either Serials Solutions or TDNet as systems they have or were considering. The role of reference librarians in helping people learn of the systems and what they can do is something that librarians seem to be taking up quite readily. Incorporating information about the systems into their reference interactions and library instruction are ways to broadcast awareness; making the link to these systems clearly visible on library Web pages is another. Using the systems in working with patrons does help cut down on confusion as to whether or not a title is available on site, therefore providing patrons with access to a much broader array of journals, and also helping decrease the number of incorrect ILL requests. Participants reported that patrons appear to adapt quite readily to using these systems once they learn of them. All in all, participants expressed great enthusiasm in electronic journal management systems and their positive impact on providing reference services to library patrons.

The discussion closed with participants commenting on the growing amount of NASIG programming that touches directly on reference and public services and how beneficial this is to librarians who may work primarily in serials units but who do provide a great amount of reference service. A conference like NASIG, providing the opportunity for discussion more focused on serials as well as public service issues, is much appreciated.

SERIALS HOLDINGS
Facilitated by Alfred Kraemer, Head of Technical Services, Medical College of Wisconsin, and Frieda Rosenberg, Head of Serials Cataloging, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Reported by Sharon Wiles

The networking node on serials holdings was well attended, and many of the participants had good questions and experiences to offer each other. Alfred Kraemer began the session by presenting a general overview of uses and new developments in serial holdings. He discussed uses such as displaying of serials holdings data for multi-formats and linking of holdings. Local serials holdings can be linked to citations in databases and then, if available, linked directly to the full text. The OpenURL and CrossRef provide the mechanisms to link serial holdings information to citations and full text. Also, the Z39.50 protocol will allow the searching and displaying of library holdings in a library network, or this protocol will allow searching selected library online catalogs and provide a display of their holdings. New technologies such as SFX use a single interface to provide meta-searching. Meta-searching allows the searcher to enter a search once, and it will be executed in different databases, including online systems, and the results will display relevant titles and citations found in multi-formats.

Next, the new developments were discussed. The participants were reminded of the OCLC announcement of the batch loading of holdings service. This allows the holdings from the local library system to be loaded into the OCLC database. OCLC can now accept Level 4 detailed holdings and load them into an LDR. Then a question was raised about batch loading SERHOLD data (serial holdings held in the National Library of Medicine's database) to OCLC, and it was reported that this will be possible by the end of this year. The next question addressed the availability of holdings records delivered with bibliographic records for purchase, but there were no examples or information to share on this topic. The discussion shifted to the question of displaying holdings to the user for titles available in various formats. The importance of how to effectively display both print and electronic should lead to our local decisions of displaying holdings using the single bibliographic record or using multiple bibliographic records. Finally, the CONSER publication pattern project was discussed. It was reported that the project is moving ahead, and currently, there are over 45,000 patterns added to OCLC serial records in the 891 fields. Ex Libris, VTLS, and III have successfully loaded patterns from OCLC into their local systems. Participants were encouraged to get involved with this project and to use this pattern information.

The second part of the node, led by Frieda Rosenberg, dealt with serial holding implementation and compliance issues. She asked the audience about their system's holdings implementations and what was working and what was not working. The participants offered examples and further discussed how to determine if their library system is MARC holdings compliant. Jean Hirons offered information about how CONSER will pair up with the vendors to begin discussions on complying with the US MARC holdings standard, so we can expect more information about system holdings compliance issues. One of the participants made the comment that she was glad to see the interest in holdings, and as librarians more fully understand the MARC holdings format, we can communicate more effectively with our vendors. More specific questions and points were made about functional requirements in our holdings/check-in systems, such as how systems handle numbers that are received out of sequence, how systems translate seasonal codes to display in the OPAC, how systems handle indexes and supplements in the 864 and 865 fields, and how systems collapse holding displays for titles that have chronology in the first level of enumeration. Participants offered different ways their systems handled these situations, and this discussion provided us with some concrete examples to check in our respective systems. A philosophical question was then raised that even if your system is not compliant or does not display certain codes in the OPAC, should we code our records according to the standard, so when the system does become fully compliant our holdings displays will be standard? This is an excellent point because the serials community will be articulating compliance requirements to the system vendors, and in the meantime, we should code according to standards. It was clear that this is the next important step in fully implementing serial holdings.

This node provided good information to all participants, and the sharing of information was wonderful. We learned of new developments and of future developments. We heard of recent migrations and of planning for migrations to new systems. I am sure at next year's NASIG networking node there will be more examples of new uses for serials holdings, new technologies that will highlight holdings, and some further information about compliance issues from our systems vendors.

USERS GROUPS

ENDEAVOR/VOYAGER
Facilitated by Maggie Rioux, and Bob Persing
Reported by Faye R. Leibowitz

Twenty-nine people attended this meeting. There was no staff from Endeavor in attendance.

Much of the discussion focused on impending Voyager upgrades. The version 2001.1 beta test went smoothly. Version 2001.2 will soon be beta tested by Cornell College and possibly by the University of Pennsylvania. The general release of this version is expected in September or October of 2002.

Voyager 2001.1 includes optional WebVoyage patron personalization "MyOPAC" options, as well as modifications to bindery options in the Acquisitions Client. These new options need to be "switched on" by the library if desired—the new software release default is for them to be turned off. The bindery modifications include generation of a list of items that are ready to be pulled for binding. This feature might only work in conjunction with the "collapse holdings" function.

Version 2001.1 will allow specification of criteria in SysAdmin for creation of hot links between related bibliographic records in both the OPAC and the Cataloging Client. These links are created using data in $w or $x of serial linking fields.

Version 2001.2 includes many changes for the Circulation Client.

An upcoming release will convert data to Unicode format to support non-Roman scripts. Windows 2000 is required to use the Unicode release. However, some meeting participants indicated that they have experienced problems using Voyager with Windows 2000, such as inability to "wrap" fields. It was reported that a patch has been made available to correct the "field wrap" problem.

Voyager's "simultaneous searching" function was discussed. Some meeting participants said that "Voyager to Voyager" simultaneous searching seems to work well, but Z39.50 connections to non-Voyager sites don't seem to work as well. In version 2001.1, subdirectories merge different types of searches.

Endeavor/Voyager has reconvened the Acquisitions Task Force, which was last convened in 1999, to gather enhancement proposals from Voyager Acquisitions users. Suggested enhancements should be forwarded to Bob Persing (persing@ pobox.upenn.edu) or acq@endinfosys.com. The task force is reranking its original list of enhancements to determine if original priorities are still valid.

The nature of "receipt" of monographs vs. serials generated much interest. The function of a purchase order is different for serials than it is for monographs. The types of statistics which can be generated for each format from purchase orders differ. For example, receipt of monographic firm orders can provide statistics about how many monographic items have been ordered, but this is not true for serials, because each item checked in is not correlated to an individual purchase order.

Use of publication pattern data was also discussed. Some of the suggested enhancements relating to publication patterns were that more patterns should be listed, "components" should be able to move from one purchase order to another, and that the check-in record should "talk" to the MFHD, so that collapsing holdings would not automatically create a separate line in the OPAC display. It was noted that the proprietary, non-standard pattern system in Voyager hinders application of CONSER-created patterns appearing on bibliographic records.

EX LIBRIS USA
Maggie Horn and Michael Kaplan, co-conveners
Reported by Maggie Horn

Every year the Ex Libris Users Group expands: This year, 24 folks, representing 17 different institutions, dropped by to share experiences or to get a head start on migration concerns. Michael Kaplan, Ex Libris USA, brought us up to date on the serials-specific enhancements to the ALEPH500 software. Much of the improvement is in the prediction fields that will move to the MARC holdings record.

Unlike previous years, there was a mix of institutions, including those with actual experience using the system, and even upgrading to 14.2. Therefore, there was a more lively discussion of loading pattern files, loading vendor files, and claiming. Now that there is a good base to build on, the group requested that some kind of "expert" database be built so that we can continue to share insights and ask questions. Maggie Horn, SUNY System Administration, volunteered to use the sign-in sheet to begin such a list.

INNOVATIVE INTERFACES
Convened and reported by Nancy Norton and Stephanie Schmitt

To an audience of more than 50 attendees, the III Interest Group meeting began with an informal survey about conversion. About one-third of the audience is already using Millennium products. Another one-third were planning to convert within the next six months. The remaining one-third had no immediate conversion plans. The first questions from the audience were about conversion. At issue were the technical specifications for both the workstation and server environments. The rule of thumb is to have III support staff evaluate the current resources and make recommendations for server upgrades prior to converting to Millennium. The minimum workstation requirements are found on the Customer Service Direct Web site in the FAQ titled Millennium Administration under System and Network Administration. In general, however, more RAM and a faster processor on the PC workstation enhances operational speed. Nancy Norton then presented several key issues regarding recent Millennium Serials enhancements including the following: an increase in the number of record templates (1,000 per record type), the use of preferred templates based on login preferences, a new record editor, capability to limit the view as well as the activities for modes and tabs, the option for multiple windows display, more options for the public display, the ability to copy records (including check-in cards), and the addition of the 007 and 008 in the check-in record. Specific to Millennium Serials are the following enhancements: check-in message (whereby a window pops up with a message for the processing staff), the ability to claim all when claiming, the ability to sort before sending out claims, the ability to automatically update the holdings field during check-in and binding processing, and the preservation of item record circulation statistics when collapsing multiple item records into one item after binding. New optional products presented are the e-check-in for batch check-in of print and electronic journals, a bindery interface for sending bindery shipments electronically (LARS only at this time), and e-journal holdings update for batch update of summary holdings statements.

Audience questions covered MARC21 holdings and what it takes for a library to convert from textual holdings to the full implementation of the MARC21 Format for Holdings Data. The system cannot convert the existing free-text holdings in the "Lib Has" field to a formatted MARC "LIB HAS" because the data itself cannot be parsed accurately. Discussion also included questions regarding what is a bug versus what is an enhancement request. An example of this topic is the public OPAC display of the data stored in the 260 subfield c. It appears that the display is limited to the last four characters in that field, thus it does not display the information correctly. The persons reporting the problem were told that the fix should be requested in an enhancement request. The audience was encouraged to let III know which software behavior they consider to be a bug, especially when a feature that has functioned previously stops working.

Following a Q&A with the audience, Nancy Norton gave a presentation on Millennium Serials in release 2002 that may soon be available on the III Web site at: http://csdirect.iii.com/ppt/ [Only III users have access].

Release 2002 PH. 2 is expected to be available to the general user population in October 2002. The release is currently undergoing beta testing.

SIRSI
Convened and reported by Pat Meyer

There were 36 lively participants at the Sirsi Users Group. Sirsi representatives Cathy Jones, Product Manager for Acquisitions and Serials Systems, and Chuck Leachman, Director of Academic Libraries, were put through their paces. While most attendees had Unicorn 2001, over a third were former DRA customers curious about what Sirsi has to offer.

There are two releases of Workflows planned for 2002. Improvements seem to concentrated in Acquisitions Ordering: expanded search options, electronic data interface (EDI) ordering using X-12 (plans to beta test orders this summer), a "Received" Wizard, browsing of titles and hot keys (many users already create custom shortcuts for both hot keys and mouse movements using separate macro software packages).

Sirsi more than doubled their programming staff to accommodate the needs of both current customers and the upcoming migrations (126 scheduled through next spring).

Things planned for the 2003 release are: browsing titles in cataloging, ADA compliance for the public interface, load programs to minimize keystrokes for Web-based orders (e.g. Title Source II and GOBI; plan to beta test in 2002) and easier label production. Many of the programmers who previously worked on Unicorn Workflows and DRA Taos are working together to design Sirsi's new version of the Workflows client. They will update many of the Workflows screens and Wizards, incorporating some of the nicer features from Taos cataloging.

Sirsi is evaluating their MARC 21 compliance to determine the new coding and displays for integrating resources and MARC holdings. Send details of any specific examples of non-compliance to Web-based forums and the help desk.

It was revealed that several customers had old unresolved problems/requests. In many cases, there is a quick fix with a bit of education/training. There appear to be issues that either go unreported to Sirsi or Sirsi's responses aren't relayed back to the person who initiated the issue. Internal communication concerns aside, we asked what would help SIRSI prioritize our requests for new features or enhancements? Cathy responded that users should be as specific as possible, use Web-based forums, inform Sirsi of opportunities to attend organized task force meetings, and alert SIRSI if a competitor ILS vendor plans to offer (or already has) it.

A lot of questions were not answered at the session, but Cathy Jones gamely offered to get back to us on issues. Detailed notes of our discussion and subsequent responses will be posted to SIRSI and DRA listservs in July.

MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING

Meg Mering, NASIG Secretary

1. Call to Order and Welcome

President Maggie Rioux convened the meeting at 8:30 a.m. on June 21, 2002. She introduced the 2001/02 officers and Board members. Beverley Geer was introduced as the Parliamentarian.

2. Highlights from June Meeting of the Executive Board

Meg Mering, Secretary, presented the following highlights from the June 19, 2002, Board meeting:

NASIG has 1,233 paid members.

The membership brochure has been revised. A brochure was included in each conference packet. It has been translated into Spanish. It will be translated into French.

This past spring, a focus group investigated the feasibility of online conference registration. An implementation team will be formed shortly. It is hoped that online registration will be available for the 2003 conference.

The Strategic Planning Task Force, chaired by Carol MacAdam, has been appointed to produce, with member input, the next vision statement: "NASIG 2015."

3. Treasurer's Report

Denise Novak reported that the financial picture of NASIG remains positive. Although most of the conferences' expenses have yet to be paid, D. Novak felt a surplus would be made on the Williamsburg conference. Committee expenditures are on target for this time of year.

4. Awards

a. Outgoing Board members

M. Rioux presented awards to outgoing Board members Connie Foster, Meg Mering, Donnice Cochenour, and Christa Easton.

b. Outgoing Committee Chairs

M. Rioux presented awards to outgoing Committee Chairs Claire Dygert (Awards & Recognition), Robert Cleary (Bylaws), Evelyn Council and Birdie MacLennan (Continuing Education), Yumin Jiang and Bob Persing (Electronic Communications), *Newsletter* (Steve Savage), Markel Tumlin (Nominations & Elections), and Jeff Bullington (Publications) and recognized committee members.

c. 2002 CPC Co-Chairs

M. Rioux presented awards to CPC Co-Chairs Stephen Clark and Joyce Tenney and thanked them for their tremendous efforts in coordinating the 2002 conference. S. Clark introduced committee members: Ladd Brown, Lauren Corbett, Rachel Frick, Sharon Gasser, Diane Hollyfield, JoAnn Keyes, Merle Kimball Steve Murden, Allison Sleeman, and Beth Weston.

Greg Roepke, husband of J. Tenney, honorary member of CPC and "CEO of NASIG Ground-Air Transportation," received a special award for his volunteer efforts on behalf of NASIG and CPC.

d. 2002 PPC Co-Chairs

M. Rioux presented awards to Lisa Macklin and Michael Somers, the two outgoing Chairs, and thanked them for their service. Kate Manuel will again be serving as a Co-Chair in 2002/03. Committee members were recognized: Eve Davis, June Garner, Joseph Harmon, Charity Martin, Lanell Rabner, Connie Roberts, Rose Robischon, Jim Stickman, Sharon Sullivan, and Gale Teaster.

5. Recognition

a. Continuing Committee Chairs

M. Rioux recognized continuing Committee Chairs: Joan Lamborn (Awards & Recognition), Kathryn Wesley (Database & Directory), Beth Holley (Evaluation & Assessment), Kate Manuel (Program Planning Committee), and Laurie Sutherland (Regional Councils & Membership Committee) and recognized committee members for their service.

b. Online Registration Focus Group

M. Rioux recognized the members of the focus group: Yumin Jiang (Chair), Jill Emery, Jessica Meek, Eric Lease Morgan, and Stephanie Schmitt. She thanked them for their excellent report to the Board and for their work.

c. *Proceedings* Editors for 2001 and 2002

M. Rioux recognized Susan Scheiberg and Shelley Neville, the Co-Editors of the 2001 *Proceedings*. She also recognized Jennifer Edwards who served as the Indexer and Mircea Stefanacu who served as the Web Editor of the 2001 *Proceedings*. S. Scheiberg and S. Neville will also serve as the editors of the 2002 *Proceedings*.

d. Honorary life membership

M. Rioux recognized Marcia Tuttle as the first person to receive an honorary NASIG life membership.

6. Greetings from Peer Associations

a. United Kingdom Serials Group (UKSG)

Christine Fyfe, President of UKSG, reported on UKSG's 25th annual conference and exhibition. It was held at the University of Warwick. Five hundred and fifty delegates attended the conference. M. Rioux attended the conference. C. Fyfe thanked NASIG for the plaque commemorating UKSG's 25th anniversary that had been presented by M. Rioux.

b. German Serials Interest Group (GeSIG)

Hartmut Walravens reported that the interest group is now three years old. Although GeSIG has yet to have its own conference, it has met in conjunction with the Frankfurt Book Fair. H. Walravens would like to gather program ideas for the 2003 IFLA conference, which will be held in Berlin.

c. Australian Serials Special Interest Group (ASSIG)

M. Rioux read a statement prepared by Nathalie Schulz, the past secretary of ASSIG. The statement summarized ASSIG's activities in the past year. In July 2001, Alfred Gans retired as managing director of RoweCom Australia and as ASSIG treasurer. In August 2001, the seminar "E-journal, E-commerce, and the Flow of Knowledge" was held in Melbourne. In May 2002, a joint annual general meeting was held with the Acquisitions National Section in Sydney.

7. New Business

M. Rioux introduced new officers and Board members. Vice President/President-Elect is Anne McKee, who previously served as a Member-at-Large. Beatrice Caraway is the new Secretary. The new Members-at-Large are Daniel Jones, Bob Persing, and Joyce Tenney.

8. 2003 Preview

a. Program Planning Committee

Sherrie Sullivan, a Co-Chair of the 2003 Program Planning Committee, announced that the theme for 2003 conference would be "Serials in the Park: Blazing Diverse Trails in the Information Forest." Program proposals should be submitted to B. Caraway, the new NASIG Secretary, by August 1. New this year, biographical information about each speaker should be included as part of proposals.

b. Conference Planning Committee

Wendy Stewart, a Co-Chair of the 2003 Conference Planning Committee, welcomed everyone to attend the conference at Portland State University in Oregon June 26-29, 2003. For the first time, conference attendees will be staying in hotels rather than campus housing.

9. Additional Business and Constituents' Concerns

Susan Davis asked everyone who had attended all 17 of NASIG's conferences to stand and be recognized.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 a.m.

CEC MENTORING PROGRAM 2002

Submitted by Carole Bell, Co-Chair, CEC Mentoring Program

The CEC Mentoring Program is designed to match first-timers to the NASIG Conference with folks who have attended more than one meeting. Partners contact each other before the conference to chat about how the conference works, what to wear, etc. At the conference, they meet at the mentor reception and have a chance to get to know each other.

Once again, the CEC Mentoring Program and reception was a great success. We had more than 50 pairs sign up for the program. The reception was held in the lovely colonial Alumni House of the College of William and Mary. Evaluations indicate a general good feeling about the program. Most people feel it is very beneficial for both newcomers and long-time conference attendees.

Some comments from participants:

"My favorite part of the experience was meeting all of the different librarians from various fields. This reassured me that a career in serials would not leave me isolated in a vacuum as I felt in library school. The opportunity to meet so many people who were willing to provide guidance, camaraderie, and support was refreshing."

Favorite part of the experience: "Explaining about NASIG and sharing the conference with someone new to it helped me to see it with new eyes. It gave me the opportunity to remember/recount all the reasons why NASIG means so much to me on so many different levels."

"The best part of the program is knowing that there is at least one person from the very beginning that you would know. My mentor was excellent. She took every opportunity to introduce me to people. She made me feel very welcome. This program definitely has value. I really felt that I could ask my mentor any silly little question, and she would answer it, passing no judgment at all. She was very helpful."

"I have been a mentor every year it has been offered, and it was nice to see my old mentees again this year. They all remembered me and our conference together. It must have been a good experience because they have all returned."

MEXICO STUDENT CONFERENCE GRANT

Submitted by Elizabeth Parang, Continuing Education Committee

The NASIG Mexico Student Conference Grant award supports the cost of travel and expenses for a Mexican library science student to attend NASIG's annual conference. Two years ago, the NASIG Board recognized that Mexico does not offer an ALA-accredited graduate library program. Instead, Mexican library students follow an intensive 4 1/2-year undergraduate program plus an internship, professional thesis, professional oral exam, and a foreign language exam. The Board created the NASIG Mexico Student Conference Grant for the 2001 conference in San Antonio and decided to offer it again in 2002. This year's Mexico Student Conference Grant team included Lisa Furubotten and Elizabeth Parang of CEC, Claire Dygert and Linda Lewis of A&R, and Viviano Milan Martinez, last year's award recipient. Together they coordinated with a group of distinguished professors in Mexico: Dr. Filiberto Felipe Martínez Arellano, Mtro. Mario Alberto Delgado Andrade, Robert Endean Gamboa, Lourdes Rovalo de Robles, and Dr. Jesus Lau. The group selected the recipient for the 2002 Mexico Student Conference Grant: Paula de la Mora Lugo from the Colegio de Bibliotecología at Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM).

Lisa arranged the details of travel and accommodations for Paula from Mexico to Virginia, including last-minute crisis phone calls to the American Consulate. Elizabeth documented procedural guidelines, including a timeline, sample announcements, and letters. Remaining problem areas, such as timing around important holidays, were identified. In the future the administration of the NASIG Mexico Conference Grant will be moving to the Awards & Recognition Committee. During the upcoming year, Lisa Furubotten and Elizabeth Parang of the Continuing Education Committee will be coordinating that transition with Joe Hinger, a newly appointed member of the Awards & Recognition Committee.

NASIG PROFILE

Allison Sharp

Eleanor I. Cook, NASIG President

Recently, during the conference in Williamsburg, I had the opportunity to sit down and talk to our new President, Eleanor I. Cook. It was quite a pleasant experience, as Eleanor quickly put me at ease. We chatted for a while in the cafeteria with her mentee Pauline La Rooy, winner of the Horizon Award, then moved across the street to the coffee shop.

Personally, Eleanor has just recently gotten married. She is a life member of her local humane society and has two dogs and two cats that she considers her babies. She enjoys gardening, cooking, and traveling. Professionally, she began her library career working as a library clerk while in college. After graduation, she worked in the acquisitions department of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and then completed her MSLS. She really enjoyed acquisitions and wanted to remain in that area, but when she began job hunting, the first professional position she obtained was as a serials cataloger at the Georgia Institute of Technology. She found that she really liked serials. After one year in Atlanta, she moved back to North Carolina and took a position as a serials cataloger at North Carolina State University. She spent six years there, starting off as a serials cataloger and moving up to serials cataloging section head. In 1990 she made her way to Appalachian State University, where she has remained ever since, serving as the coordinator of serials. She now has the best of both worlds—acquisitions and serials together!

Eleanor's history with NASIG began in 1988 at the third annual conference in Atlanta, Georgia. She was convinced to attend by Christie Degener, one of the select all-timers. It took quite a bit of determination for Eleanor to make it to that first conference. Her institution did not provide financial support, so a co-worker who had received funding for NASIG offered to split her money with Eleanor if she would drive. Since then, Eleanor has served in many capacities for NASIG. She started out on the Student Grant Committee (1991-94). She also served on the North Carolina Site Selection Task Force (1993-94), the Conference Planning Committee (1994-95), and was elected to the Executive Board as a Member-at-Large for 1995-97 and 1997-99. In addition to these responsibilities, in 2000 she served on both the Regional Council & Membership Committee and as Co-Chair of the Task Force on Continuing Education. And now, she is our President.

When asked what she likes most and what she dislikes most about serials work, Eleanor's answer was the same: the constant changes that are inherent in this field. It is challenging and fun to work with serials since they are forever changing. This change is also the most frustrating part of the job. You are never finished.

In response to the question of what her dream job would be, Eleanor smiled and replied, "I already have it." She loves her work, the people she works with, and the culture she works in. She has a supportive director and loves the casual, open environment. It is exactly where she wants to be, although she wouldn't mind taking a sabbatical in order to work with a serials vendor or publisher. She would like to experience serials from that perspective at some point. She also dreams of finding a job at the beach. This beach job would need to be her last job so she can retire on the coast.

Serials are constantly changing, so it is difficult to predict where they will go next, but Eleanor suspects that even more serials will move online. All of our jobs will change as a result. She attended Rick Anderson's session, "How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Give Up Periodical Check-In," and she could easily see us not checking in most of our print titles in the future. The focus of librarians and staff will be on electronic titles, not the few print titles that are still being received. We will be providing access to these materials rather than the actual materials themselves. Some of our other duties may be outsourced, such as copy cataloging or even serials title list maintenance, as is already being evidenced by services like Serials Solutions or TDNet. Our physical collections will shrink, but our responsibilities will shift to electronic journals.

As a result of this major change, Eleanor believes the future of NASIG may look very different. This organization will become even more relevant. The many qualities that make NASIG great now will keep it great in the future. NASIG is and probably will continue to be a volunteer organization made up of individual members with no corporate sponsorships. Strategic planning committees will no longer try to plan ten or even five years in the future. They will create strategic plans for three years maximum. We will need even more continuing education opportunities to stay current in serials librarianship. NASIG will continue to be a unique place in the field of librarianship where serialists can come together and receive support from their colleagues. Eleanor feels that "we are lucky to have a group like this." And we, as a group, are lucky to have her as our President.

REPORT FROM 2002 CONFERENCE AWARD RECIPIENTS

Virginia Taffurelli, Awards & Recognition Committee

As usual, NASIG received applications from many worthy candidates, and the Awards & Recognition Committee had a difficult time narrowing down the selections. Each application was carefully examined and rated by all committee members. These ratings were tallied, and those with the highest aggregate scores were awarded the grants. This year, five student grants, one Fritz Schwartz Serials Education Scholarship, and one Horizon Award were awarded. The awards and scholarship covered the cost of room, board, transportation, and registration to NASIG's 17th Annual Conference held in Williamsburg, Virginia, June 20-23, 2002. In addition, the Fritz Schwartz Scholarship winner received $2,500 to help defray library school tuition costs. This year's award winners were:

Horizon Award:
Pauline La Rooy
Victoria University of Wellington

Student Grant Awards:
Denise M. Branch
Catholic University of America
Meg Manahan
Queens College, City University of New York
Vanessa Mitchell
Catholic University of America
Yolande R. Shelton
University of Maryland
John W. Wiggins
Drexel University

Fritz Schwartz Serials Education Scholarship:
Angela Riggio
University of California, Los Angeles

Each of the winners was asked to complete a survey about their experience at this year's NASIG Conference. Here is a sampling of their responses:

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

• I discovered that NASIG members are not only librarians. They come from diverse areas within the serials arena bringing their experience, knowledge, and camaraderie to us students. They are vendors, publishers, educators, information specialists, and information technologists.

• I think that it is important for students to gain a broader perspective on the field by interacting with others in the profession and learning about the various aspects of serials work that they may not yet have had the opportunity to experience through work or study, or to focus on in-depth.

• Attending the conference takes a student far beyond the limits of a classroom experience, and even work experience. The opportunity to participate in sessions and workshops that deal with current concerns and newer concepts (the "eclectic journal" and its cataloging, for example) are just great.

2. *How did attending the conference benefit you personally?*

• Attending the conference convinced me that as a serials librarian I would not be working in a vacuum. As a recent library school student I was the only person who was interested in a career in technical services, much less working as serials librarian. Often my interests were not supported by the academic curriculum, and many of my peers could not relate to serials-related issues. Coming to the conference has assured me that there are a vast number of potential colleagues who are more than willing to offer me support, camaraderie, and guidance in the future.

• Technology is changing everyone's role in libraries, and it was a learning experience to hear how other libraries are dealing with the WWW, print and electronic collections, and information access. The workshops I attended gave me ideas that I took back with me to work and discussed with my supervisor, ideas that might work for our library.

• The NASIG Conference was enormously helpful in confirming my interest in and knowledge of serials. I am even more convinced that serials work is absolutely central to the work of all departments—not only acquisitions, but cataloging and reference as well.

• Attending the conference gave me a better sense of the overall serials context within which cataloging operates. It also enhanced my awareness of the current issues in the field and the newest technologies and solutions that are being proposed or worked on.

• From the preconference workshop to the users' group meetings, I was awed by the amount and quality of information imparted. All sessions were up-to-date, organized, and focused. But perhaps most importantly, attending the conference was a source of true inspiration for me. It reinforced the importance of serials work to the overall mission of the library. To provide timely access to materials, the serials librarian must remain at the forefront, utilizing new technology, and adapting the rules for providing that access as needed.

• Some of my favorite parts and benefits included:
-funny stories from previous conferences
-chance to be on the cutting-edge of new changes and current debates!

3. *Did attending the conference influence your career plans? How?*

• I was very impressed by the session, "Thinking and Working Outside the Library Box." I learned that it is possible to have a satisfying and rewarding career in many different types of library settings. What I did learn from this conference, however, is that enthusiasm comes from doing what you love.

• It has strengthened my belief that being in the world of serials is one of the most exciting fields to be in today. Many serials are available online, and this is what users want. In order for libraries to meet the users' needs, they have to be skilled and knowledgeable in ordering, receiving, evaluating, and organizing information. Serials librarians…help set standards and best practices in acquiring and providing information. From what I witnessed at the NASIG Conference, serials librarians are blazing trails in supporting this new and exciting serials frontier. I want to be one of the librarians who helps to promote the management and delivery of serials.

• I find the serials community to be the most highly organized and informed that I've seen so far in my library career. I am looking forward to being a part of that.

• It made me excited to finish school and move fully into the profession. The conference intensified my respect for serials librarianship, and also gave me a much wider view of potential opportunities beyond my local area.

• And this from our Horizon winner:
* Coming from a small country it was a unique experience for me to be able to exchange ideas and experiences with such a large number of people in serials/serials related work.
* Opportunity to make contacts and networks for the future.
* Conference sessions that had direct relevance to the work I do.
* Exposure to innovative, thinking-outside-the-square type of visions.

The last two questions solicited comments and suggestions for future conferences. Some of the award winners commented that the mentoring program helped to make this conference an enjoyable and memorable experience. In addition to the excerpts above, all award winners expressed gratitude for the opportunity to attend this year's conference. Most are hoping to attend future conferences and to participate actively by volunteering for committee work. These comments justify the awards and emphasize the importance of reaching out to new and potential future serials librarians. All comments and suggestions were forwarded to the Awards & Recognition Committee members for further discussion and possible implementation.

TITLE CHANGES

Carol MacAdam

[Note: Please report promotions, awards, new degrees, new positions, and other significant professional milestones. You may submit items about yourself or other members to Carol MacAdam, clm@jstor.org. Contributions on behalf of fellow members will be cleared with the person mentioned in the news item before they are printed. Please include your e-mail address or phone number.]

Adrian Alexander has news of his new sideline, an acting career: "I acted in high school and college and then did community theatre on and off in the '70s and '80s until I went to work at Faxon and had to give it all up due to the hectic travel schedule. I've missed it terribly all this time. Finally, about three years ago, I was watching "Inside The Actors' Studio" on BRAVO, and the person being interviewed said something that made me realize how much I really did miss acting and that I had to do something positive about changing that. I contacted the Missouri Rep here in KC, and they put me in touch with the excellent coach I've been studying with ever since!" Adrian has performed in plays *Betty's Summer Vacation*, *Our Town*, *Stop Kiss*, and in commercials in Kansas City. His specialty is dialects: Southern U.S., Texas, Scottish, New England, and Russian. The actor is quoted as saying: "I'm really much more interested in voice work, but I want to get camera experience, hence the TV commercial work. My emphasis is still on stage, though. I think that will always be what I enjoy most. My next project, I hope, will be a production of Brecht's *Mother Courage* in October." You can contact Adrian through his agent, Exposure Model & Talent Agency in Kansas City, and at his day job at BioOne, Inc.

Carole R. Bell sends this news: I am now Head of Acquisitions at Temple University in Philadelphia. I have come home for good to Philadelphia after wandering around the country for 15 years. I was previously Head of Acquisitions at the University of Maryland. My new addresses are:

Paley Library 017-00
1210 West Berks Street
Temple University
Philadelphia, PA 19122
Phone: (215) 204-3275
Fax: (215) 204-5201
E-mail: crbell@temple.edu

Jeff Bullington is now Coordinator of Reference Services at the University of Houston Libraries. He was previously Social Science Reference Librarian at the University of Kansas, Lawrence. Jeff's new addresses are:

University of Houston Libraries
114 Information Services
Houston, TX 77204-5046
Phone: (713) 743-9763
Fax: (713) 743-9778
E-mail: jbullington@uh.edu

Eric Celeste wants us to know that after ten years at MIT as Assistant Director for Technology Planning and Administration, the final year spent commuting to Cambridge from Saint Paul, he has now become the Associate University Librarian for Information Technology for the University of Minnesota (Twin Cities) Libraries. Eric's new addresses are:

University of Minnesota (Twin Cities)
499 Wilson Library
309 19th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55455
Phone: (612) 624-4126
Fax: (612) 626-9353
E-mail: efc@tc.umn.edu

Robert Cleary reports that he started work in May 2002 as the Acquisitions Librarian at Syracuse University, after 8 1/2 years as the Serial Acquisitions Librarian at the University of Missouri in Kansas City. He was sorry to miss the NASIG conference this year after attending nine in a row. In addition, Robert graduated in May 2002 from the UMKC with an M.A. in History. His thesis title was, "The Education of Mexican-Americans in Kansas City, Kansas, 1916-1951." On June 28, 2002, the same day that Robert received his diploma in the mail, he was mentioned in the *Kansas City Star*. A reporter had been given a copy of his thesis by one of his sources in the Mexican-American community and Robert was quoted for a column. Robert's new addresses are:

Syracuse University
E. S. Bird Library
222 Waverly Avenue
Syracuse, NY 13244-2010
Phone: (315) 443-2989
Fax: (315) 443-9401
E-mail: rmcleary@library.syr.edu

Beverley Geer has a new job. She is now BioOne Product Specialist for Amigos Library Services. She is still in Houston, where her previous position was as Metadata Librarian for Serials at Questia Media, Inc. You can reach Beverley at:

Amigos Library Services
3211 Norfolk Street
Apartment 23311
Houston, TX 77098-3816
Phone: (800) 843-8482 x147
Fax: (713) 807-9277
E-mail: geer@amigos.org

Leanne B. Hillery has left her position as Serials Librarian at the University of Miami School of Law Library Coral Gables for a new one as Technical Services Librarian at Florida International University's College of Law Library. Leanne's new addresses are:

Florida International University
College of Law Library
University Park GL819
Miami, FL 33199
Phone: (305) 348-6295
Fax: (305) 348-1159
E-mail: hilleryl@fiu.edu

Betty Landesman writes that she is currently in a long-term temporary position as the Cataloger at the Congressional Research Service at the Library of Congress. She will be in this position until the end of the government fiscal year, September 30, at least. It is quite an interesting job for her as she was a Head of Cataloging quite some time ago, and the things that have and have not changed are remarkable. Now she catalogs all the CRS materials in all formats, including serials and electronic resources. Betty is actively looking for a permanent position in the DC area. It is best to reach her at home:

Phone: 202-232-0186
E-mail: bettyindc@yahoo.com

Konstantina Matsoukas has a new job as Reference and Educational Services Librarian at the Health Sciences Library at Columbia University. Her former position was at McGill University. Her new addresses are:

Augustus C. Long Health Sciences Library, Office of Scholarly Resources
Columbia University, Health Sciences Division
701 West 168th Street, HHSC L6
New York, NY 10032
Phone: (212) 305-1411
E-mail: km2056@columbia.edu

At the end of January this year **Dianne E. McCutcheon** started a new job as Digital Projects Coordinator at the Library of Congress. This was a change from being Head of the Serial Records Section at the National Library of Medicine. Diane had wanted to get back to the systems work which she had done for years at NLM, including implementing their new ILS, Voyager. Now she is supporting the Voyager system at LOC and working on other electronic journal projects. The electronic resources licensing experience that she got at NLM has stood her in good stead at LOC. Diane likes working in the Adams building at LOC and seeing on a daily basis its Art Deco features. Her new addresses are:

Library of Congress
Washington, DC 20540-5560
Phone: (202) 707-7622
Fax: (202) 707-4719
E-mail: dimc@loc.gov

We have this news about **Carole M. Myles**: Ingenta is pleased to announce that Carole M. Myles, former Regional Manager for the Southeast, was recently appointed Director of Library Services, North America. Carole came to Ingenta after nine years at SilverPlatter and a brief stint at Books24x7.com. She will be instrumental in maintaining a successful U.S. sales and customer service program at Ingenta, as well as contributing to the company's global, library services/product development. Carole's new addresses are:

Ingenta, Inc.
44 Brattle Street, 4th Floor
Cambridge, MA 02138
Phone: (617) 395-4000
E-mail: carole.myles@ingenta.com

Marianne Orme sends us this news of recent events in her life: "I began working as a part-time reference librarian at Des Plaines Public Library in Illinois in September 2001. The new position was one of three big changes last year. The other two changes were returning to my native suburban Chicago and also adopting a son, Daniel, at the age of four days in April. Another highlight since finishing my library science program at Pratt Institute in May 1999 has been doing book reviews for *Library Journal*. It's been great to have the chance to both serve professionally in these ways and spend time with Daniel. My husband and I left NYC, where I worked at NYPL, in August 1999 and lived in Indiana for two years, where I served at as a reference librarian at Indiana University-Kokomo." Marianne attended the 1999 NASIG Conference in Pittsburgh as a student grant winner. She can now be reached at:

Des Plaines Public Library
1501 Ellinwood Drive
Des Plaines, IL 60016

Phone: (847) 827-5551
E-mail: marianne@coconut-palm-software.com

Tamara J. Schnell wrote to let us know that, "I began my new job as Technical Services Director at Lincoln Land Community College Library in February 2002. This has been a great move for me professionally, in that I hold more responsibility in a broader technical services environment. I've also found that I enjoy working in a smaller library with a smaller collection. The same challenges are here...only more manageable!" Tammy was previously Senior Cataloger at the Illinois Newspaper Project at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champagne. Her new addresses are:

Lincoln Land Community College Library
5250 Shepherd Road
Springfield, IL 62794-9256
Phone: (217) 786-2353
E-mail: tammy.schnell@llcc.edu

Miki Scholl is now Cataloging Librarian at the University of St. Thomas School of Law. She was previously an Assistant Librarian in the Law Library at Hamline School of Law in St. Paul. Miki's new addresses are:

University of St. Thomas School of Law
1000 LaSalle Avene
Mail# TMHLL27
Minneapolis, MN 55403
Phone: (651) 962-4911
Fax: (651) 962-4910
E-mail: mfscholl@stthomas.edu

Priscilla Shontz is enjoying several changes this year. First, she left her position as Branch Librarian in the Aldine Branch of the Harris County Public Library. In January she started as Library Supervisor at the University of Houston System at Cinco Ranch. And she will soon leave that position to become a full-time mom for awhile. The baby is expected in September. For the moment, Priscilla can be reached at:

University of Houston System at Cinco Ranch
4242 South Mason Road
Katy, TX 77450-7100
Phone: (281) 395-2800
Fax: (281) 395-2629
E-mail: pshontz@yahoo.com

Lanie Williamson started a new job in January 2002 as Serials Librarian at Samford University in Birmingham, Alabama. She moved there from her position as Serials Cataloger at Wake Forest University in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. Lanie's new addresses are:

Samford University
Law Library
800 Lakeshore Drive
Birmingham, AL 35229
Phone: (205) 726-2714
E-mail: lpwilli1@samford.edu

NASIG COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORTS

PROCEEDINGS

Susan Scheiberg

The editorial team for the 16th Annual NASIG Conference *Proceedings*, *NASIG 2001: A Serials Odyssey*, consisted of Susan Scheiberg and Shelley Neville; Jennifer Edwards was the indexer, and Mircea Stefanacu will produce the Web version of the *Proceedings*. Shelley and I took a little different tack this year to capitalize on our individual strengths and interests in working on this project. Shelley assumed responsibility for the administrative duties such as calls for recorders and for the indexer and Web editor, session assignments, and attending NASIG and the speakers' meeting in San Antonio; while I took responsibility for the editorial work—editing the papers, compiling the volume, reading and editing the proofs, and working closely with the Haworth staff.

As reported by previous editorial teams, the period between May and October was one of intense activity—soliciting recorders, papers, copyright forms, tracking receipt of the paperwork, and finally, editing the papers themselves and working with the authors and publisher. At this point we'd like to thank the membership of NASIG for their generosity of time and effort (and senses of humor!) that were much in evidence during this period. We especially thank those that we contacted in error regarding papers—again, as previously happened, we found the process of matching recorders to sessions challenging, and we apologize for any extra gray hairs we might have caused! We hope that next year will go more smoothly in this regard.

The papers were received in a timely manner for the most part, which made the editorial job much easier—we thank the recorders for finishing their papers by the deadline. We did run into a problem with two of the plenary speakers who did not submit papers. Shelley transcribed and edited the audiotapes so that these talks could be included in the volume. However, because of poor sound and the real potential of a poorly transcribed tape, this painful process resulted in less than optimal papers, and we recommend highly in the future that there be standby recorders for these sessions.

The manuscript was delivered to Haworth Press on Oct. 18 and was unfortunately stalled due to Haworth project manager Nancy Deisroth's hip replacement surgery. She did manage to do the first round of editing and tagging before suffering a complication with her surgery, which effectively has taken her out of the process. However, we were not left in the lurch, as her colleagues, Nancy Colpitts and Zella Ondrey, have ably stepped in to see the project through. I have been in close contact with them throughout the editorial and publishing process. As of this writing the journal edition is at press, the index for the monograph edition has been submitted, and they are going to start producing the monograph version of the *Proceedings* as soon as possible. Unfortunately, due to a delay in indexing the previous volume of the serial and the complications of having Nancy Deisroth unavailable, the monograph edition is behind schedule and may not be available at NASIG in Williamsburg. However, the production team is working hard to try to get it out by then.

Overall, editing the *Proceedings* proved to be a very interesting and rewarding experience. We had to overcome a high learning curve, but the process was worth the occasional frustration and pain. We want to thank the previous editors for their excellent work on the editor's manual—we will be updating the manual before we pass it on to the 2003 editors.

Of course, we could not have done this work without the help of all the recorders and workshop speakers, and we thank them all for their hard work, patience, and humor. A special thanks is due to Donnice Cochenour, without whom we could not have been successful. Her generosity of time and knowledge were generously given and much appreciated. So, too, was the work of the Program Planning Committee and Conference Registrar, who helped us in those organizational moments of despair. A special thanks also goes to Nancy Deisroth of Haworth Press, who edited from her bed, and to Nancy Colpitts and Zella Ondrey, who have picked up the slack with aplomb. We are looking forward to working with them on next year's *Proceedings*. Finally, a thank you is due to the NASIG Board for giving us the opportunity to serve as editors for this and next year. We have enjoyed it and are looking forward to getting started with 2002.

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Jeff Bullington, Chair

Committee members: Agnes Adams, Marty Gordon, Kristen Kern, Betty Landesman, Linda Pitts, Marit Taylor, Sarah Tusa.

The Publications Committee has worked on the following projects this year:

Creation of Guidelines for Conference Handouts

- The need for guidelines for conference handouts is driven mainly by a greater need for consistency in format and length of handouts. This will hopefully make conference handouts more usable for attendees and help in the production and distribution of conference handout packets, the production of which is another Publications Committee task.
- Using the conference *Proceedings* style guidelines, committee members created a proposed set of "Guidelines for Conference Handouts." These have been submitted for review and approval.

Creation of NASIGuides

- The committee is working with an author on the creation of a "NASIGuide for Serials Holdings." This involves working with the author to complete the document, taking it through an editorial review process, and then on to final publication.

Conference Handout Packet Distribution

- The committee has discussed the possibility of seeking an alternative distribution model for the *Conference Handouts,* most likely in electronic form. This would hopefully reduce production costs, paper use, and postage as well as provide handouts in a more accessible and useful format.

There are several questions to be addressed, including appropriate format for handouts, appropriate production model (CD-ROM), and potential collaboration with other NASIG committees on the project. The project is carrying over to the next year's agenda.

Serials Management Course

- The committee was approached about working to further develop and promote a collection of materials currently maintained and hosted by EBSCO. This project is carrying over to the next year's agenda.

The Chair would like to thank the committee members for their service on the committee. As an all-volunteer organization, NASIG counts on its members for accomplishing the organization's work.

SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE

Anne E. McKee
2001/2002 Site Selection Liaison

My duties for the year included:

- Identifying several potential conference sites for the 2003 NASIG Conference from 2001 evaluation forms and suggestions from the NASIG Board.
- Requesting each potential site to fill out a preliminary site selection form for general information about each site.
- Narrowing down the list to three possible sites and obtaining board approval to visit these three sites.
- Visited one in May 2001 with Fran Wilkinson and the other one in mid-September 2001 with Eleanor Cook, Vice President/President-Elect. The third site opted out of the process in mid-September and was not visited.
- Reported to the NASIG Board the findings of the two site visits. As is customary, the Site Selection Liaison does not make a recommendation as to final selection but instead reports how well the institution(s) meet the requirements on the long site selection form.
- The Board selected Portland State University as the 2003 conference site. It will be the first time that hotels will be used for conference accommodations, as well as the added bonus of being able to receive "on campus" pricing as opposed to much higher rates normally charged to "outside" groups. We are able to realize this excellent pricing since the PSU Library is kindly offering to "sponsor" this conference on campus.
- Due to the increasingly difficult time in locating institutions that are willing to host this conference (our dates for the conference were extremely limited as PSU is on a "quarter" system), our first two choices of dates (late May and early June) could not be used, as PSU would still be in their spring quarter. Our third choice, June 26-29, 2003, was selected, as this was the only week PSU could host the conference.
- Hotels selected were:
    - Marriott Downtown/Riverfront: This will be designated the conference hotel, and we have guaranteed 275 rooms at $109 a night single or double-double (2 people, 2 beds occupancy) without the usual percentage increase
    - Doubletree Downtown: This is an "overflow" hotel, and we have guaranteed approximately 100 hotel rooms at $89 a night single, $99 double-double. Parking fees have been waived.
    - The Mallory Hotel: This is an "overflow" hotel, and we have guaranteed approximately 100 hotel rooms. As they offer many sizes of rooms, rates will be from $70 a night for a single twin bed up to $125 a night for a queen-queen (2 queen beds sleeping a potential of 4 people). Please note that the Mallory's room blocks will be first given to NASIG speakers. Parking is free at the Mallory.
    - PLEASE NOTE THAT NASIG MUST PAY FOR ANY UNUSED ROOM WITHIN THE THREE HOTEL ROOM BLOCKS.

- I attempted to begin identifying potential sites for the 2004 conference, and I have passed the information on to the 2004 Site Selection Liaisons, Denise Novak and Mary Page.
- I constantly updated both the "short" and "long" site selection forms and forwarded all additions, deletions, and updates to Sara George, 2002/2003 NASIG Web Master, for updating on our home page.

OTHER NASIG NEWS

CONTINUING EDUCATION COMMITTEE REPORT

PUERTO RICO OUTREACH
Submitted by Lisa Furubotten

The CEC is interested in establishing contacts with our colleagues in Puerto Rico and the Caribbean. Puerto Rico is the home of ACURIL, the Association of Caribbean University, Research and Institutional Libraries: http://acuril.rrp.upr.edu/. For 2002, ACURIL's annual conference was held May 27-June 1 in Ocho Rios, Jamaica, and the CEC was able to sponsor a SCCTP Electronic Serials Workshop conducted simultaneously in Spanish and in English by Robert Endean (Hemeroteca Nacional de Mexico) and Lisa Furubotten (Texas A&M). This event is certainly an excellent forum at which to introduce our Caribbean colleagues to NASIG! Librarians attend from Puerto Rico, Haiti, Cuba, Trinidad and Tobago, Jamaica, Venezuela, etc., and pretty much any island one could think of. Librarians from Florida and other parts of the United States also attended. Next year the event will be held in Puerto Rico, making it much more accessible to us, and it is hoped that other NASIG members interested in Latin America might consider attending this event to meet our colleagues from the south and show a strong NASIG presence! English and French are spoken as well as Spanish. This event is highly recommended for CEC consideration for 2003.

SCCTP WORKSHOP AT AMBAC 2002 MEXICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION MEETING
Submitted by Lisa Furubotten

In Mexico, the CEC was able to sponsor a presentation and the SCCTP Electronic Serials Workshop again at the annual Jornadas of the Mexican Library Association (AMBAC), June 3-5, in Monterrey, Mexico. Dr. Elizabeth Steinhagen presented a paper on a bilingual distance reference project, and the SCCTP workshop, presented by Lisa Furubotten (Texas A&M) and Joe Hinger (St. John's, NY), was a great success. Next year the AMBAC annual meeting will be in Guadalajara. AMBAC's new President, Dr. Martinez Arrellano, is very interested in establishing relationships outside of Mexico, and it is hoped that NASIG members will also be interested in attending this event. For updated information on the Mexican Library Association and its annual conference, please see http://www.ambac.org.mx.

SCCTP WORKSHOPS IN NEVADA
Submitted by Wen-ying Lu

With the Bibliographic Center for Research (BCR), the CEC co-sponsored two SCCTP workshops in June 2002 at the Las Vegas Library in Nevada. One was the Basic Serials Cataloging Workshop on June 4-5 and the other was the Serials Holdings Workshop on June 6. Both workshops and the trainer, Linda Gonzalez, were very well received. As indicated on the evaluations, workshop participants appreciated NASIG's cosponsorship and effort in making the workshops happen in a less populous state. Three of the workshop participants were from Hawaii. After the workshops, they sent Linda a box of chocolate-covered macadamia nuts as a thank you.

MISSISSIPPI PROGRAM: MAPPING THE JOURNEY TO E-JOURNAL ACCESS
Submitted by Christine L. Ferguson

The second annual workshop presented by the NASIG Continuing Education Committee, the Mississippi State University (MSU) Libraries, and EBSCO proved to be as popular as the first, with a number of first-time participants as well as repeat attendees. Participants came from Mississippi, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Alabama, Louisiana, and Georgia for the all-day workshop held at MSU's Mitchell Memorial Library on July 19, 2002. The workshop consisted of four individual speaker sessions as well as a panel session. The theme of this year's workshop was, "Mapping the Journey to E-Journal Access." In keeping with this focus, the program highlighted a number of tools that assist in managing and providing access to electronic journals.

In her presentation, "Context-Sensitive Linking Systems for Libraries: the SFX Model," Jenny Walker, director of sales and marketing in the information services division of Ex Libris, discussed the difficulties in cohesively linking disparate electronic resources, including the limitations of traditional, static linking. Such limitations include the need to maintain accurate URLs and the fact that control of the linking is in the hands of the vendor, not the library. Walker outlined the differences between static linking and OpenURL linking, also called context-sensitive linking. OpenURL linking allows libraries to customize and localize their linking options, creating a single point of access for users. Additionally, the principles of the OpenURL format, which is currently undergoing standardization through the National Information Standards Organization, were discussed as well as the advantages of an OpenURL-based linking system. Walker provided specific examples of context-sensitive linking using the SFX model.

With more and more resources becoming available electronically, it is often difficult to determine where a resource is available in a full-text electronic format. In the second presentation of the day, Chris Pierard, cofounder and director of sales of Serials Solutions, discussed this issue and outlined one potential solution. A library's full-text electronic resources are often spread out over a number of database providers and aggregators, making it difficult to create a comprehensive list of the titles and their coverage dates. As a consequence, the library has incomplete information when making collection development decisions and may have difficulty providing access to these titles for their patrons. Serials Solutions offers one solution, tracking a wide variety of databases through unique, individual arrangements with database providers/aggregators. Pierard stated that Serials Solutions customers receive a single, comprehensive list of all of the titles to which they subscribe, including their coverage dates and links to the title level.

The last two speaker sessions were held concurrently, and both were well attended. Jim Tucker, sales representative, and Mary Sue Hoyle, sales manager, of EBSCO Subscription Services presented a session titled, "Understanding Embargoes and Utilizing Other Services." In the presentation, embargoes were defined as the time period between when an article appears in print and when an aggregator is allowed to provide the full text electronically. Tucker discussed the various factors that may lead a publisher to create an embargo, mentioning that embargoes can discourage the cancellation of the print version of a title and may vary in length, depending upon the publisher. Emphasized in this discussion was the fact that an embargo on a particular title applies to all aggregators. The decision made by Sage Publishing to remove its titles from aggregated collections proved pertinent to this topic and participants discussed the recent announcement. Hoyle then discussed a variety of methods that can be used to provide the full text to a user when an embargo is in effect, including electronic subscriptions, document delivery, and pay-per-view options.

"Cataloguing as Cartography," presented by Amy Murphy, serials cataloger at MSU, was the second concurrent session. In her presentation, Murphy outlined the basic principles of cataloging electronic journals, basing her discussion on the cataloging policies in force at MSU. Beginning with a discussion of the necessity of cataloging these resources, Murphy stated that an e-journal must meet all of the criteria for being a serial publication as well as the criteria for being an electronic resource. A number of other factors are considered before a title is cataloged, including the availability of an archive of back issues and title-level access. The bulk of the presentation outlined which MARC record fields are required when cataloging an e-journal and which fields are optional, but a discussion of the rules governing the use of a single record or multiple records to catalog the electronic version of a title was also included in the session. Murphy concluded the session with a list of other factors to consider when cataloging electronic journals, including URL maintenance, licensing and authentication, and embargoes.

The daylong workshop concluded with a panel session on e-journal management systems, which was moderated by Jeff Slagell, the serials/ILL librarian at Delta State University. The panelists included several of the workshop speakers: Jenny Walker, Chris Pierard, and Mary Sue Hoyle. Also on the panel were Allison Mays and Beth Bernhardt. Mays, the acquisitions/serials librarian at Millsaps College in Jackson, Mississippi, offered her perspective as a user of an e-journal management system, Serials Solutions, while Bernhardt, the electronic journals/document delivery librarian at the University of North Carolina–Greensboro (UNCG), discussed a unique, library-created e-journal management solution, UNCG's new Journal Finder service. Bernhardt outlined the development of the service and demonstrated some of its capabilities.

Coordinated by MSU Libraries' faculty and staff, including Maria Collins, member of the NASIG Continuing Education Committee, this year's program was a rousing success. Plans are already underway for next year's workshop.

WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS REGIONAL LIBRARY SYSTEM SERIALS SUPPORT GROUP
Submitted by Maggie Rioux

Maggie Rioux gave a presentation about NASIG to the Western Massachusetts Regional Library System Serials Support Group. This is an informal group of serialists in western Massachusetts that meets three or four times a year. They were very interested in learning about NASIG and its activities. Tina Herman, the coordinator of the group, had requested the program after she attended Maggie's presentation at NELA last fall.

UPCOMING CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

October 2002

Elizabeth Parang and Wen-ying Lu have arranged for NASIG to sponsor a speaker for a preconference program at the Mountain Plains Library Association's (MPLA) tri-conference (with the North Dakota Library Association and the South Dakota Library Association), which will be held Oct. 2-5, 2002, in Fargo, North Dakota. As the statewide library networks in both South Dakota and North Dakota will be migrating to new automation systems in the near future, Becky Bell of MnSCU PALS will present a program on migration issues, including a section specifically on migration issues related to serials.

Marsha Seamans has arranged to sponsor a SCCTP Electronic Serials Cataloging Workshop at the preconference at the Kentucky Library Association (KLA) Fall Conference on Oct. 16, 2002. The trainer will be Ann Ercelawn from Vanderbilt University. The conference is being held at the Galt House in Louisville.

Birdie MacLennan, CEC's former Co-Chair, has coordinated with Carol Hryciw-Wing of the New England Technical Services Librarians group (NETSL) to sponsor three speakers for two programs at the New England Library Association (NELA) Annual Conference in Sturbridge, Massachusetts. Jean Hirons and Ann Sandberg-Fox will give a talk titled, "Reclaiming the Past and Reshaping the Future: Revisions to AACR2 Chapters 9 and 12." Albert Joy, Jay Schafer and Leslie Knapp will participate in a panel discussion, "Serials Reviews in Uncertain Economic Times: Two Different Approaches, Plus Advice for Avoiding Fiscal Nightmares." Both programs are on Oct. 21, 2002. For more information, please see the Web site at http://www.nelib.org/events.asp?eventHead=1.

November 2002

Evelyn Council, former CEC Co-Chair, has been coordinating with the North Carolina Library Association to present workshops in November. Resources and Technical Services Sections will be sponsoring programming in collaboration with NASIG members Frieda Rosenberg and Arlene Hanerfeld, who are the Cataloging and Serials Interest Chairs of the association. Wen-ying Lu is communicating with Evelyn and will report firm information as planned.

Victoria Peters is coordinating with the Serials Interest Group of Academic Libraries in Oklahoma (SIGALO) to arrange a SCCTP Electronic Serials Cataloging Workshop in Oklahoma in November. Announcement will be made when the date is set.

NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Beverley Geer, Chair

Hello, NASIG friends. As Chair of the Nominations and Elections Committee, it is my job to keep you informed about the process! To that end, I am attaching the section of the NASIG Bylaws (http://www.nasig.org/public/bylaws.html) that addresses nominations and elections. Let me know if you have any questions. And remember, you have until Oct. 15 to submit your nominations. The form is available on NASIGWeb at http://www.nasig.org/ members/forms/nomform.html and elsewhere in this issue of the *NASIG Newsletter*. You can submit the form as many times as you like, so come on, flood my mailbox!!

Article VII. Nominations and Elections.

Section 1. Nominations.

The Nominating Committee shall present candidates for the positions of Vice President/President Elect, Secretary, Treasurer, and Executive Board Members-At-Large when required. Other nominations for these offices, endorsed by at least 10 active members of NASIG, may be submitted in writing to the Nominating Committee. Any such nominations shall be included on the official ballot. The Committee shall endeavor to present at least 2 candidates for each office to be filled, and shall also provide on the ballot a space for write-in candidates for each office to be filled. Candidates shall be selected in such a manner as to insure as broad a representation as possible of NASIG constituencies and of the geographic distribution of membership. The Nominating Committee chairperson shall report nominations to the NASIG President at least 90 days prior to the Annual Conference.

Section 2. Elections.

Elections shall be held by mail ballot at least 90 days prior to the Annual Conference. Candidates receiving a plurality of votes cast shall be elected, and be so declared at the Annual Conference. In case of a tie vote, the Nominating Committee shall decide the election by lot. Notice of those elected shall be communicated to the membership prior to the Annual Conference.

Section 3. Challenges.

Challenges to the election results must be made in writing to the President within 60 days of the announcement of the election results.

OTHER SERIALS NEWS

ALA PROGRAM ON SERIALS CATALOGING CHANGES

Jean Hirons, Library of Congress; Regina Reynolds, Library of Congress; Rhonda Lawrence, UCLA Law Library; Adam Schiff, University of Washington
Reported by John Radencich, Florida International University

The program, "Introduction to AACR2 Revised Chapter 12," was held at the American Library Association Conference in Atlanta on June 18, 2002. It was an official ALCTS program, co-sponsored by the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access and the Committee to Study Serials Cataloging.

The program featured four speakers who presented on separate aspects of the rule changes. Jean Hirons of the Library of Congress spoke on the topic, "Concepts, Definitions, and Serial Descriptive Changes." Regina Reynolds, also from the Library of Congress, spoke on "Major/Minor Differences." Rhonda Lawrence, UCLA Law Library, focused on "Integrating Resources (Loose-Leafs)." Finally, Adam Schiff of the University of Washington covered "Integrating Resources (Web-Based Resources)."

Jean Hirons covered the general aspects of the rule revisions. She went through the revisions point by point, explaining the new rules, how they differed from past rules, and showed examples of what cataloging would look like with the new rules. One of the major changes is that Chapter 12 will now include more than traditional serials. It will also include works that are "serial-like" in nature, such as loose-leaf publications that are updated, Web sites which undergo changes over time, publications of limited-duration events (such as newsletters of conferences, which were never before considered serials due to the fact that when the conference ended, the newsletter ended), reprints of serials, etc. All this means that more resources will now be cataloged as serials. Serials themselves are no longer to be called "serials," but are now to be called "continuing resources."

Other important highlights of the revisions include provisions for and examples of the rules of electronic resources. The rules are more complete in that they include former rule interpretations and CONSER practices, give more recognition to cataloging from the complete work, and the descriptive rules include more provisions for minor changes in title over time and allow more flexibility in cataloging these changes. There are still other aspects, too numerous to be listed here, to the rule revisions.

Regina Reynolds then spoke on major and minor differences in title. This presentation focused on when titles are considered to have changed and whether or not these changes are sufficient to cause the creation of a new record. She went through a detailed analysis of titles and the changes they can go through. Major differences will cause a new record to be created. Minor differences will not be accounted for on the existing record. The new rules have liberalized the past strict interpretations of changes that caused new records to be created. Under the rule revisions, fewer differences in titles appearing from issue to issue are considered major enough to warrant creating a new record. In other words, look for fewer new serial records being created. More of the old records will be allowed to remain current rather than being closed out.

The following are considered major changes: addition, deletion, change, or reordering of any of the first five words of a title (minus the initial article), unless the change is among the minor changes listed below; words added, dropped, or changed anywhere in the title that change the meaning of the title or indicate a different subject matter; and major change in the name of a corporate body recorded as part of the title proper. Any of the above changes will require a new record to be cataloged for the resource.

The following are to be considered minor changes: representation of words; articles, prepositions, and/or conjunctions added, deleted, or changed; corporate body added, deleted, moved, or the representation of body's name changed (this is new to the rules); punctuation changed; changed order of titles for titles in more than one language; words linking title to designation added, deleted, or changed; fluctuating titles; words added or deleted from a list or order changed with no significant subject change (new to the rules); and words indicating type of resource added/dropped (also new to the rules).

Rhonda Lawrence covered "Integrating Resources (Loose-Leafs)." This was a detailed expansion of the Hirons presentation and focused solely on the cataloging of loose-leaf publications, showing how the rule revisions will affect the cataloging of these resources. The people mostly affected are law librarians, as they are the ones who have the most to do with loose-leaf updating publications. A lot of serial cataloging concepts have been introduced into this formerly monographic form of cataloging.

Adam Schiff spoke on the related topic of "Integrating Resources (Web-Based Resources)." He concentrated on the cataloging of Web sites that are updated, showing how the concept of seriality affects them and how catalogers will have to account for the changes they undergo. His presentation also included those parts of AACR2 Chapter 9 that deal with the cataloging of remote electronic resources. His talk clearly showed how much the divisions between serials and monographs have been graying in the library world.

Close to 400 people attended the program, testifying to the high interest the library cataloging community has concerning the new rule revisions.

NEGOTIATING SERVICES AND PRICES: PERSPECTIVES FROM A LIBRARIAN, A PUBLISHER, AND A VENDOR

Rick Burke, University Librarian, University of Judaism and Director for the Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium; Trisha Davis, Head, Serials and Electronic Resources Dept., Ohio State University Libraries; Bob Schatz, Manager of North American Sales, W. H. Everett and Sons; Adam Chesler, Director of Library Relations, Kluwer Academic Publishers
Reported by Patricia Ann Loghry

Sponsored by ALA's ALCTS Serials Section Acquisition Committee, this program offered participants various perspectives on negotiating. Burke began by defining negotiation as bargaining between buyer and seller with a view to reaching an agreement, occurring when there are differences between the two parties that need to be resolved. It is a "back and forth," "give and take" process that often involves compromise. He suggested that participants separate people from the problem, create options for mutual gain, be principled in their negotiations, and use objective criteria. Preparation is one of the keys to successful negotiation, as is organizing ahead of time. Bargainers should envision a successful agreement and what steps are needed for success. Prepare your goals carefully and have your bargaining chips ready by knowing what you can give up and what you have to have. Develop a relationship with your negotiating partner, and try to understand their point of view. A successful negotiation needs both parties to feel ownership and that the results are a joint opinion with mutual gain. Power in negotiation comes from knowing the people, the options, and the criteria governing the negotiation.

Trisha Davis presented two negotiating scenarios. As serials librarians, we need to remember that we are in a business world. The successful negotiator has prepared, planned ahead, knows the people and relationships involved, has a back-up plan, and knows where and when they will stop negotiating.

How can you prepare to negotiate with serials agents? Understand the normal communication chain and who does the negotiating. Are there potential imbalances such as an experienced sales representative and a relatively inexperienced library negotiator? What are your financial issues that need to be negotiated? What is your service charge, can you explore prepayment options, and are fees/discounts associated with your report or invoices? What are your payment options, and can you adjust the frequency or timing of your invoices and lower/raise the service charge? Look at the vendor's database, its size, completeness, and quality of content. Is your library-specific data available, and can you do your order/claims work in the vendor's database or offer some of your data to help lower your service charge? Important service issues to explore include how many accounts your representative handles, where your library falls in the priority chain, and what back-up arrangements are available when your representative is unavailable. Does your library use electronic invoices/orders/claims? Is the vendor's product compatible with your local system? Does your library need help with local problems or notification of e-journal availability and licensing services? All of these should be factored into your negotiations.

Unlike the print environment, negotiating with electronic publishers is different, as both publishers and libraries are adjusting. Product issues to be negotiated can include the version of the product, access method, who are the users, is there remote access, and price. What are your rights under this license and what are your library's obligations? Be aware of what you have agreed to. It isn't just price. What services and products do you want? What are your circumstances and needs? You have to tell the vendor what is most important to you.

Bob Schatz said that part of the problem with negotiation is that the players do not really understand each other. Publishers do not understand the service issues and have not had to deal with irate patrons who are objecting to something. Likewise, librarians don't understand the reality of profit. A successful negotiation for librarians would allow them to get the product quickly, reasonably, and keep their users happy. For vendors, a successful negotiation is a profitable long-term relationship. Remember that vendors only have a one to two percent profit ratio to negotiate with. The publisher can make adjustments to pricing, but vendors must pass on publishers' demands and still try to make a profit. The number of titles a library has is not as important as the quality of those titles, who publishes them, and what discounts might be available to the vendor. There are variables that a vendor must deal with, including how much does the library claim, how quickly must responses be returned to the library, does the library indicate claims receipt, and how quickly their invoices are paid. Vendors do not have unlimited resources to help libraries solve library problems.

Adam Chesler began by saying everything is negotiable, but neither party will get everything they want. Contracts put your negotiations in writing, so get all your terms in writing. Techniques that will help you to negotiate successfully are: know what you want/need, your limits, what you can negotiate, what areas are "off limits," and that both parties negotiating have the authority to decide. Negotiate with one individual, not a committee, who acts on behalf of all the stakeholders. Both negotiators need to have a clear understanding of the product/service being negotiated and what the terms/conditions mean. What is the license terminology and what are the implications of accepting/changing those terms?

Publishers want to develop and maintain a stable revenue flow and widen access to their content. They want a long-term sustainable relationship that is a low-maintenance agreement for both parties.

Both negotiators should expect a fair and reasonable proposal, a willingness to discuss terms, and consider alternative language or conditions. Both parties should be responsive before, during, and after negotiation. They should expect that both parties will make honest efforts to live up to their agreements.

Participants left with several suggestions that will enhance their negotiating tool kit.

2003 RESEARCH AWARD
LIBRARY ACQUISITIONS, COLLECTIONS AND TECHNICAL SERVICES

http://www.elsevier.com/locate/lcats/

The *Library Acquisitions, Collections and Technical Services* (*LCATS*) Research Award provides a biannual prize of $2,000 for research in the broad areas of collection management and technical services. The award will be given for one proposal and administered in two parts: $1,000 when the proposal is selected to fund the research effort and $1,000 when the completed manuscript is submitted to *Library Acquisitions, Collections and Technical Services*. The award will be granted to the individual, not the institution, and may be used to cover expenses incurred in conducting the research outlined in the proposal, including travel, postage, staff support, supplies, and other items.

The winning proposal will identify a critical issue in collection management or technical services and outline a rigorous approach to testing or solving the issue raised. Proposals will be judged on their significance, clarity, and originality. The proposal should be a brief, concise description of the project (no more than 500 words). A budget proposal and a one-page vita of the author(s) must be attached. Awards will not be limited to experienced researchers; however, researchers should present their proposal clearly addressing the following issues:

1. What are the aims and objectives of the research proposal?
2. What methodology and data analysis procedures will be employed?
3. What related research has been undertaken and/or published? Please include specific citations.
4. Is the research replication of a previous study?

The deadline for submitting proposals is September 15, 2002. Proposals will be reviewed by a panel consisting of the Editor-In-Chief, the Associate/Assistant Editors, and three members of the Editorial Board. The winning proposal will be announced at the American Library Association Midwinter Conference in 2003 and in an issue of *LCATS* for that year. Research for the winning proposal must be completed within one year of the date when the award is announced. *Library Acquisitions, Collections and Technical Services* reserves the right of first refusal of the completed manuscript.

Questions about the proposal can be addressed to the Editor, Carol Pitts Diedrichs, or any Editorial Board member listed below:

PAST RECIPIENTS AND THEIR RESEARCH

1992 – Anna H. Perrault – “The Shrinking Collection: A Study of the Effects of the Diversion of Funds from Monographs to Serials on the Monograph Collections of Research Libraries” Published in *LAPT* v. 18, no. 1, pp. 3-22.

1993 – Samuel Demas, Anne S. Caputo, and William J. Kara – “Viability of the Vendor Model of Information Delivery Through a Library Gateway”

1994 – Tina E. Chrzastowski and Karen A. Schmidt – “The Serials Cancellation Crisis: Determining Recent National Trends in Academic Library Serial Collections Through the Use of Commercial Vendor Subscription Records” Published in *LAPT* v. 21, no. 4, pp. 431-443.

1996 – Tschera Harkness Connell – “Effects of Series Authority Control for Acquisitions” Published in *LAPT* v. 22, no. 4, pp. 393-407.

1997 – Carol Cubberley – “Books Demonstrating Diversity in Mississippi School Libraries”

1999 – Jo Ann Carr – “Full Text Journal Databases and Frequently Cited Titles: A Content Analysis”

2001 – D.G. Dorner – “The Impact of Digital Information Resources on the Roles of Collection Managers”

Proposals for the 2003 award should be addressed to:

Carol Pitts Diedrichs
Editor-in-Chief
Library Acquisitions, Collections and Technical Services
5095 Shattuc Avenue
Cincinnati, OH 45208
(614) 292-4738
FAX: (614) 292-7859
Internet: diedrichs.1@osu.edu

CALENDAR

Stephanie Schmitt

[Please submit announcements for upcoming meetings, conferences, workshops and other events of interest to your NASIG colleagues to Stephanie Schmitt, stephanie.schmitt@yale.edu.]

October 10-13, 2002
Library & Information Technology Association
LITA National Forum
"Making Connections"
Houston, Texas
URL: http://www.lita.org/forum02/index.html

October 21-23, 2002
Access 2002
"Delivering the Promise"
Windsor, Ontario
URL: http://www.access.uwindsor.ca/

November 4-6, 2002
Internet Librarian
"Navigating in Turbulent Waters"
Palm Springs, California
URL: http://www.infotoday.com/il2002/

November 14-16, 2002
Library Administration and Management Association
2nd National Institute
"The E-ssential Library: Creating and Sustaining Our Leading Edge"
Naples, Florida
URL: http://www.ala.org/lama/essential/

January 24-29, 2003
American Library Association
Midwinter Meeting
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

April 10-13, 2003
Association of College & Research Libraries
11th National Conference
Charlotte, North Carolina
URL: http://www.ala.org/acrl/charlotte/

June 26-29, 2003
NASIG
18th Annual Conference
"Serials in the Park: Blazing Diverse Trails in the Information Forest"
Portland, Oregon

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

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.

Send all submissions/editorial comments to:
Charlene Simser
Chair, Technical Services
137 Hale Library
Mid Campus Drive
Manhattan, KS 66506-1200
Phone: (785) 532-7444
Fax: (785) 532-7644
E-mail: csimser@lib.ksu.edu

Send all items for "Title Changes" to:
Carol MacAdam
188 Madison Avenue
New York, N.Y. 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:
Bea Caraway
Trinity University
Elizabeth Huth Coates Library
715 Stadium Dr.
San Antonio, TX 78212-7200
Phone: (210) 999-7292
Fax: 210) 999-8021
E-mail: bcaraway@trinity.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 publication date. The submission deadline for the next issue is:

November 1, 2002

NO LATE SUBMISSIONS WILL BE ACCEPTED

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS
2003/04 NASIG EXECUTIVE BOARD AND OFFICERS**

Vice-President/President-Elect

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

Treasurer

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:

**Position descriptions are at http://www.nasig.org/public/htmoffc.htm

Deadline: October 15, 2002. Nominees must be current NASIG members.

Send the form via mail, fax, or e-mail to:

Beverley Geer
Chair, NASIG Nominations & Election Committee
P.O. Box 542068
Houston, TX 77254-2068
Phone: (800) 843-8482 ext. 147
Fax: (972) 991-6061
E-mail: geer@amigos.org