PRESIDENT’S CORNER
Steve Savage, NASIG President

Well, I would have hoped that after seven years as a member of the Newsletter Editorial Board, I would have made dead sure that I turn in all of my president’s articles by their submission deadlines. But even my first article is late, so I guess I’ll just have to try to save face by saying I now understand why many of my predecessors’ articles were late, too. At least now I can say that I am beginning to truly understand just how much work is required to keep such an active organization as NASIG running.

I had thought that the first few weeks after the Milwaukee conference would be a downtime. Was that ever naïve! From the Board meeting, brainstorming session, town hall meeting, many scheduled and impromptu meetings during the conference, and the ensuing NASIG-L discussion, the list of new ideas, projects, and concerns for the Board and committees to consider and possibly implement is immense—over 150 items altogether! A handful of these are very small-scale issues. Several dozen items are huge, conceptual policy or technological scenarios. The remainder fit anywhere between those two extremes.

Several task forces have been established in recent months to address some of the newer or larger-scale ideas. Charges and rosters of the groups appointed so far are included elsewhere in this issue. One new group is the Anniversary Task Force. It will recommend ways to celebrate our upcoming twentieth anniversary and will also implement adopted ideas which are not assigned to standing committees. The recently announced History Task Force is another anniversary-related activity. The Online Registration Team will implement several enhancements to make our online registration process...
even easier and more efficient, both for people registering for the conference and the several volunteers who process the registrations. The Proceedings Task Force will recommend what to do with publishing our Conference Proceedings when our current contract with Haworth expires soon. The Online Survey and Evaluation Task Force will investigate software options for conducting ad hoc polls of the membership as needed and for possibly handling the annual conference evaluations online. At least two more groups will have been put together by the time this issue is published, and another one or two groups may be formed for other issues soon afterward.

Strategic Support Task Force

Another task force represents a new experiment for NASIG. Nearly all of the Board’s time is consumed by day-to-day management of the organization. Given how much time Board members routinely devote to NASIG, it would be unreasonable to ask more of them—and probably impossible for them to give more time. An important lesson I learned years ago from a supervisor, Mike Lach at the University of Kentucky, is another reason for trying this experiment. One semester, he required that all of his department heads set aside one hour per week to unplug the phone, close the office door, shut down e-mail, and just think. Not work on projects or reports or cleaning off the desk. Just Think. It was an enlightening experience. It was actually very difficult at first, but we quickly realized how rarely we take time to truly think through many things in the midst of work.

So we created the new Strategic Support Task Force (SSTF) in an effort to provide the Board with assistance by doing a lot of the background work that so often suffers when everyone is overwhelmed and overworked, free some of the Board’s time for broader issues, and just to do some of the in-depth thinking and analysis the Board needs but has so little time to do. For task force members, we looked for a good balance of a wide variety of factors, including a range of professional experiences. We were especially looking, though, for people who are creative and good at “thinking outside the box” (to use an overworked cliché!)

Chaired by Katy Ginanni, the SSTF’s primary approach will be to consider every point it studies within the context of the new strategic plan. Their procedure will be to take issues, ideas, and possible projects assigned by the Board, conduct research and analyze the relevant factors, resources, and concerns, and provide reports with their conclusions to the Board.

Financial Planning

One major issue which the SSTF will study for the Board will be concerns about NASIG’s financial situation, which are among the most important issues the Board must resolve this year. Most pressing of these worries is the disconnect between our recurring, annual non-conference expenditures (just over $80,000 this year) and our recurring, stable income (approximately $35,000). None of us need a financial analyst to tell us that having only 40 percent of regular expenses covered by stable income is a recipe for disaster!

On the surface, NASIG has always seemed financially secure. But this is truly only a superficial perspective. Our financial assets seem abundant, but in fact, they would barely be adequate for a single year’s general operating expenses and seed money for the next conference.

None of us can imagine not having a conference during any year. It is a possibility, however, which we cannot ignore if we are determined to prevent it, and recent history provides several examples of why this is true. We came *very* close to not having a conference location in time for 2002. If a campus or hotel site had a huge disaster—a fire or earthquake, for example—just several weeks before our conference, we would have to cancel it. The host colleges of at least half of the campus-based conferences in recent years changed which dorms we were allowed to use just a few weeks before their conferences (this was how we ended up with dorms without air conditioning in Pittsburgh). So we’ve had enough experience with the riskiness of conference planning to realize unexpected things do happen more often than anyone would guess. And we all know about the effects of the unexpected SARS fears on ALA’s Toronto conference.

So as a result of these experiences and other developments around us during the past few years, the Board has come to realize that it would be seriously irresponsible to continue betting so heavily on our good financial luck. NASIG is simply too important to take this risk any longer. Consequently, during the coming months and with the help of the Finance Committee and the Strategic Support Task Force, the Board will work to devise a financial plan that will help to ensure NASIG’s continued financial health in order to ensure our continued professional success. The end result of this planning process will be a sophisticated and modern financial plan consisting of a suite of strategies and income sources, including membership dues, fundraising, operating reserves, and self-regenerating income that will:

a. match recurring expense levels with recurring, stable income (including provisions for inflation and organizational growth)
b. look for opportunities to reduce expenses without hindering effectiveness

c. use short-term sources of income for short-term projects only, rather than for general operating expenses

d. keep membership rates as low as possible

e. investigate options for a varied structure of member rates (student rate, retirees rate, etc.)

f. establish a contingency for difficult financial periods

g. establish a robust method for gradually building NASIG’s financial resources to the limits allowed for non-profit organizations by the U.S. Tax Code.

So as you can see, this year is going to be an extremely busy one for all of us! The year's developments will be possible only because of our large group of very hardworking, dedicated volunteers. And we certainly would not have reached our current state of complexity, size, and success without all of the excellent work of the hundreds of hardworking, dedicated volunteers of the past 20 years. Our history proves that success does indeed breed success. This brings with it a twofold challenge: to continue this long line of successes, and also to ensure that future years' members have the resources necessary for continued growth and vitality.

**NASIG EXECUTIVE BOARD MINUTES**

Bea Caraway, NASIG Secretary

Date, Time: June 16, 2004, 8:18 a.m.-5:25 p.m.

Place: Oak Room of the Historic Hilton Milwaukee City Center, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Attending:
Anne McKee, President
Eleanor Cook, Past President
Steve Savage, Vice President/President-Elect
Denise Novak, Treasurer
Bea Caraway, Secretary

Members-at-Large:
Carol MacAdam
Mary Page
Robert Persing
Kevin Randall
Stephanie Schmitt
Joyce Tenney

Ex-Officio member:
Char Simser, *NASIG Newsletter* Editor-in-Chief

Guests:
Elizabeth Parang, incoming Secretary
Jill Emery, incoming Member-at-Large
Judy Luther, incoming Member-at-Large
Pam Cipkowski, 2004 CPC Co-Chair

1.0 Welcome (McKee)

McKee called the meeting to order at 8:18 a.m., welcomed Board members and guests, and asked that each person introduce himself or herself. She added two items to the agenda under “new business,” namely, the Town Hall Meeting and the Thursday morning brainstorming session, and then asked for other changes to the agenda. Caraway asked that the discussion of how to dispose of extra copies of the *Proceedings* be moved from agenda item 2.3 to item 4.1. McKee reminded those present of the ground rules for the meeting: Incoming members may not vote but are welcome to join in the discussions. Decisions will be made by formal motions and voting. As Board members have read all reports before the start of the meeting, only those reports requiring action will be discussed in the meeting.

Bob Persing agreed to serve as timekeeper for discussions.

2.0 Secretary’s report (Caraway)

2.1 Board actions taken since the Midwinter Board meeting, January 8, 2004:

- 2/4/04 Steve Savage moved (Eleanor Cook seconded) that we accept the minutes from the January 8, 2004, Board meeting. The motion carried.

- 2/17/04 Schmitt moved (Persing seconded) that the Board waive the membership cutoff date for conference fee purposes in 2004. If an individual’s membership is established or renewed prior to the submission of online registration for the 2004 conference, the member conference fee will be accepted. There were seven affirmative votes, two negative votes, and one vote too late to count. The motion carried.

- 2/25/04 A majority of the Board members voted to approve a $500 honorarium for Mr. John Gurda, who will speak at the opening session of the Milwaukee conference.

- 2/25/04 A majority of the Board members voted to approve a $500 honorarium for Mr. John Gurda, who will speak at the opening session of the Milwaukee conference.

- 3/19/04 Novak moved (Persing seconded) that the Board approve the correction in the June Board meeting minutes of the date of the Minneapolis conference from 2004 to 2005. The motion carried.
3/23/04 The Board unanimously accepted and approved the recommendation that Meg Mering and Pat French serve as the 2004 co-editors of the NASIG Conference Proceedings.

3/25/04 Page moved (Persing seconded) that the Board accept revisions to the policy regarding conference registrants’ eligibility for the member rate. There were six votes in the affirmative, none in the negative, and five who were unable to vote for various reasons (away from work, out of the country, etc.). The motion carried.

4/5/04 Tenney moved (Schmitt seconded) that the Board accept the recommendation of the Awards & Recognition Committee regarding the 2004 winners of the student grant awards, the Fritz Schwartz Award, the Horizon Award, and the Marcia Tuttle Award. The motion carried.

4/14/04 Cook moved (Persing seconded) that the Board accept the executive session minutes of the conference call of April 13, 2004, as amended. The motion carried.

5/18/04 Savage moved (Randall seconded) that the Board appoint Marie Seymour-Green as NASIG Archivist for the standard term of three years (in this case, 2004/05-2006/07) to begin at the end of this year’s conference. The motion carried.

Other items of interest:

2/27/04 A laptop purchased for the use of the conference registrar arrived with all required software loaded and ready for use.

3/12/04 The Board determined that henceforward, the CPC (in consultation with the Board liaison) will determine the selling price of the conference souvenirs. They will keep in mind the break-even point and will notify the Board of the prices as a point of information.

3/23/04 Accepted Midwest Airlines offer to be an official airline of the 2004 conference. In return for a minimum number of bookings by conference participants, NASIG will receive discounted tickets for future travel, to be used to offset the travel cost of student grant winners, speakers, etc.

4/23/04 The Board accepted the recommendation of the Awards & Recognition Committee regarding the recipient of the Mexican Student Grant and thanked them for all their work on this.

5/14/04 Given that Denise Novak was able to negotiate substantially lower prices for the food budget at the Hilton, the Board considered and approved CPC’s request that we add snack food and soft drinks to the afternoon breaks.

Cook moved (Tenney seconded) that the action items be approved. The motion passed unanimously.

2.2 Board roster updates

Caraway asked Board members to verify the accuracy of the Board rosters. No changes were made.

2.3 (moved to 4.1)

2.4 Consideration to replace banners with posters

Lisa Furbotten had suggested that NASIG consider replacing the NASIG banners with posters. These would be easier to transport or ship to the various CE events where they were needed. In addition, they could perhaps be left behind for display at the institution where the event had been held. Board members appreciated Lisa’s creative thinking about this issue; however, since posters would, like banners, also have to be rolled and either carried or shipped, and since the expense of a color poster can be quite high, the Board decided to continue with the banners for the time being. In the future, if we decide to use posters instead, Gerald Printing, with whom we do considerable business, should be asked to submit a bid.

2.5 Revisions to the Executive Working Calendar

Caraway asked for changes needing to be made to the Executive Working Calendar. None were noted. Caraway asked that Board members contact Elizabeth Parang (incoming Secretary) as they work with the calendar and discover inaccuracies. She added a reminder that all changes to the working calendar should come through the Board liaisons to the Secretary, who will inform the Webmaster and the entire Board of the changes.

3.0 Treasurer’s report (Novak)

Novak reported that as of June 16, 2004, memberships numbered 1,293. She provided a detailed financial report for the period January through May 2004, detailed and summary reports of 2004 conference expenses and income, and a detailed budget report. She noted that several committees have yet to spend any of their allocated funds but will certainly do so later in the year. She noted that as of May 31, 2004, NASIG had a total equity of $325,687.52 and liabilities of $0.00. However, most of the conference expenses will be paid after the conference, which will substantially reduce the equity. The Charles Schwab account has fluctuated with the stock market over the past six months. Regarding this account,
Novak noted that the account has a trading function built in that cannot be turned off without our losing all Web access to the account. Therefore, the Board and especially the Treasurer need to be aware of the possibility of unauthorized trades and to monitor the account for unusual activity.

Novak indicated that many NASIG mailings (over 100) had failed to be delivered to the addressee and had been delivered instead to the Decatur, Georgia, postal box. Because the printer had been careful to position the return address correctly, the problem is most likely being caused by improper placement of the mailing label, causing the postal scanners to read the return address as the mailing address. Liaisons will remind Database & Directory, Bylaws, Nominations & Elections, and CPC to position mailing labels farther to the right on the envelopes they mail out.

**ACTION ITEM:** Novak to scan in some incorrectly labeled pieces of mail to be mounted on the website for committee chairs to view. Novak will also scan examples of correctly placed labels.

**DATE:** Before the fall Board meeting.

Novak pointed out that during the transition from a two-year to a three-year term for treasurer, the new treasurer will not be elected a year in advance and therefore will not have a year in training. In order to provide adequate training to the new treasurer, she requested that the Board allow her to meet her successor in person for two to three days. The Board agreed with the wisdom of the suggestion. Cook added that Novak should write up and give to Nominations & Elections a list of skills the new treasurer would need. This will help them as they screen the treasurer nominees. The nominees should also be informed that they will need to set aside these two or three days before the beginning of their term of service in order to be trained in the work of the treasurer. McKee noted that the funds allocated for Board expenses for the year in question will need to reflect the cost of travel and lodging for this purpose.

**ACTION ITEM:** Novak to provide Nominations & Elections with a list of skills needed in the candidates for Treasurer.

**DATE:** Before N&E begins its work for 2004/05.

**ACTION ITEM:** Novak to include estimated costs in her budget request for 2005 for the travel expenses for training the new treasurer.

**DATE:** By October Board meeting.

### 4.0 Committee Reports

#### 4.1 Archivist (Caraway)

On January 30, 2004, Archivist Holley Lange shipped eight boxes of materials to the University of Illinois Archives. A description of the collection is now on their website. The archivist there retained only the hardbound copies of the *NASIG Proceedings*, leaving us with softbound and *Serials Librarian* versions of the same *Proceedings*. It was suggested that NASIG offer these copies to NASIG members whose libraries might like to have them, especially those members who live outside the United States. The Board could not come to a consensus about who will pay the postage, but instead decided to have the archivist announce the offer and see what the response might be. Once we know who might make use of the *Proceedings*, we can see how much the postage might be and figure out who might pay for it.

**ACTION ITEM:** Archivist Maria Seymour-Green will announce the offer via NASIG-L.

**DATE:** Early fall.

The Board thanks Holley Lange for her fine service during her term as NASIG Archivist.

#### 4.2 Awards & Recognition (Randall)

In all, 48 applications for awards were received: 1 for the Marcia Tuttle (1 awarded), 22 for the student grant (3 awarded), 14 for the Horizon (1 awarded), and 11 for the Fritz Schwartz (1 awarded). There was one Mexico student grant awarded as well. The work went smoothly with the exception of a few communication and scheduling difficulties for the Mexico grant.

The report requested Board discussion on two points: the size of the committee, and the appropriateness of committee members’ writing letters of reference for applicants. Regarding committee size, the number of committee members is at the discretion of the Board. In the spring, Vice President Savage appointed two fewer members for 2004/05 than in the preceding year. Next spring, Vice President Page will again consider committee size when making appointments for 2005/06. McKee noted that screening and evaluating the applicants is much work but that the number of applicants has been falling in recent years. She requested that information on numbers of applicants in recent years be provided to the Board.

**ACTION ITEM:** Savage to ask the History Task Force to track the numbers of applications received for the various grants over the last seven years.

**DATE:** As they put together a history for the Twentieth Annual Conference.

Randall expressed his hope that we can increase the number of student grants awarded next year.
On the question of committee members serving as references for applicants, MacAdam moved (Tenney seconded) that no member of the Awards & Recognition Committee or of the Executive Board will write recommendations or serve as references for applicants of any NASIG-sponsored awards or grants. The motion passed unanimously.

As a final point, the Board thanked the Awards & Recognition Committee for their hard work and especially for their innovation in making application review a blind process, and requested that blind review be continued for all awards, including student grants.

4.3 Bylaws (Tenney)

The membership approved three bylaws changes, which are detailed on the NASIG website behind the “What’s New” button on the homepage. More details on the bylaws changes are available on the Bylaws Committee’s webpage. The Board commended and thanked the committee for their very hard work throughout this year, especially noting their effective collaboration with the Nominations & Elections Committee.

4.4. Continuing Education (MacAdam)

During 2003/04, CEC sponsored ten events or projects in Canada, Mexico, Trinidad and Tobago, and the United States. The committee sent out a call on NASIG-L for programming proposals and ideas but received few responses; they will repeat the call. Ensuing Board discussion centered on ideas for generating NASIG-created workshops rather than NASIG sponsorship of other organizations’ workshops. The PPC has forwarded to CEC the program proposals that were not used at the 2004 annual conference. The Board asked MacAdam to encourage the CEC members to consider developing some of these programming ideas into CE events or bringing back some particularly successful programs from earlier conferences. McKee commended CEC for trying to broaden the focus and include events that cover topics other than cataloging and encouraged them to continue in this effort. The Board congratulated the committee on its CE work for the year.

4.5 Database & Directory (Persing)

The cost of printing and mailing the NASIG directory for 2003 was $6,400. The 2004 directory should be distributed shortly after the conference, and the cost should be comparable to last year’s. Presently, one-third of the membership chooses not to receive the print directory. In addition to its normal activities, the committee piloted a print-on-demand, Web-accessible version of the directory. The PDF version of the directory is mounted twice monthly.

The committee had recommended last year that the Board consider discontinuing the print version of the directory, but the Board decided that it was not yet time to eliminate the print. In response to MacAdam’s question as to being able to know how many times the PDF version had been printed, Schmitt informed us that this cannot be tracked. Cook reminded the Board that the directory front matter is not included in the online version of the directory and that if and when the directory moves to an electronic-only format, that information must be included somewhere on the NASIG website. In the course of the discussion, questions arose about the “purge date” for dropping members who had not renewed for the new year, which led to the very important reminder that the membership renewal form must include the date by which one must renew in order to be eligible for the member rate for the 2005 conference.

The Board expressed its gratitude for the efficiency, accuracy, and helpful attitude of the Database & Directory Committee.

4.6 Electronic Communications Committee (Persing)

Sarah George (Co-Chair) and Ruth Scales served as Webspinner and back-up, Merle Steeves (Co-Chair) and Kitti Canepi served as list manager and back-up, David Burke and Jennifer Duncan served as job listings coordinator and back-up, Marina Oliver served as the liaison for online registration, Anna Creech worked with Char Simser to develop a prototype webpage for conference photos (http://www.nasig.org/conference/photos), and Sheila Tawney helped work on the planned conversion of the membership database to SQL. EEC added four new e-mail addresses this year for NASIG business and four new lists for PPC. NASIG has 33 listservs, and NASIG-L had 1180 subscribers as of April 29, 2004. Filtering software installed by Bee.net has greatly reduced the amount of spam sent to the list. Bee.net did away with the limit on the number of simultaneous users, so NASIGWeb users now have unlimited access.

The Board discussed the shift in responsibility within the NASIG committee structure which provides for a Web liaison for each committee to work with the ECC. This change means that some of the ECC members have little to devote their energy to. Cook suggested that one member could be assigned to help the publicist in managing his or her list of e-mail lists. Page wondered if the position of webmaster should be analogous to the position of archivist.
**ACTION ITEM:** President Savage, Vice President/President-Elect Page, and Randall (ECC Board liaison for 2004/05) to discuss the future shape of the ECC.

**DATE:** By the January Board meeting, in time for committee appointments in spring 2005.

The Board thanks the ECC for their excellent work.

4.7 Evaluation and Assessment (Schmitt)

The EAC prepared and shipped the evaluation forms to the CPC the week of May 17, 2004. The questions on the form for this year’s conference reflected the changes in program structure, in venue, and in the conference information (website and online registration information instead of a print brochure). Communication between EAC and the CPC and PPC is crucial each year in order to create a form that collects needed feedback on the conference. The committee expressed in its report a continued interest in the question of moving to an online evaluation form, noting, however, that there are some problems with an online form, notably that participants may not be able to access a form until several days after the conference closes.

**ACTION ITEM:** Savage to appoint a task force to study the question of moving to an online evaluation form.

**DATE:** By end of summer 2004.

The Board expresses its thanks to the committee for its important contribution to the organization.

4.8 Newsletter (Simser)

Pam Cipkowski, who had taken a leave of absence as copy editor in order to serve as CPC Co-Chair for the Milwaukee conference, will be resuming her responsibilities with the Newsletter. Sharon Heminger, who took Pam’s place, will stay on as column editor for “Calling All Serialists.” Maggie Rioux became editor for the “Profiles” column. Simser and Anna Creech from ECC worked together to implement a conference photo archive. Simser is still compiling a Newsletter manual.

Savage brought up the fact that the Newsletter is the official archival organ of the organization, but that despite its role as such, several things have been dropped from the Newsletter over the years. He expressed an interest in rethinking or reaffirming the Newsletter’s purpose and identity.

**ACTION ITEM:** Savage and Simser to open discussion on this topic.

**DATE:** During September 2004.

The Board thanks Simser for the wonderful tool that the Newsletter is for the organization.

4.9 Nominations & Elections (Cook)

The N&E Committee received 115 nominations, or 36 percent more than last year. Of these, 111 were eligible for consideration. The rate of return of ballots was 48 percent. The committee began investigating various online voting services suitable for use by organizations such as ours and has offered to pass its findings on to the new Strategic Support Task Force for further consideration.

The Board expressed deep gratitude to the N&E Committee for doing an outstanding job during an especially busy year for them.

4.10 Proceedings

Proceedings editors Pat French and Rick Worthing successfully completed all the many steps required to organize recording volunteers, acquire papers and permissions from presenters, compile, edit, and proofread the papers, coordinate the indexing, convert and mount a version on the NASIG website, and send the proceedings off to Haworth for printing. The editors had notable success in getting papers from presenters on time. LadyJane Hickey served as indexer, and Mircea Stefancu was Web editor.

Randall pointed out that the selection of Proceedings editors for the 2005 conference must begin earlier than usual this year due to the May conference date.

The Board commended the editors for an important job well done.

4.11 Publications (Page)

The committee’s ongoing projects include, 1) improving the Human Resources page and perhaps making its contents searchable by means of a relational database, and 2) completing the NASIGuide to Serials Holdings. The committee has considered potential projects to work on, such as making both the proceedings and the handouts for a given conference searchable simultaneously through a single search-and-retrieval interface, or helping create and publish a NASIG history for the twentieth anniversary.

The Board discussed at some length the change in the Publications Committee’s role since the conference handouts have moved from print to online. The acquisition, duplication, and distribution of print handouts had previously been its largest responsibility. Possibilities of new roles could be investigation of other publishers for
the proceedings, helping with the history project (as already mentioned in the committee’s report), or coming up with substantial publications, perhaps for sale. Page pointed out that trying to publish revenue-producing works can be a difficult challenge.

**ACTION ITEM:** The Publications Committee is to discuss how it might reinvent itself and then report its findings to the Board.

**DATE:** By the January Board meeting.

4.12 Program Planning (Savage)

All PPC members reviewed and categorized all proposals this year, which resulted in an overall program with a broader committee consensus. The PPC members also worked in subcommittees as follows: Informal Group Meetings (Sandy Folsom, Marilyn Geller, Emily McElroy, Rose Robischon), Poster Sessions Subcommittee (Jill Emery, June Garner, Marilyn Geller, Emily McElroy, Dana Walker), Focused Vendor Demo (Marilyn Geller, Emily McElroy, Steve Oberg, Dana Walker), and Streamlining Paperwork Subcommittee (Pat Loghry, Erika Riple, Emily McElroy, Marilyn Geller). Sandy Folsom and Connie Roberts worked with Mark Jacobs to arrange and coordinate a joint session with Susan Kane of the National Women’s Studies Association. Total number of proposals or ideas received for programs was 167, much higher than in recent years.

Some difficulties were noted in the course of the committee’s work (see related action items below): 1) The reimbursement policy caused some confusion. 2) What was allowable with regard to AV equipment was not always clear. 3) Some miscommunication between the secretary and the PPC co-chairs resulted from the fact that both the secretary and the PPC co-chairs received program proposals. 4) There was some miscommunication between the *Proceedings* editors and the PPC co-chairs about submission deadlines for papers. 5) General communications with speakers seemed confusing.

The PPC report included a suggestion to drop the requirement that program proposals include brief biographical information. The Board decided, however, that this information should continue to be required from the beginning of the proposal process.

The Board noted that we had been in a trial period for poster sessions for a few years now and that we needed to decide whether to continue them or not.

**ACTION ITEM:** Novak and Savage to revise the reimbursement policy, including a limit on the number of nights of paid lodging offered to vision and strategy speakers.

**DATE:** By late August.

**ACTION ITEM:** PPC co-chairs and Board to work together to create more specific guidelines for AV use.

**DATE:** By the time the call for 2005 proposals goes out.

**ACTION ITEM:** PPC to incorporate AV restrictions in the call for proposals and to require that speakers specify their AV needs in their proposals.

**DATE:** By the time the call for 2005 proposals goes out.

**ACTION ITEM:** PPC co-chairs to work with ECC to create an online program proposal form for submission of 2005 proposals.

**DATE:** By the time the call for 2005 proposals goes out.

**ACTION ITEM:** The Board and PPC to decide whether or not to offer poster sessions at the 2005 conference.

**DATE:** By the fall Board meeting.

The Board expressed its sincerest congratulations and thanks to the entire PPC and especially to Co-Chairs Marilyn Geller and Emily McElroy for their dedication and hard work in reinventing the programming.

4.13. Publicist (Cook)

Cook distributed 480 English membership brochures, 100 in Spanish, and 65 in French during the year. She posted messages as appropriate to 16 electronic lists. She canvassed owners of these lists and found that most believed their list was relevant for NASIG outreach. At the publicist’s request, ECC set up a generic e-mail address to be used to subscribe to these lists, eliminating the need to unsubscribe and resubscribe each year when a new publicist takes over. Cook also updated the procedural document, which will be useful to the next publicist.

The Board thanks Cook for her good work as publicist.

4.14. Site Selection (Page and Tenney)

2005 Conference: The Minneapolis Hilton will be the site of the 2005 conference. Contracts with the hotel have been signed. The main contract provides for free meeting space and microphones if we fill our room block and spend $35,000 on food.

2006 Conference: Denver and Birmingham have sent proposals, as has Hofstra University. The Board thanks NASIG members at Hofstra University for the proposal they submitted for the 2006 conference. The Board engaged in substantial discussion of all the pros and cons. They noted several needs of NASIG members that must
be considered, including convenient ground transportation from airports to the site, lodging that is easily accessible from the meeting rooms, convenient or nearby venues for evening events and for entertainment, and flexibility of dates to allow us to avoid conflict with other library meetings. In light of these considerations, Randall moved (MacAdam seconded) that we decline Hofstra’s offer to host the conference for 2006. The motion passed unanimously.

Given that preliminary information from Denver and Birmingham appears to meet the criteria for a venue, Novak moved (Persing seconded) that the Board approve travel to these two cities by the site selection team (Tenney, Page, and Luther). The motion carried.

Savage suggested that it might be helpful to post the assessment document for each site proposal on NASIGWeb.

5.0 Conference Planning (Cipkowski, Novak)

Pam Cipkowski reported that registration was set to begin at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday (today), on the fourth floor of the hotel. As of June 16, 2004, 600 people had registered. Cipkowski reported that she had cancelled the brewery tour because it did not attract the minimum number of registrants. The souvenirs—pens, notepads, and t-shirts—are ready for sale. Pam mentioned how helpful Board member Stephanie Schmitt and ECC member Marina Oliver had been with online registration.

Before Pam left the meeting to resume her responsibilities as CPC Co-Chair, the Board thanked her enthusiastically for her and her committee’s wonderful work in organizing the conference.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Awards and Recognition (Randall)

6.1.1 Mexico Student Grant

The Board engaged in a long discussion about both the original reasons for and the administration of a grant for a Mexican student in a library science program. The logistics have almost always been difficult, requiring as they do a completely separate process and timeline. To eliminate these difficulties while continuing to offer a grant to a Mexican student, the Board decided that for the 2005 conference, all applications for the Mexico Student Grant must be in English and will be submitted directly to the Awards & Recognition Committee. The committee will set aside one award for a Mexican student.

**ACTION ITEM:** To accommodate the earlier conference date for 2005, A&R must provide a revised timeline for grants and awards.

**DATE:** By the end of August.

**ACTION ITEM:** Savage to ask the Strategic Support Task Force to explore additional methods for involving Mexican serialists in NASIG.

**DATE:** By the January Board meeting.

6.1.2 Other awards procedures

McKee took the opportunity to reiterate that NASIG pays for three nights’ lodging for award winners. Each winner will either share a room with another or will pick up the difference in cost if a single room is chosen. Because logistics are different when dealing with a hotel than when working with a campus conference center, it is best to have one contact person designated to make reservations for speakers and award winners. That contact person will be a member of the CPC.

**ACTION ITEM:** A&R to provide a list of grant and award winners to the CPC liaison, who will attend to their hotel reservations.

**DATE:** By the date that CPC will stipulate.

6.2 Newsletter (Simser)

6.2.1 Privacy issues and the “Title Changes” column

Because the Newsletter is no longer password protected, the personal information in “Title Changes” is now accessible to anyone. McKee asked that the column editor include a reminder in her return e-mail to those submitting information about job changes, pointing out that any information they provide can be seen by anyone—not only NASIG members.

6.2.2 Board minutes from the Board webpage

Simser suggested that we establish a procedure for keeping the list of Board minutes up-to-date. The following procedure was agreed upon: When the current minutes are approved by the Board, the Newsletter HTML editor will convert them from Word to HTML and will update the list of minutes on the Newsletter page. ECC will move the HTML files listing links to files of Board minutes into the Newsletter space, so it will reside in the area for which the Newsletter staff have editing authorization. ECC will also make the link to the minutes appear more prominently on the Board webpage and will make an announcement under the “What’s New” button on the homepage when each new set of minutes is approved.
6.3 Appointment of *Proceedings* editors (Randall and Savage)

In order to coordinate information sent to speakers, especially dates for receipt of papers for the 2005 conference, we need to appoint the editors earlier in the year. The revised dates follow:

- November 1, 2004 – issue the call for *Proceedings* editors
- December 1, 2004 – applications due
- By January 2005 Board meeting – *Proceedings* editors for 2005 are decided on

**ACTION ITEM:** Caraway to update the working calendar to reflect these dates.

**DATE:** ASAP. Done. 7/16/04.

6.4 Public Relations Task Force – next step (McKee)

McKee had planned to appoint a task force to flesh out the PR recommendations made by the Strategic Planning Task Force. In the end, she did not manage to do so, but will rely on Savage to provide for follow-up to the SPTF recommendations. Savage’s idea was to appoint members to a Strategic Support Task Force, which will devote its energies to investigating issues and working on projects that the Board passes on to it. Savage has completed his appointments to this task force and will assign work for them soon.

6.5 Survey and Evaluations Task Force (Schmitt and McKee)

Schmitt has written a charge for such a task force.

**ACTION ITEM:** Savage will appoint members to the task force.

**DATE:** By September 1, 2004.

6.6 Future of the Mentoring Program (Cook)

The mentoring program will continue independently for another year, reporting directly to Tenney as Board liaison. Student grant award winners (including the grant winner from Mexico) will automatically be assigned a mentor.

6.7 Strategic Thinking (All)

Cook spent several minutes describing the American Society of Association Executives and leading the Board in a discussion about its possible value to us as a resource. The Strategic Support Task Force may be asked to look into this possibility.

McKee stated that the Board would do well to review the strategic plan carefully once a year, beginning at the fall 2004 Board meeting.

6.8 New liaison responsibilities, how Savage plans to operate as president

Savage briefly discussed his plans for his presidential year and his manner of working. As part of this, he indicated that he plans to delegate as much as possible.

**ACTION ITEM:** All Board members and committee chairs to list the issues that are pending. Committee chairs to submit their lists to Board liaisons; Board members to submit their lists and their committee chairs’ lists to Savage.

**DATE:** August 15, 2004.

Savage wants committee members and chairs to feel that they are an integral part of the organization, because they are indeed so. Therefore, he encouraged Board liaisons not to micromanage committees, but rather to rely on committees to do their committee work and to devote their own energy instead to thinking further ahead and more globally than the chairs are perhaps able to do.

6.9 Online registration (Schmitt)

Online registration in its second year was successful. Schmitt expressed thanks to consultant Paul Seeman (Maxwell-Street.net), Alice Gormley, Darwin Sanders, Pam Cipkowski, Marina Oliver, and the team participants at Marquette University. Schmitt advised the Board that the Online Registration Implementation Project needs to be integrated into organizational routines and processes according to a standardized calendar, now that initial development and implementation are complete. She presented a draft working calendar, suggested that committee responsibilities and inter-committee dependencies be formalized, and advised that an enhancements budget line be added to the annual conference budget. In addition, she recommended that the Board establish a standing online registration team composed of the NASIG treasurer, the conference registrar, and liaisons from ECC, PPC, and CPC. Finally, Schmitt listed five enhancement projects that would improve online registration, some of which would require financial resources and others of which would require only organizational work.

After much Board discussion about enhancements to the system, four alternatives were identified: 1) switch to a turnkey system, 2) continue with our existing system more or less as it is, 3) continue with our existing system, making selected enhancements to it, or 4) continue with our existing system, making extensive enhancements to it.
Savage moved (Novak seconded) that we continue with our existing system and that we budget for $3500 worth of enhancements, addressing them in priority order until the budget is exhausted. The motion carried.

Tenney reminded the Board that all conference-related decisions must be made by December 1, 2004, including finalized programming and conference fees. Therefore, recommendations for programming should be submitted to the Board no later than November 15, 2004.

In a different vein, Schmitt requested again that training time be set aside at the annual conference for committee Web liaisons and also for whoever will be working with online registration.

**ACTION ITEM:** Page to direct the 2005 PPC to include this training time in the 2005 conference schedule.

**DATE:** Before the PPC begins drawing up the 2005 schedule.

6.10 Other new business/discussion

McKee reminded Savage, Novak, Page, Cook, Emery, Parang, and Luther of the new Board member orientation to be held on Thursday at 8 a.m. The brainstorming session is scheduled for 10 a.m.-12 noon in the Mitchell Room, which seats 40. MacAdam will make a brief report of the session at the business meeting Sunday under “new business.” McKee pointed out the guidelines for the Town Hall Meeting: The purpose of the meeting is for members to talk. Board members may respond but must keep comments very brief and certainly no longer than two minutes.

On the topic of member and non-member rates, for the 2005 conference, the January 31, 2005, deadline for membership renewal is firm. This date will be announced in every committee meeting, at the conference, and over NASIG-L every two weeks during the last two months of the year. It will also appear prominently on the membership renewal form.

Savage is finishing his appointments to the Twentieth Anniversary Task Force.

Novak mentioned that Bank of America still does not deal efficiently with checks in Canadian currency.

McKee announced that the invoice for our institutional subscription to the UKSG’s *E-Serials News* has arrived. We have been invited to have someone from our organization contribute an article twice a year on serials trends in North America.

McKee proposed having a fourth Board meeting sometime in mid-spring each year via conference call or Web conferencing.

**ACTION ITEM:** Novak to investigate possibilities for Web conferencing. [Later noted: CEC is also investigating Web conferencing. Novak will consult with CEC.]

**DATE:** January meeting

No other business being brought to the table, McKee adjourned the meeting at 5:25 p.m.

Minutes approved July 30, 2004.
NASIG’s finances are healthy. I seem to say that same thing in every Newsletter, but it happens to be true. The balance sheet below reflects our income and assets as of August 1, 2004.

Balance Sheet
(Includes unrealized gains)
As of 8/1/04

ASSETS
Cash and Bank Accounts
Charles Schwab-Cash 31,554.60
CHECKING-264 67,419.18
SAVINGS-267 82,638.60
TOTAL Cash and Bank Accounts 181,612.38
Investments
Charles Schwab 24,759.81
TOTAL Investments 24,759.81
TOTAL ASSETS 206,372.19

LIABILITIES & EQUITY
Liabilities 0.00
Equity 206,372.19
TOTAL LIABILITIES & EQUITY 206,372.19

The 2004 conference in Milwaukee has come and gone. It was well attended, and the majority of comments were positive. I think the brainstorming session was very successful with many wonderful/original ideas tossed around!

It appears that there will be a surplus from the Milwaukee conference.

The bulk of conference invoices have been received and paid. Some speakers still need to submit requests for reimbursement along with receipts. All requests for conference reimbursements must be received by September 2004.

2004 Milwaukee Conference Summary Report
7/1/03 Through 12/31/04

INCOME
Conference Registration 206,089.48
Preconference income 7,120.00
Conference - Tours 2,140.00
TOTAL INCOME 215,349.48

EXPENSES
Conference – Equipment Rental 15,411.21
(includes AV)
Conference – Temporary Help 2,250.00
Conference – Brochure 143.28
Preconference Workshop 200.00
Conference – Building Rent 3,381.00
Conference – Entertainment 500.00
Conference – Meals (including catering for Public Museum event) 106,903.94
Conference – Souvenirs 4,333.83
Credit Card Charges 812.41
Conference – Photocopying & Printing 2,514.47
Conference – Postage 912.80
Conference Supplies 413.41
Conference – Speakers 3,393.89
Conference – Tours 3,009.00
Conference – Transportation 979.25
Conference – Parking 289.00
Conference – Other (includes Logo Design) 1,000.00
Conference – Refund 1,585.49
Bank Charges 380.00
TOTAL EXPENSES 148,412.98

TOTAL INCOME – EXPENSES 66,936.50

With five months remaining in the fiscal year, the 2004 budget is on track. Committees are doing a very good job of watching expenses.

NASIG Budget Expenditures
1/1/04 Through 8/1/04

Admin-Board Expenses -11,969.75
Awards & Recognition -9,698.11
Archives -1,343.35
By-Laws -983.13
Continuing Education -5,590.99
Conference Planning -8.00
Site Selection 2006 -61.90
Electronic Communications -4,200.00
Evaluation -205.29
Finance -3,190.02
Nominations & Elections -984.71
Database & Directory -6,242.98
Proceedings -74.68
OVERALL TOTAL -44,552.91
The NASIG 2005 Conference Planning Committee held its first meeting on Tuesday, July 13, and began by divvying up assignments. We will be meeting again on Tuesday, August 10, in downtown Minneapolis so that we can take a closer look at restaurants and possible activity locations near the meeting hotel, the Minneapolis Hilton. We are also planning to work closely with the Minneapolis Convention and Visitors Association, who have offered us help with locating venues and making arrangements. We are also in the process of contacting speakers for the conference opening.

Recognize this famous Minneapolis landmark? You, too, will have the opportunity to throw your hat to the wind in May 2005!
(The 2005 Site Selection Committee (Page, McKee, Novak) stands in front of Minneapolis’ tribute to Mary Tyler Moore)

By now, you know that the theme for next year’s 20th anniversary conference has already been set. NASIG’s 20th anniversary will be a time to look back on how far we’ve come as an organization, as a profession, and as individuals. It is also the perfect time to assess where we are right now and to dream about what our future holds in store for us. We hope this conference program will help us Roar Into Our 20s!

Over the summer, the Program Planning Committee has had the opportunity to review the preliminary compilation of comments from the 2004 conference evaluations. Based on these comments, the committee members are discussing whether and how to continue some of the special program events featured at last year’s conference. Currently under discussion are the Poster Sessions, the Focused Vendor Demo Session, User Group Lunches, Networking Nodes, and Lunch Connections. Many of these activities were well received, and we are now trying to figure out how to fine-tune them to make them even better for next year’s conference. We are also trying to figure out how to fit everything into 3½ busy, productive, and educational days.

By the time you read this article, we hope you will have seen the Call for Proposals and Ideas, and we hope that you will consider submitting something. As the year progresses, we look forward to telling you more about this very special 20th anniversary conference, and we hope to hear from you about contributions you can make to this effort.
The preconference program, Integrating Resources Cataloging Workshop, is part of the Serials Cooperative Training Program, or SCCTP. The workshop was both prepared and presented by Steven Miller, Head of the Monographs Department at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Libraries. Rhonda K. Lawrence of the UCLA Law Library added information related to loose-leaf publications to the workshop materials. Topics covered in the workshop included an introduction to integrating resources as a concept, as well as original cataloging, updating records, and copy cataloging of these materials. Participants received a copy of the workshop materials, to be used later for reference.

The presentation began with an overview of the background related to the development of the new category of integrating resources, which appeared in Chapter 12 in the revisions of AACR2 in 2002. Prior to this revision, new electronic resources appeared for which there were no rules. Neither quite monographic nor serial in nature, these materials required separate cataloging rules. In fact, these new electronic resources were found to have much in common with the print loose-leaf format, which also was not covered in AACR2. Thus, the former bibliographic landscape of monographs and serials was transformed into a new bibliographic landscape of integrating resources, whether continuing or finite.

The new cataloging rules closely align integrating resources with serials since they have elements of seriality, but integrating resources differ from serials in several fundamental aspects. Integrating resources are like serials in that they have no predetermined conclusion. They differ from serials, however, in the manner of issuance. While serials have discrete parts, updates to integrating resources do not remain discrete, but are “integrated” into the whole work. Rather than having issues or volumes, integrating resources have iterations. The basis of description for cataloging differs as well in that integrating resources are described according to the latest iteration as opposed to the customary serials description based on the first issue. Numerous MARC fields previously used only for serials are now applied to integrating resources.

Entry convention is another major difference between serials and integrating resources. Serials changes are based on successive entry with a new bibliographic record created with each major change. Integrating resources are based on integrating entry, meaning that most often the same bibliographic record is updated to reflect changes in the bibliographic record. The integrating entry convention is similar to an earlier used convention for serials cataloging known as latest entry.

There are three major types of integrating resources: the familiar print loose-leaf publication, updating databases, and updating websites. Of course, not all electronic publications are integrating resources, and the first decision that the cataloger must make is that of determining whether the electronic resource is a monograph, serial, or an integrating resource. To further complicate the matter, the same title will often change formats when converted from print to an electronic format. Often titles that are serial in the print version become integrating resources online. Monographic integrating resources are those determined to be finite in scope, although they may be updated up to the date of the predetermined conclusion. However, there are no differences in the cataloging rules for integrating resources, whether continuing or finite.

Even with the new cataloging rules, cataloging integrating resources requires a great deal of cataloger interpretation and judgment. Many electronic resources are multi-level, so the cataloger must determine exactly what aspect or “granularity” of the resource is to be cataloged. The entire site might be cataloged as an integrating resource, while individual documents within the site could be monographs. It is appropriate to catalog the resource at different levels or at more than one level. An area of real difficulty in cataloging integrating resources is that of determining iteration. Unless explicitly stated, the cataloger has no way of knowing whether the resource is in the first or a later iteration. Dates, too, are problematic, since the most prominent date is often the date that the resource was last updated. Publication date, to be based on the first and last iteration, can be difficult or impossible to find. Then there is the question of how far to go in searching for the dates or how many pages to “drill down” to find information needed to describe an integrating resource.
Determining the title proper can be a challenge since the title is often presented differently on the home page, the HTML header, or a title screen. The new rules prescribe the resource itself as the chief source of information, calling for cataloger’s judgment in evaluating the formally presented evidence and in applying liberal use of MARC 246 fields for additional title access. The MARC 246, or variant title field, is very important in cataloging integrating resources and can serve as both note and title added entry. The MARC 247 field is used for former title proper information, and the MARC 245 always reflects the title proper of the current iteration. Reciprocal linking notes are used in integrated resources cataloging as well, indicating the bibliographic history of a title and its relationship to other titles.

The preconference was a very worthwhile day spent reviewing the new cataloging rules for integrating resources. The program format included participant discussion and the exchange of ideas, as well as the completion and discussion of related exercises. There were numerous discussion points for which there was no certain answer, and lively discussions ensued with many divergent opinions. The area of selection of title proper revealed a great deal of difference in opinion about how to determine the title proper, what added entries to create, and what information is important to transcribe. The new rules, representing traditional rules adapted to fit new resources, will continue to evolve and become more precise as they become widely used.

**Serialist Boot Camp**

*Beverley Geer, Regional Sales Manager, YBP Library Services; Susan Davis, Head of Periodicals, University at Buffalo (SUNY)*

Reported by Linda M. LaPointe

Boot Camp for the serialist is not for the faint of heart. Drill Sergeants **Beverley Geer** from YBP Library Services and **Susan Davis** from the University at Buffalo (SUNY) lost no time in setting the tone for this morning-long session. They donned their muscle shirts and got the new serialists “pumped” up with a skit that focused on the many muscles (including a good brain) needed in this challenging and changing profession.

After the skit, we settled down to the hard work of understanding the real world of a serialist. The trainees came from all walks of the industry. While the majority of participants came from the academic world, private and public libraries, as well as publishers, were represented.

The program consisted of five main points: acquisitions, cataloging, public services, publishers, and vendors. Time spent on each area included defining terms, understanding common goals and problems, and finally, but most important, knowing where to find help. A handout with paper and online resources listed many resources, but we were reminded throughout the day that other serialists are an invaluable resource.

One of the many things we learned from Susan Davis was that, “F is not a failing grade.” Rather, it is a series of challenges that remind us to be “flexible”; to remember our “families”—personal and professional; to approach challenges with “fascination,” not “frustration”; and above all, to have “fun.” Every day presents a new set of opportunities for a new experience.

Beverly Geer pointed out that when you consider cataloging serials, the field is not hard, it is just different. Curiosity tempered with skepticism is the key to a successful serials cataloger.

By the end of the session we were all able to understand that a serialist is like Miss Marple, who is always able to kick butt at the end of a mystery. This is because she observes her environment and is able to read the clues to pull it all together in the end. Once we all learn to follow her example, we will also be able to solve the mystery of serials and find that kicking butt can be fun and rewarding.

**Budgeting Lessons and Stories: Modeling the Budget**

*Nancy Slight-Gibney, Budget and Management Information Services, University of Oregon Libraries; Virginia Taffurelli, Head of Technical Processing, Science, Industry and Business Library, New York Public Library–Research Libraries; Mary Iber, Cornell College*

Reported by Betty Landesman

**Slight-Gibney** began the preconference by describing the process used at her institution, a small ARL library with a collections budget of just under $5 million. They have a single budget for the library rather than specific allocations for specific collections. The aspects of the information resources budget that she went on to describe are context, conceptualization, cycles, content, stewardship, and cost control.

The context of the budget is one in which funding for higher education is shrinking. Colleges are not controlling costs because they cannot, and legislatures are not providing enough money because they don’t have it. Access to higher education is a real problem because of higher tuition and lower financial aid. There is also a push toward “more, better, faster (and cheaper?)” education: Get more students in, give them a good education, and get them out in four years. The scholarly publishing business model affects the budget. Institutions are expanding their
sources of revenue, and there is a greater emphasis on online courses.

Expenses include payroll, collections and access, supplies and services, and building operations. Revenue includes the general fund, other budgeted funds, income generation, and gifts and grants. Seven positions were eliminated last year by attrition, but the Libraries are still paying out more in benefits. The collections budget was cut by 3 percent.

Slight-Gibney described “silos” and “tubes”—two methods of conceptualizing a budget. Using the “silos” model means looking at big categories (e.g., processing and automation, database access, serials, monographs), breaking them down into smaller categories, and deciding how to spend in each category. Using the “tubes” model means looking at disciplines and deciding how to spend for materials within the disciplines.

In terms of cycles and timelines, Slight-Gibney has been working on next year’s budget since last fall. The library has to plan serials cancellations well in advance, since faculty leave in June. She advocated planning for multiple years.

In developing budget content, you need to know what information you need, when you need it, where do you find it, and how do you present it. Some examples of useful information are inflation rate by category and sometimes subject, new programs, and strategic initiatives.

Stewardship means using your resources wisely. In an atmosphere of level or reduced funding, Slight-Gibney recommended increased cooperation and collaboration, focusing on the library’s mission and values, and managing for sustainability. Budget cuts make you decide what your core values are. In Oregon’s case they made the decision not to lay off any staff but to cut collections instead. They are no longer collecting as they used to, but rather relying more on their consortium as a collection. Slight-Gibney warned against implementing false economies. For example, if you cut the student budget, are you just moving the same sort of work up to higher staff if you don’t cut services?

Finally, Slight-Gibney described specific methods of serials cost control being utilized at her institution. They are eliminating format redundancy in favor of online only. They are purchasing to support the curriculum, which means unbundling and ordering fewer foreign titles. They have cut standing orders for continuations. This practice is common in law libraries, which may order a base volume every few years and not order updates because the information is available online. Cuts are based on usage data. They are entering into resource sharing and “last copy” cooperative agreements. Long-term strategies include moving the discussion out of the library and looking at new models that are evolving, such as open access and pay-per-view. With 8-10 percent price increases, it is not hard to get people to understand that things have to change.

Taffurelli then gave an overview of the historical development of the New York Public Library and the current structure of 85 circulating branch libraries in 3 boroughs (Manhattan, The Bronx, and Staten Island), with almost 2 million card holders and 6.8 million volumes, and 4 research library centers with approximately 48,000 card holders and over 43 million volumes. She described the 2003 sources of income. Sixty-five percent of the branch libraries’ income came from the City of New York, while the largest source of income for the research libraries was investment income (thirty percent). For both, salaries accounted for the greatest percentage of expenditures.

A five-year overview of the research libraries’ materials budget showed increases for every year except 2002. However, they still have to cut. Taffurelli described the measures taken to maintain research library collection integrity while coping with budget cuts. In 2000, they cancelled the microfilm for JSTOR titles and decided not to bind. There were hiring freezes in the three subsequent years. In 2002, they reduced service to five days, cut the general book fund, and cancelled duplicate databases and expensive science titles. In 2003, there was an 18 percent cut in the general book fund and cancellation of some databases.

For 2004, they have cancelled foreign-language materials and duplicate subscriptions. Taffurelli described the criteria used for selecting microfilm cancellations: price (compare print/film price with binding cost), frequency (less frequent than weekly), quality of paper (must be bindable), and size (oversize is more expensive to bind). If a journal comes irregularly, requires many claims, and has many missing issues, the microfilm would not be cancelled. The Science, Industry, and Business Library cancelled 84 percent of its microfilm subscriptions in FY2004 with an estimated savings of $35,000-50,000. There are indirect costs associated with these cancellations. As a library of record, they are unable to discard print issues when microfilm is cancelled. They have also had to implement a new binding policy, with a nearly 50 percent reduction in the binding budget. They are using their Serials Solutions list; if a title is available in a database, they will not bind it, even though the version in the database might not be complete. They are also deferring binding for sturdier titles.
The Research Libraries, Princeton University, and Columbia University have formed a consortium to utilize an off-site storage facility housed on one of the Princeton campuses. NYPL’s initial load out was 1.9 million, and they are adding another 155,000 per year.

The projection for FY2005 is not promising. The Research Libraries (all four centers) overspent 18 percent for FY2004; not all cancellations were processed in time, and price increases were greater than anticipated. There will be an 8 percent cut: $400,000 for science and $250,000 for business.

Iber then described how her institution handled a need to cut. Traditional methods include cutting a percentage across the board and asking individual librarians to decide what to cut in their areas. Cornell College decided on a different model. They imagined that they had no collection at all, and tried to determine what collection they should have to meet their needs.

For each subject area, they examined the curriculum, library usage within the subject area, the history of its needs, faculty research, usage statistics for each title, and accreditation requirements. Using resources such as *Magazines for Libraries* and professional associations, they created an “ideal” title list and compared it to what they owned both in print and electronically. For the latter, they considered embargoes and instability (e.g., OUP and Sage have pulled their full text out of aggregator databases).

They created spreadsheets from the ideal list and involved the faculty. By sharing the spreadsheets, they hoped to have the faculty claim ownership (will students use? does faculty use?). Benefits of involving the faculty in this way included raising awareness of what titles the library had—and there were more available than either the library or the faculty realized—as well as demonstrating that the library was following a systematic process (and not just trying to cut “their favorites”).

Cornell College did this project last summer. Iber recommended doing such a project when the faculty is available to respond. She also recommended communicating clearly with faculty, librarians, support staff, and student workers, as well as being fully honest with faculty: Will you cut whether they agree or not, or will they have input into the process?

Repercussions for students included (hopefully) a more relevant selection of titles; holdings confusion as titles stop, start, and change formats; and confusing links to databases where the message is that, “Your library owns this title,” but you may only have 1-2 years. Repercussions for staff included anxiety, a time-consuming process, hard decisions (what to do with long runs after they discontinue, “vested interest syndrome”), and decisions on binding or microform for titles not being renewed.

Iber reported mostly positive feedback from faculty. They preferred the systematic approach over a blanket percentage cut. They were able to get out of the “we’ve always gotten that journal” rut, and they feel that the deans have a greater awareness of library needs and costs. The overall change in the collection was probably only 10 percent, but the return on investment was in getting a good collection and having a greater awareness of what is in it and how it is being used.

---

**MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING**
Bea Caraway, NASIG Secretary

1. **Welcome (McKee)**

At 8:30 a.m., June 20, 2004, Anne McKee, NASIG President, welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order.

2. **Highlights of the past year (McKee)**

President McKee shared the following highlights with the membership:

NASIG purchased a laptop for the conference registrar’s use before and during the conference.

As a result of holding the conference entirely in a hotel, we were able to have 30 complimentary guest rooms, which we used to house award recipients, thus saving about $3,000. Conference participants booked more than 300 rooms beyond our minimum.

As a result of some NASIG members’ use of our “official airline,” Midwest Airlines, to get to Milwaukee, we will have a free flight to use for the next conference. This will decrease the expenditures accordingly for bringing award recipients to Minneapolis in 2005.

Minneapolis was chosen as the location for the 2005 conference.

The NASIG archives gained a permanent home at the University of Illinois Archives.

The NASIG membership approved three changes to the bylaws. These provided for additions to Section 1,
Membership Rights, for changes in the nomination procedure to allow for petition candidates; and for a change of term length for the Treasurer and the Secretary from two to three years, but with no possibility for re-election to a consecutive term.

NASIG adopted a new strategic plan.

The Database and Directory Committee added a print-on-demand version of the online membership Directory.

The organization survived our first spamming incident, and we even bonded over it!

For the first time, conference registration was conducted exclusively online. The software performed well and the process was further refined in this its second year of use.

The Board and some committees made excellent use of our new conference-calling ability.

3. Introduction of the 2003/04 Board members and parliamentarian (McKee)

McKee introduced Connie Foster as the parliamentarian for the business meeting. Board members were introduced as follows: Steve Savage (Vice President/President-Elect), Eleanor Cook (Past President), Denise Novak (Treasurer), Bea Caraway (Secretary), Members-at-Large Carol MacAdam, Mary Page, Robert Persing, Kevin Randall, Stephanie Schmitt, and Joyce Tenney.

4. Highlights from June 2004 meeting of the Executive Board

Secretary Bea Caraway presented the following highlights from the Board meeting held on June 16, 2004:

As of June 16, 2004, NASIG had 1,293 paid members, or 6 percent more than at the same time last year.

The contract with the Minneapolis Hilton for the 2005 conference has been signed.

President-Elect Steve Savage is in the process of appointing or will soon appoint the following task forces: the Online Evaluations Task Force, the Strategic Support Task Force, and the Anniversary Task Force.

For the convenience of NASIG members and members of the Executive Board, links to newly approved Board meeting and business meeting minutes will be added to already approved minutes on a list of minutes to be mounted on the Newsletter webpage. An announcement of newly approved minutes will be added each time behind the “What’s New” button on the NASIG homepage.

The Board voted to continue making use of our successful online registration system and to budget for $3,500 worth of needed enhancements during 2004/05, addressing them in priority order until the budget is exhausted.

5. Treasurer’s report (Novak)

Treasurer Novak opened her report by saying that we are in good financial position, with approximately $325,700 in equity; however, almost all of the bills from the conference are still to be paid, which will reduce that figure considerably. She then explained that only about 40 percent of each year’s expenses are covered by stable, recurring income sources (our membership dues and the payment we receive from Haworth for publishing the Conference Proceedings). The rest comes from conference surpluses, which vary greatly from year to year (some years being negative). She mentioned that one option for increasing our income was to identify higher-yielding investments, but that over the long term, the organization must find a more stable source of income that will cover the annual operating expenses.

6. Introduction of new members of the Executive Board (Ginnani)

Katy Ginnani, Chair of the Nominations & Elections Committee, introduced the new members for 2004/05 as follows: Mary Page (Vice President/President-Elect), Elizabeth Parang (Secretary), Members-at-Large (Jill Emery, Judy Luther).

7. Site Selection (Mary Page, Joyce Tenney)

Page reminded the membership of the date and location of the 2005 conference (May 19-22, 2005, at the Minneapolis Hilton). She then described what goes on during the site selection process, including how the Site Selection team accepts or solicits proposals, the intensive site visits they make to assess the potential for a given site, and the long Board discussions they lead regarding all the options available. The Board bases decisions on many factors, but most prominently on geographic location; availability of affordable and convenient public transit from the airport to the site; price; accessibility; availability on needed dates; ability to provide adequate meeting space, meals, and breaks; and availability of affordable and convenient venues for evening entertainment. She finished by inviting interested members to submit a site proposal if they believe they know a site that meets most or all of the aforementioned criteria.

8. Old business

None reported.
9. New business

McKee described for the membership the brainstorming session held on Thursday, June 17, 2004, from 10:00 a.m.-12 noon. About 40 members and Board members attended, and for two hours, all sorts of ideas flowed forth for ways to increase NASIG’s revenue. The group generated great enthusiasm, and everyone seemed to think it very productive. The one idea that was immediately adopted was to have a drawing for full conference registration for either 2005 or 2006. By the time of the business meeting there were many entries for the drawing. Incoming Secretary Elizabeth Parang took detailed notes from the brainstorming session and will write them up for publication on NASIGWeb after the conference.

10. Adjournment

There being no further business, the 2004 business meeting was adjourned at 9:15 a.m.

Minutes approved July 30, 2004.

VISION SESSIONS

Alternative Scholarly Publishing. The Role of the Libraries in the World; Role of the World in Libraries: An Interview with an Author

Matthew Battles, author of Library: An Unquiet History and Rare Books Librarian at Harvard University, interviewed by Adrian Alexander, Executive Director, Greater Western Library Alliance

Reported by Virginia Taffurelli

This year’s conference opened with a new format for NASIG conferences: an interview. Adrian Alexander interviewed Matthew Battles, author of Library: An Unquiet History, a book about the history of libraries, the destruction of books, and building outstanding collections. Battles considers the library a text. Preparing 500,000 volumes for transfer to offsite storage gave Battles an opportunity to learn about the rare books collection at Harvard University’s Widener Library. Exposure to the many treasures in libraries inspired Battles to become an author, although he does not consider himself a scholar because his attention span is too short. He recalled an incident from his childhood when he was playing baseball with some friends. The ball went through a basement window of the library where literature was shelved, and his interest was piqued.

Destruction of libraries is a significant theme throughout the book, often serving a mythological purpose. Throughout history, there are many tales of library destruction. In actuality, many collections have been preserved. The library at Alexandria was the archetype of library destruction. Although the library was burned several times, many ancient texts survived. When books were burned in feudal villages in China, calligraphers made copies of the illuminated manuscripts for burning and buried the originals. When the city of Herculaneum was buried under volcanic ash in 79 A.D., many scrolls were preserved. Battles described Swift’s “Battle of the Books,” the debate in England about the role of libraries in the seventeenth century. The twentieth century witnessed another period of library destruction, particularly by the Nazis of Germany, in Russian communities, and more recently in Baghdad.

These are just a few of the stories related in Battles’ book. “Libraries have survived for centuries; nothing today is comparable.” Many modern resources, such as e-mail, memoranda, and phone conversations, are considered ephemera and are therefore in peril. Important documentation is lost to future historians.

When asked what he admires most about librarians, Battles agreed with Emerson that librarians don’t just open doors to libraries but lead the way to finding information. In the early nineteenth century, book publishing went from a craft to a period of mass production, and students fled from a “labyrinth of groaning shelves” in university libraries. Emerson advocated that a scholar was needed to create order out of the chaos. Battles skirted the question, “What do you admire least about librarians?” by replying, “My favorite word is serendipity.”

The formal interview was followed by a lively question-and-answer period. Questions ranged from how libraries reflect the culture of the day, to Jonathan Franz’s refusal of Oprah’s Book Club, to how to attract readers to the library, to what will be the long-term impact of the Internet.

Just as Battles’ interest in libraries was piqued when his ball went through the basement window, this interview piqued the interest of many in the audience. When this reporter was assigned Vision Session I for the NASIG Newsletter, she borrowed the library’s copy to get a sense of what the book was about. After a quick scan, she decided that this was a “must read” text and immediately ordered her own personal copy.

What’s the Big Deal?

Kenneth Frazier, Director, University of Wisconsin-Madison Libraries; Loretta Ebert, Director, Rensselaer Research Libraries
This session was about publisher packages (Big Deals) from the perspective of a large ARL library that hasn’t taken the Big Deal, and from a consortium of small-medium size libraries that has. The first speaker was Ken Frasier, Director of the University of Wisconsin-Madison Libraries. He is a past president of ARL and a founding member of SPARC.

Frasier explained that the “Big Deal” is a comprehensive library agreement. In most cases, all journals by a publisher are licensed for a cost based on previous subscription levels, plus a premium of 10-30 percent. They are typically multi-year contracts with specified annual price increases, usually promised to be less than journal inflation. Ninety percent of the ARL libraries have the Big Deal. This arrangement controls costs and expands access to information. Researchers prefer online journals, and it’s also a big win for publishers, as Big Deals increase market share and are opportunities to put restrictions on use of the content (such as ILL) that could not occur with print. Library directors say the Big Deals have benefited users.

However, the Big Deal has not benefited everyone. University presses and small societies are facing huge challenges and can’t compete. Other bad outcomes are that libraries pay the giants first, and then cut cheaper society journals. We are seeing less diverse collections and decreases in book buying, especially in medicine. Can all this be attributed to the Big Deal? Frasier says that living without the Big Deal is not so bad. UW-Madison’s serials collection remains strong, its ARL ranking is rising, and it is still a large ILL lender. The University of Wisconsin system now co-operates as never before.

However, they have cancelled half of their commercial journals, including a third of their Wiley titles. They are cutting five percent of their titles a year. Faculty in biomedicine and chemistry feel that the university can’t support their research. LibQual+ results show that UW-Madison faculty perceive that access to information is below standard, but faculty are dissatisfied with that at most of the universities the LibQual+ surveyed. The Big Deal would be a benefit if the budget would cover inflation, but the University of Wisconsin budget will not increase.

Frasier says there are alternatives available. Linking software such as SFX turns every index into a full-text database. It calls into question familiar patterns of using indexes. It is possible to go from an index to an article delivery service. Libraries can go to a pay-per-view model. Linking to open-access journals and information repositories, like the math-physics archive at Cornell, is another possibility. This was started by Paul Ginsparg and now has over 300,000 articles in math and physics. It is the first place researchers in high-energy physics go, getting 20 million hits per year. It no longer matters if your institution subscribes to Nuclear Physics A&B. What will happen in the SFX environment when it can link to these open repositories? Frasier acknowledged that disciplines are different and the physics model may not be transferable. However, scholars increasingly feel that they own their research, and we should encourage them to self-archive. Frasier doesn’t see this as an either/or world (Big Deal or not), but we can become too complacent and need to work on the creation of new models.

In addition, reform of scholarly communication is gaining momentum. Researchers are increasingly ready to redirect their publications to non-commercial publishers. More are turning to the open-access model. It is possible to urge faculty to turn to non-commercial options. Even when they don’t use these options, they still have self-archiving options.

Where do we go from here? How to meet the needs of users with declining budgets? The future will be different from the past. Frasier believes that libraries need to preserve their mission, which is not to preserve commercial products but to help our researchers disseminate their work.

The second speaker was Loretta Ebert, Director of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (RPI) since 1994. She has forged partnerships between public and private institutions in New York. Ebert reminded us of some scholarly communication debates which affect libraries. Many feel that research funded by government grants should be publicly available. Commercial publishers are monopolistic and parasitic, and non-profit publishers are not far behind them. Ebert later clarified that she did not intend to imply that all societies are trying to emulate the giant commercial publishers. As large, shared disciplinary databases grow, reliance on journals will decrease. Open access is promising, but so far lacks evidence of sustainability.

Academic dilemmas that involve libraries include longstanding ones, such as the reliance on commercial publishers’ products in tenure and promotion, reliance on peer review to establish credibility, and reliance on the “halo effect” of prestigious journals. We now face the print/electronic conundrum.

Exactly what is the modern “research library”? We expect change in the scholarly and academic community, but what change do we expect of ourselves? Should we maintain print or go electronic only? Do we need local ownership? Are we interested in intrinsic value or usage?
We see different pricing in libraries for the same content. How committed are we really to resource sharing? Ebert strongly believes that libraries must collaborate to strengthen our collections. She says that we cooperate, but this is not true collaboration. She offers an example of a successful Big Deal collaboration effort that benefited all the institutions involved.

Ebert formed the Partners in Information and Innovation (Pi2). It is a consortium of small, medium, and large independent colleges and universities in New York and includes the New York State Department of Health, American Museum of Natural History, and the Albany Medical College. A complete list of institutions in the consortium is available at http://www.lib.rpi.edu/about/consortia/pi22/members.html. Pi2 does not include the SUNY or CUNY campuses. It has no staff, fees, or even any real organization. It began with a shared license for Current Contents, which was housed at RPI and began licensing of other electronic products when they became available.

For the Science Direct license, 13 institutions analyzed their subscriptions for duplicates. They found they had 697 subscriptions with 290 duplicates. Each title was “claimed” by an institution. Those who gave up duplicate subscriptions added titles up to the amount needed to maintain their subscription base. As a result, they dropped half of the duplicates and added 94 new titles.

For their first contract, 2001-2003, 18 institutions shared access to 791 unique titles with the equivalent to a $1.4 million subscription base. Larger institutions paid a content fee of 15 percent, and small institutions paid a flat fee of $13,000. They had an annual price cap, and no cancellations were allowed, but they could exchange titles and received a discount for electronic-only subscriptions. They paid $15 per article from non-subscribed titles.

Going electronic-only and dropping print gave them the best value for the dollar. They saw a tremendous growth in usage with full-text article retrieval rising 281 percent. They used 1084 titles, and 201 titles were not used at all. 600 titles got 93 percent of the use. Four institutions had 56 percent of the use, and the other fourteen had 44 percent use between them. None of the institutions feel that their payment or usage has been unfair. For example, RPI accounts for 12.6 percent of the amount spent and 24 percent of the usage. RPI used 955 titles, but originally owned only 63 titles. Even the smallest institutions used about 500 titles. They have just entered their second three-year contract, this time with a cross-access fee.

Ebert feels that the Big Deal had a good impact on their collections: They decreased their duplicate titles, decreased their print subscriptions, and emphasized current access over archiving. They have document delivery for titles not shared. Each institution receives an individual invoice, but they have full disclosure of pricing. They can view shared and individual statistics. Ebert said that her consortium’s deal is not equal in pay or usage, and fairness is in the mind of the beholder. Their institutions seem to be happy with what they’re paying for. No institution has dropped out of the deal for that reason, and the faculties on all the campuses are happy. She is most proud of the good communication and high level of trust among the Pi2 institutions and hopes it will be a model for other successful collaborations.

**Alternative Scholarly Publishing**

*Heather Joseph, President and COO, BioOne; John Tagler, Vice President Account Development and Channel Marketing, Elsevier*

Reported by Molly Thomas

Heather Joseph drew on her experience as president and COO of BioOne to speak on the changes she has seen in alternative scholarly publishing in the last ten years. She started the presentation by asking the audience to think about the statement, “You say you want a revolution,” for scholarly publishing, but this depends on understanding the whole publishing community. Ten years ago, it would have been difficult to find anyone exploring alternative scholarly publishing opportunities. However, developing alternative routes of scholarly communication is not easy, and individuals and institutions must be—and only recently have been—ready to try. Another factor that needs to be taken into account is the exploding volume of material since World War II, which Joseph has particularly noticed in the science field.

Scholarly communication is based on a circle of gifts where ideas are shared freely and not for gain. The rewards come from the advancement of knowledge, respect in the field, and tenure and promotion. Commercial publishers dominate the market because they saw the demand for a way to disseminate scholarly research, moved in to fill the need, and set about testing what the market was able to bear. Alternative scholarly publishing is a response to the continuing raise in prices from the commercial publishers. Another opportunity for scholarly publishing exists in the smaller, non-profit entities as consolidation in the market place continues and there are fewer and fewer commercial entities.

Scholarly communication has also been affected by advances in technology, which have allowed for greater collection, distribution, and publication of information. However, these advances can be both a boon and a drain with an increased demand for electronic delivery. Additionally, the trend of “bundling” emerged, and purchasing entities are forced to take all the publications...
in the bundle or nothing. The net effect of this trend has been a reduced number of purchasing entities and a reduced choice of what to purchase.

Joseph continued with additional factors that have influenced scholarly communication. One of these is the open access movement. Another is the emergence of electronic tools, which provide new possibilities for research. Research is being collected digitally, and researchers want to disseminate it this way. Again, the sheer amount of raw data being collected has exploded due to greater and new technology. Researchers are now able to share data and apply informatics techniques, as well as manipulate data, as it becomes too much for one researcher to do alone. In fact, researchers are now making use of free depositories to deposit raw data and regularly trading ownership of data for the greater good of the research community. As researchers become more computer savvy, they are able to control the distribution of their data from their desk. New entrants in research fields have lower barriers to accessing data and are more used to sharing their research.

Joseph then spoke on the progress that has been made with alternative models for scholarly publishing. This progress is seen in the rapid embrace of digital technology, the active collaboration on standards, and the collective action to broaden participation in alternative scholarly publishing. The level of success of these alternatives can be seen in the increased competition as more outlets to choose from become available. Finally, there are beginning signs of price moderation. For example, SPARC has published an individual journal in direct competition to one that was only available through a commercial publisher, and this resulted in the stabilization in the pricing of the commercially published journal.

Customers also benefit from alternative scholarly publishing. Joseph spoke of the culture of educated customers that has been created. Purchasers are more aware of business practices and are able to renegotiate package deals and loosen restrictive licenses, which alleviates stress on library budgets. Authors have also become more educated on alternative routes to scholarly communication and are following grassroots movements in terms of the journals to which they submit articles, creating new author agreements, and establishing new criteria for selecting publication options.

As the deconstruction of the current scholarly communication model occurs, Joseph feels the scholarly community must be aware of four crucial functions of scholarly journals: Registration, Certification, Awareness, and Archiving. The value of each function and who is responsible for each function must be examined and understood as alternatives for scholarly publishing are explored. Joseph commented that changes need to be made systemwide and on a large scale. Although one journal was successful, a bigger impact is needed in order to make a significant difference.

Finally, one must recognize that the movement is still young and that support from all the major stakeholders is necessary. As creators of the content, author support is essential. High-level administration at universities, laboratories, and libraries also must be engaged. Public entities also must be involved with the movement. If research is being conducted with public money, than is research public property? If so, the public policy arena must be to discuss alternative scholarly publishing. Joseph concluded the talk by stating her belief that instead of a revolution, scholarly communication needs an evolution.

John Tagler began his presentation by defining the classic functions of scholarly journals: Certification, Validation, Communication, and Preservation. Although the labels were slightly different, these functions meshed closely with those presented by Joseph. Tagler then spoke on the value that is added by the publishing process. Authors are able to establish priority through the date stamping of their research. Publishers provide structuring to manuscripts and formatting for print and electronic formats, which makes permanent archiving possible. The publishing process also protects authors in terms of copyright and archives research results, which is connected to abstracting and indexing databases. In addition, the current publishing method allows for self-monitoring and self-correcting, as editors and publishers work together to prevent abuses.

Tagler then spoke on the role of the commercial publisher, which he sees as taking calculated risks. Commercial publishers are able to foster journals in areas others may not believe will be viable in the market, as well as support scholarly communication in areas not always well-funded or fully developed. Factors driving publications include speed, global reach of content, technology development, new digital content, fierce competition, increased efficiencies in terms of cost and service, back office changes, and the uncertainty of future publishing model.

Libraries and publishers face many challenges in the current scholarly communication environment. Support for libraries has not kept pace with the cost of scholarly, particularly scientific, publishing. Electronic publication is often misrepresented as being quicker and simpler and able to be done cheaper, better, and faster. As many users also perceive that everything is free on the Web, more education about services and developing a greater appreciation of librarian services is necessary.
Misinformation continues to appear on e-mail lists and discussion boards, which harms both publishers and libraries.

Publishers are attempting to improve the situation by developing new business models in terms of consortia pricing and providing more flexible subscription options. Elsevier is also working on improving authors’ rights. Authors may now post articles on their personal homepages, institutional repositories, and pre-print servers. This allows authors to better share their research with colleagues. Elsevier is also investing in author tools that will provide faster dissemination of information.

Tagler also spoke on commercial publishers’ investment in the future through their investment in technology, particularly in terms of product development. Ultimately, technological innovations will lead to more access. Publishers are starting to collaborate with each other to keep technology moving. One example of this is the recent products that provide linking between publisher resources, such as CrossRef. Tagler also pointed out that open access is not free, and open access publishers will need to find ways to recoup publishing costs. Although commercial publishers welcome the experimental processes of alternative scholarly publishing, Tagler cautioned that the existing model shouldn’t be endangered in the blind hope of something better. Tagler concluded with his belief that collaboration, not fragmentation, is essential as new publishing models are examined, and that libraries and librarians must play a key role in helping to raise awareness about these new initiatives.

**STRAATEGY SESSIONS**

**Economics of Society Publishing: Through a Glass Darkly**

*October Ivins, Consultant, Digital Content and Access Solutions, and Member, Board of Directors of the Society for Scholarly Publishing; Bill Kasdorf, General Editor, Columbia Guide to Digital Publishing and President, Impressions Book and Services, Inc; and Keith Settier, Deputy Executive Director, American Meteorological Society*

Reported by Andrée Rathemacher

The first speaker was October Ivins, who has a broad background with vendors, publishers, and libraries. Ivins’ major point was that the diversity among scholarly publishers is at risk. In a study she did in 1999 of titles in Ulrich’s and PubList, Ivins found that 25 percent of publishers published 7-1,400 titles, another 25 percent published 2-6 titles, while 50 percent published only 1 serial title.

Based on an article by Born and Van Orsdel in the April 15, 2004, *Library Journal*, Ivins presented three “tiers” of scholarly publishers:

- Tier 1, the “Group of 7,” which consists of several large commercial publishers who each publish many titles (Elsevier, Springer, Kluwer (which has since been bought by Springer), Taylor & Francis, Blackwell, Wiley, and Lippincott).
- Tier 2, large society and university presses, such as Cambridge, Oxford, Harvard, MIT, AIP, ACS, IEEE, Sage, and Nature.
- Tier 3, a diverse network of publishers with one or more title each. They are international in nature and tend to be small publishers, with little or no budget for marketing and few staff. A little over 20 percent of Tier 3 publishers consist of scholarly and professional associations which usually offer a quarterly refereed journal, a newsletter, and perhaps a directory or conference proceedings. Other Tier 3 publishers are university presses; independent non-profit publishers, often run by academic departments or institutes based at universities and managed by one or two faculty members; and independent for-profit publishers whose offerings are inexpensive. There are perhaps 20,000 Tier 3 publishers.

Tier 3 publishers are “at risk.” They are facing fierce competition by the large, for-profit publishers. Furthermore, some of the decisions libraries are making are hurting them, thus threatening the very publishers that offer the most affordable information. For example, by signing up for “Big Deals,” libraries have less money left for non-Big Deal publishers. They often cancel the publications of Tier 3 publishers and are very unlikely to add any subscriptions from them. To make matters worse, libraries often decide which journals to cancel based on percentage—not dollar—price increase and usage measures. Both tend to favor larger publishers: Percentage increases tend to be higher for low-cost journals, especially for journals that have kept their prices low for as long as possible and then increase their prices as a last resort, and usage tends to be higher for Big Deal services with federated searching capabilities that provide access to many journal titles. Libraries are also favoring journals that are available in online format and have extensive online backfiles, both of which are costly propositions for small publishers with little capital.

In this environment of corporate consolidation, increasing serial prices, a weak dollar, and flat library budgets, all publishers are facing heightened financial pressure. Tier 3 publishers, however, are in the weakest position to “ride it out,” and become destabilized more easily. To make
matters worse, Tier 1 and Tier 2 publishers, recognizing the limited market for new titles, often set their sights on taking over established titles, many of which are published by Tier 3 society publishers. In fact, journal titles from society, association, and other non-profits now make up 17-45 percent of the titles published by Tier 1 publishers. A comparison of the prices of journals “before” and “after” moving from small/non-profit publishers to the large commercial publishers reveals immediate price increases of 12-398 percent.

Following Ivins, Bill Kasdorf revealed the “hidden” technological processes and costs that go into producing print and electronic journals. At the beginning of the publication process, journals need to acquire manuscripts and shepherd them through the peer review process. Commercial publishers and big society publishers tend to use MS Tracking/Peer Review software systems, such as RapidReview from Cadmus or AllenTrack from Allen Press. Small societies do without them.

After the manuscripts have been reviewed, they must be edited, which is a very detailed and time-consuming process. For example, articles must conform to the journal’s editorial style, must use proper units and nomenclature, must use clear, consistent language, and references and figures must be in acceptable formats. Some editing is still done on paper, usually by freelancers, as well as in Microsoft Word, using styles. More advanced systems use XML “tags” to structure elements of the document.

The next step is composition and page layout. This is more complicated than many people realize, as the article must be laid out in justified columns, with proper hyphenation and formatting of tables, figures, and equations. Updates from the author once the process has started often require time-intensive reworking of the layout. For composition and layout, the large publishers use high-end systems that require large investments to acquire, learn, maintain, and update. They engage in extensive setup and coding in order to automate the process as much as possible, often using XML tagging. The labor that is required is increasingly done offshore. Such systems are beyond the reach of smaller publishers, who tend to use less-automated desktop publishing software, either in-house or contracted out to freelancers. Their process is much more labor-intensive and requires a concerted effort to keep staff and systems up to date. Furthermore, the advanced capabilities of XML tagging, which is still unavailable in most desktop publishing packages, is forcing a re-evaluation of desktop publishing methods altogether.

The final step in publishing a journal is the printing and mailing. Despite the advent of online publishing, the demand for print is still high. Therefore, publishers have to continue to create print journals while creating online versions as well. Unfortunately, each format requires a different publishing process. Print versions of journals must have professional-quality typography and layout; simplistic page output (as might result from using the online version as the source for the print version) is not accepted. While Adobe’s PDF format (easily produced from the print version) is commonly used for online publishing, it is not ideal. An XML-based format is better, since it allows for complex tagging that will enhance online searchability and linking capabilities and meets archival standards. Unfortunately, few systems or vendors provide advanced XML capabilities at this time.

The third speaker was Keith L. Seitter, who provided a case study of a nonprofit publisher by showcasing the publishing activities of the AMS. The mission of the American Meteorological Society is the dissemination of knowledge. To this end, the Society publishes nine scientific journals and a magazine in both print and online formats. The AMS earns a net revenue of 5.8 percent on their publications, which they use to support K-12 education programs, public awareness, student travel to meetings, and other educational activities.

Seitter provided a detailed financial picture of the AMS’s journal-publishing activities. The figures he presented reinforced Kasdorf’s point that publishers cannot save money by publishing their journals online unless they eliminate the print format altogether, since publishing both online and in print costs more than publishing in print alone. However, while publishing online is not without significant costs (for example it costs the AMS about $250,000 a year just to host their journals online), on the expense side of the balance sheet, it does achieve cost savings, because reprint expenses, postage, and print expenses are eliminated (although salaries and benefits, support to volunteer editors, back-issue storage, and overhead remain the same). All in all, eliminating print and publishing only online would lower expenses for the AMS by about 25 percent.

However, it is not enough to look just at expenses. On the income side, a society publisher faces significant risk in making a decision to publish only online. Most significantly, the publisher risks a decline in overall subscriptions that might result from a decision to cease publishing in print format. Even among institutional subscribers to AMS journals, 59 percent still subscribe to print-only, and an additional 15 percent subscribe to print plus online. Only 26 percent of institutional publishers purchase AMS journals online-only. If the institutional subscribers who currently subscribe to print format only were faced with the discontinuation of the print journals, they might decide to convert their subscription to online
format, but they might also decide to drop it altogether in favor of pay-per-view or ILL access. If that happened, the AMS would lose income to the extent that any savings in expenses by publishing online only would be cancelled out. Furthermore, if the subscriber base of the AMS were to decrease overall, even if income continued to exceed expenses, the AMS would not be fulfilling its mission as a non-profit organization, because their journals would not be available in as many places, and their lower overall income would not support as many educational activities.

The goal for the AMS, like other society publishers, explained Seitter, is to make the transition gradually from publishing in print and online to publishing only online over the next two to four years. This will allow print-only institutional subscribers to shift to online-only at their own pace instead of being forced into a decision. As the percentage of print-only subscribers becomes smaller, it becomes less of a risk for publishers to go online-only. The scientific community has already decided that it doesn’t need print, however a significant part of the library community will not be able to accept online-only until a dependable system for retaining a permanent print archive exists. On their part, publishers need to develop a pricing structure that encourages online-only subscriptions while still allowing print-only as an option. This would involve separating out the cost of producing the print from the price for online subscriptions. And, since there is a distinct probability that print will never quite go away, print should be made to “pay for itself” by making print subscribers pay a premium so that publishing in print format is financially neutral to the publisher.

A brief but spirited discussion concluded this session. One idea that caught the attention of those present was suggested by a member of the audience. This was to create a pricing model in which the content of the journal is priced separately from the delivery options. Thus, all subscribers would pay the same content fee, with online subscribers paying one amount for online delivery while print subscribers paying another amount for print delivery.

E-Resource Management: the Quest for Systems and Standards
Timothy D. Jewell, Project Director for the DLF Electronic Resource Management Initiative; and Head, Collection Management Services, University of Washington Libraries
Reported by Dalene Hawthorne

Tim Jewell began the session by providing the following context for electronic resource management (ERM):

- Demand for 24/7 access to information
- Increased spending on electronic resources
- Restricted budgets that have driven a shift to electronic-only journal access
- Dynamic nature of the marketplace with shifting business models
- “Google-ization” of searching for information (make it easy or forget about it)
- Complexities of e-resource acquisition
- Impact of licensing agreements

Jewell explained that e-resource management tasks such as generating and maintaining alphabetical and subject lists of e-resources, loading aggregator holdings information, tracking license negotiation, license terms, and the communication processes involved in negotiating licenses, problem tracking, and systematic usage reporting are not supported by current integrated library systems. This has led to the creation of many separate documents and/or applications to support this data.

Jewell provided a list of institutions that have instituted ERM initiatives or systems. Of those, he highlighted Yale, MIT’s VERA, the Colorado Alliance’s Gold Rush, Johns Hopkins’ HERMES, UCLA’s Erdb, and Penn State’s ERLIC2.

Jewell showed Yale’s lists of databases and screen shots of Yale’s license terms of use that are presented in a tabular format that is easy to read and interpret. He also demonstrated how the database links to the general license terms at the publisher’s website.

MIT’s VERA electronic resource management system generates public webpages that provide access to databases and e-journals by searching or through alphabetic or subject lists. It describes availability of e-resources by location, manages and generates URLs, provides access to license information, and provides status and user support information.

The Colorado Alliance ERM system summarizes license terms. The package is available for purchase.

Johns Hopkins’ HERMES system includes a full workflow to support selection through implementation. It dynamically generates public webpages, automatically notifies staff about renewals, provides link management, and manages access and use restrictions by user group. It is also interoperable with the ILS. The system is SQL and Cold Fusion-based and has been available on an open source basis since December 2003.

UCLA’s Erdb provides public webpages where users can search by title or subject. The system allows staff to enter and track data that describes the title, type of resource,
acquisition information, license terms, and access problems.

Penn State’s ERLIC\textsuperscript{2} includes many of the functions included in the other systems described and a “billboard” that displays the current status of an electronic resource.

The DLF Electronic Resource Management Initiative began in September 2002. The NISO/DLF steering group formed after the ALCTS Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group developed an interest in e-resource management and agreed to sponsor an informal meeting at the 2001 ALA Annual conference. The steering group members are Tim Jewell; Ivy Anderson of Harvard; Adam Chandler, Sharon Farb and Angela Riggio of UCLA; Kimberly Parker of Yale; and Nathan Robertson of Johns Hopkins. This group became the ERMI Steering Group.

The formal, stated goals of ERMI are to describe the architecture needed to support ERM, establish lists of data elements and definitions, write and publish XML schemas and DTDs, and promote best practices and standards for data interchange. The informal goal of ERMI is to promote growth and development of local and vendor systems and services. The website that describes the project is at http://www.diglib.org/standards/dlf-erm02.htm.

A library reactor panel of 16 members and a vendor reactor panel of 12 members were formed to review the project goals and deliverables. The project “deliverables” for ERMI include a definition of the problem and a road map, functional requirements for an ERM system, a workflow diagram, an entity relationship diagram, data elements and definitions—including a data dictionary and data structure—and an XML schema.

The problem definition included a system survey to develop understanding of the scope of need and the options already available, and a final report. The workflow diagram outlines information needed for internal analysis and planning. The functional requirements provide details of the functionality needed for local and vendor system planning and as a source for developing RFPs. The entity relationship diagram can be thought of as the “tree” and is intended as an aid to conceptualization, while the data element dictionary can be thought of as the “leaves,” and the data structure can be thought of as the branches or “where the leaves go.” XML was investigated as having potential to support future data migration, vendor-to-library data interchange, and library-to-library data interchange.

Functional specifications were defined as the result of a series of meetings between Harvard and MIT in the spring of 2003 to discuss possible work with Ex Libris on ERM development. The DLF data element set was available, but functionality had yet to be defined. The results of these discussions were the basis of the current DLF functional requirements document.

Guiding principles for the functional requirements were agreed upon. They include the creation of an integrated environment for management and access, interoperability or data exchange with existing services such as OPACs, Web portals, library management systems, and link resolution services, and a single point of maintenance for each data element.

The general functional requirements that resulted include the ability to represent relationships among individual e-resources, packages, licenses, and online interfaces and associate them with license characteristics. Also required are robust reporting capabilities and the ability to export data.

Jewell then explained and showed slides of workflow diagrams, entity relationship diagrams, and the data dictionary and data structure.

Meanwhile, XML was being investigated by a work group comprised of Adam Chandler, Miriam Blake from the Los Alamos National Laboratory Research Library, Sharon Farb and Angela Riggio of UCLA, Nancy Hoebelheinrich from Stanford University, Nathan Robertson of Johns Hopkins, Simon St. Laurent of O’Reilly & Associates, and Robin Wendler from Harvard University. The work group originally considered creating a schema for the entire data dictionary but decided that the project was too big: It overlapped with other schemas and provided limited functionality. They agreed to refocus on license data.

Jewell then mentioned the status of ERM systems from vendors. Innovative Interfaces is the only vendor with a product currently in production, although several others are in development.

Jewell described areas where standards seem achievable and practical, although questions remain about each of them. These include descriptive data using JWP or ONIX, license information via ERLIC, usage information using COUNTER, and authentication using Shibboleth. He then described areas where standards seem harder to establish, such as contact information, administrative information, workflow, status, troubleshooting and problem tracking, and interoperability among modules.

Jewell finished by suggesting possible ERM futures, such as consideration and adoption of DLF documents and data elements, continued or accelerated development, another
NISO/DLF pre-standardization workshop, a new standards group for license or rights expression, and ERM interest groups such as a joint LITA/ALCTS Electronic Resources Management Interest Group.

**Quality of Scholarship in the Electronic Era**

*Michael Mabe, Director of Academic Relations, Elsevier; and Visiting Professor, City University, London.*

Reported by Gene Gardner

Michael Mabe is studying the publishing behavior of publishers and researchers. He has determined that the quality of scholarship is a difficult thing to measure and that relying on impact factors alone is not sufficient.

Assessment of quality and value is at the heart of scholarly communication. Assessment measures that have been used include peer review, judgments about the quality of the journal, assessment of the work of the researcher, and judgments about the researcher’s institution. There is a variance between what quality assessors say and the actions people actually take in regard to downloading, reading, citing, and linking.

Since 1999, Elsevier has conducted an ongoing study through their author feedback program. They ask their journal authors to rate the performance of the Elsevier title in which they were just published compared with their previous publishing experience in any journal.

Elsevier also looks at user behavior in terms of article use (infers reading), citations to the article (infers value), and linking (infers importance) and citation behavior, all of which represent an attribution of the scholarly value of the article.

Mabe suggests that the absolute value of an impact factor is not meaningful since so many variables influence the impact factor rating. These variables include the number of co-authors, size of the journal, time period of the measurement, and the type of article published. Also, impact factors mean different things in different disciplines: the humanities and research science, for example.

Quality measures should be tested. Perception studies, conducted by ranking journals through questionnaires, can be compared to impact factors. Comparison can also be made between what an author thinks is his/her best paper vs. impact factors. Another way to look at measurement is the correlation between how widely a paper is read vs. the impact factor of the journal.

Research being conducted in 2004 suggests that citations lead to downloads, but downloads don’t necessarily lead to citations.

Perceptions, citations, and downloads all reflect some aspect of quality. None provide a complete measure, but used together, they offer a richer perspective for measuring the quality of scholarship.

**E-Journal Site Licensing and Consortia**

*Philip Wallas, Vice President, Content Development, EBSCO Publishing; Linda Beebe, Senior Director, PsycINFO, American Psychological Association; Mark Mandelbaum, Director, Office of Publications, Association for Computing Machinery; Mark Danderson, Director of Institutional Licensing and Services, New England Journal of Medicine*  

Reported by Jeanne Langendorfer

Linda Beebe spoke about “Licensing Electronic Products at APA.” In 2004, the American Psychological Association (APA) licensed four databases: PsycINFO, a secondary database available in electronic form since the late 1960s; PsycARTICLES, a database of 53 full-text journals available since 1998; PsycEXTRA, a gray-literature database in extensive free trials; and PsycBOOKS, a database of over 600 books that will be available for free trials in August.

The content of these databases is available on multiple platforms, enabling APA, “… to be where our customers want to find us,” a philosophy that was formed with PsycINFO. The mission of APA is to disseminate their information widely.

APA began licensing in 1987 with their new CD product. They wanted to highlight their connection to their customers, regardless of platform, to make it easier to hear and respond to their concerns.

Early on, the organization was not structured to meet the challenges presented by electronic products. When announcements were made in 2000 about pricing changes and product delivery, APA found out “big time” that their system didn’t work very well, as customers and vendors expressed frustration and dismay at the delays in negotiating a cumbersome licensing process.

In response, APA instituted a new organizational structure in which appropriate staff resources were assigned to sales, marketing, and licensing. Customer’s advice on APA’s license was sought, and then the license was refined to eliminate unnecessary “legal-ese” and to fully address full-text issues. A streamlined structure and better use of technology led to faster processing and better customer service. Still, negotiating licenses was time consuming for all parties.

A bright, but “half-baked” idea was to institute a click-through license. Its main problems are that it circumvents
the library’s processes for recommendation, review, and signatory authority; it may not hold up in court; and it lacks provisions for changes. Even as APA seeks to simplify their license, many libraries are required by their institution or state to add or delete provisions (i.e., usage data, performance standards, ADA requirements, indemnification, payment schedules, attorney’s fees). Other areas of concern are ILL, binding arbitration, limits on liability, and perpetual access.

What are the main issues? Libraries want to be assured that they will get the content for which they paid. Publishers want to be assured that their investment in electronic publishing won’t be blown away by some user sending content out to the world. As these risks seem quite low, it seems it should be possible to reduce bulky license agreements to one page.

Mark Mandelbaum spoke about “ACM’s Experience with Licensing its Digital Library.” Formed in 1947, the Association for Computing Machinery (ACM) is a nonprofit society with 78,000 members from all areas of computer science and information technology. Individual memberships constitute 25 percent of their members, with professional and corporate members making up 75 percent of their members. ACM publishes 27 journals, 90 conference proceedings, 35 technical newsletters, and 7 magazines, of which 2 are online only.

The ACM Digital Library contains the full text of all of their publications (over 140,000 articles), an online bibliographic guide to the computer science literature that includes 850,000 citations to all computer science literature, and one-click book ordering through Amazon or Barnes & Noble. It also offers advanced searching, online forums for each article, table of contents alerts, reference linking, and citings (forward) linking, among other functions.

ACM offers pricing for single institutions, consortia, and corporations. The license agreement is a single page containing ten short statements addressing unlimited downloading, unlimited simultaneous users, “you won’t do anything bad”/“we won’t do anything bad,” rights to the material, term of access, copyright, pricing, and unrestricted ILL. They have not lost any customers due to licensing problems.

Institutions and consortia love the license, though their lawyers don’t. ACM does need to clearly address usage statistics delivery (COUNTER compliance), fee adjustments for adding or deleting institutions from consortia agreements, fee adjustments for ACM removing access to publications, and what can or cannot be done in the event of termination. Relative to licensing, it may be that ACM needs to “grow up” and be a bit more bureaucratic (though the risk of problems is low), but it will have to be later, “…because we’re too busy signing up new customers!!!”

Mark Danderson spoke about “The NEJM Site License Program: a Journey to a New Land.” The New England Journal of Medicine’s (NEJM) site license program was a disaster for librarians: NEJM didn’t know their needs and didn’t care. Institutional subscribers made up less than eight percent of subscribers (and is declining) and provided less than five percent of revenues. Institutional access was subsidized by individual subscriptions and pharmaceutical support.

When beginning their efforts to go online, NEJM made their big mistake. Very late in getting to the Web (late 1996), they immediately were overwhelmed with over 200,000 visits per week to their site, mostly from individual subscribers. There were increasing numbers of requests for institutional access. Fear of the unknown led them to offer online access via five workstations in October 2001.

To address the dissatisfaction expressed by libraries, they decided they needed to learn more, so they set up focus groups and surveys in 2002. They discovered they weren’t doing their job. There was great discontent with industry regulations limiting access, the site license was too complicated and restrictive, and pricing policies were complicated and unresponsive to market conditions. Lastly, there was no dialogue between the publisher and libraries: “We didn’t know and we didn’t care.”

In January 2003, NEJM set up a Library Advisory Board to establish dialogue between librarians and themselves. Made up of nine members weighted to the CORE membership of medical school libraries, hospital libraries, and science libraries, the board would teach and advise NEJM. The guiding principles for the board would be independence, exchange of ideas, advisory status to NEJM, and no veto power.

NEJM realized they would need a new site license program, which meant a complete rewrite of their business model. The new model would have to be consistent with their mission of disseminating medical information to practicing doctors to impact patient care. Also, it had to earn income, focus on medical schools and hospitals, be simple to understand, and provide options to meet most institutions’ needs.

The new concept set up the institution, not the library, as NEJM’s customer. NEJM would partner with the whole institution. NEJM offers three pricing models: IP-based access, concurrent user-based access (through third
Challenges to be overcome include flawed cooperation with subscription agencies, addressing needs of smaller institutions and consortia, ways to provide personal Web service, better license agreements, and the funding challenges that libraries face.

A lively question-and-answer session followed the presentations.

Open is as Open Does: Pulling Success out of the Open Hat
Mark Leggott, University Librarian, University of Winnipeg
Reported by Elna L. Saxton

In an after-lunch session, to an audience including vendors, students, administrators, consortium associates, and other serialists, Mark Leggott tackled four philosophies of Open: open access, OpenURL, open source and open content. As libraries continue to grow in their commitment to these Open movements, more fields—medicine, computing, psychology, and biology, among others—will benefit from increases in accessible, timely research.

Open access is used to describe a type of resource, an authentication method, and unfettered access to information. The Open Archives Initiative (OAI) focuses on standards of journal metadata and content to support open access. OAI works to develop and promote interoperability standards with a protocol known as OAI-PMH (Protocol for Metadata Harvesting). This protocol facilitates dissemination of content, allowing transfer of content regardless of application. Open archives can include a variety of resources: article preprints and post-prints, conference proceedings, theses, data sets, unpublished manuscripts, and multimedia resources. Works previously relegated to the category of unpublished may be included. Researchers may be surprised to learn that studies show research works held in open access generate more linking citations. An institution could become an institutional repository by collecting OAI compliant resources that represent a collective intellectual output, or they may choose to participate in a regional or subject-based depository.

Declarations of support for open access include the Budapest Open Access Initiative, ACRL Principles & Strategies, Bethesda Statement, Berlin Declaration, OECD Declaration, and IFLA Statement, among others. There are over 1,000 titles in the Directory of Open Access Journals (http://www.doaj.org). The ePrints system supports self-archiving and open access (http://www.eprints.org), and can be modified for local purposes. PloS, the Public Library of Science (http://www.plos.org), is a high-profile experiment in open access. This nonprofit scientific publishing venture seeks to provide scientists with quality journals in which to publish, while at the same time providing open access to the full contents. Leggott recommended four ways that libraries can commit to open access: build institutional repositories, work with faculty to publish in open access venues, link to repositories on websites, and distribute open access propaganda to raise awareness.

OpenURL was the next concept introduced, which Mark defined as a method to pass metadata to a citation server. OpenURL is used to describe a standard, a linking method, and facilitated access to licensed and open resources. A NISO standard allows digital resources to be easily accessed. A common syntax bring sources and targets together, a syntax that can be extended to other environments, e.g. ILL. The components of OpenURL include a linking engine, definition of how to access, the level of access, your local knowledgebase, and information about resources and coverage. Accuracy of the knowledgebase, i.e., what you have access to, is critical, because failure creates a scenario found currently: paying twice for intellectual content. There are over 17 linking systems available, both commercial and open source. Open source examples are GODOT (http://godot.lib.sfu.ca/godot/) and CUFTS (http://cufts.sourceforge.net). Leggott also recommended ways for libraries to commit to OpenURL: Implement OpenURL linking systems, promote regional linking infrastructure, support open source systems like GODOT or CUFTS, and participate in the development of an open knowledge base.

Leggott covered two more discussions of “open”: open source, and open content. Each is both also a philosophy and a movement. Open source refers to a type of software license that provides complete access to code. Several well-known examples include Linux, Apache, MySQL, and PHP. Open content refers to a type of resource and ownership, a contribution methodology, and unfettered access to creation. Examples of open content include DMoz, Wikipedia, and CUFTS Knowledgebase.

Open is as open does, as Leggott reiterated at the end of the session. For the philosophy of Open to compete in today’s world, libraries must commit to the Open movement, with education, support, and implementation. Read Mark Leggott’s blog, Loomware: Crafting New Libraries, at http://blog.uwinnipeg.ca/loomware.
Proliferating Pricing Models

Jan Siar, Head of Acquisitions, University of Maryland Libraries; Melanie Schaffner, Marketing and Sales Manager, Project Muse/John Hopkins University Press; Karla Hahn, Collection Manager Team Leader, University of Maryland Libraries

Reported by Joe Becker

This session discussed three current pricing models for electronic journals: traditional subscription with add-on pricing, tiered pricing, and consortia pricing. A brief description for each model was provided by moderator Jan Siar. Then each model was analyzed from both a librarian and a (non-commercial) publisher point-of-view, with Karla Hahn providing the librarian perspective and Melanie Schaffner speaking for the publisher perspective. The interest and concern about developments in journal pricing models was evident from the high attendance at this session, including significant representation from publishers.

The discussion began with a few points on the concept of dynamic pricing. The move from print to electronic publishing has led to a more complex publishing industry, with greater variety of customers, competitors, product options, and demand for services. This change has led to a shift toward dynamic pricing. It was noted that dynamic pricing allows for pricing adjustment according to supply and demand. It can place value on quantity, currency, and end-user value as well as content. It may allow for differential pricing, such as bundling and value-added options.

Moving to the first model, traditional subscription pricing was described as the known world: fixed, easily discernable prices; standard order and receipt process; and the development of add-on pricing for print-only, to print/electronic, to electronic-only that maintained the familiar print model.

Hahn reiterated the dependability of print format and the associated archive and the predictability and transparency of p + e pricing. Libraries want the added value that electronic versions provide in terms of increased access, searching, indexing, and archive access. Libraries also want the flexibility to move between print or electronic access. The librarian expressed concern about delayed access for electronic versions, whether content is the same in the electronic version, and where responsibility for archiving the electronic version lies.

The publisher’s comments on the traditional model stressed several economic points. Publisher revenue streams are presently predicated on print or bundled print and electronic subscriptions. Print format continues to be a significant part of journal operations, especially in the humanities and social sciences. Therefore, it is not feasible now to consider eliminating the print version. Even if e-only publication is an option, the publisher emphasized that journal publication entails high fixed costs. Eliminating the print version may reduce costs only 10-20 percent. Revenues, however, could decrease by 60 percent or more, due to loss of advertising, reprint and subscription income. Additionally, there are new costs associated with the technical support for online access.

Schaffner also made the point that journal sponsors expect publishers to provide income to the society or sponsor. The traditional model with add-on pricing has provided the most reliable revenue stream for sponsors. Given that non-commercial publishers face competition from commercial publishers for journal publishing rights, if this income becomes more variable due to electronic options, journal sponsors may be provoked to moving to the commercial side. This scenario almost invariably results in significant increases in subscription prices. The publisher also noted that libraries have indicated that they want flexibility in format and pricing options. This has made subscription management workflow as increasingly complex for the publisher as it is for the library.

The tiered pricing model is seen as an attempt to develop flexible or dynamic pricing. Tiered pricing is generally based on criteria such as full-time equivalents (FTE) which are used to establish levels, or tiers, by which subscribing institutions, and proportional costs, are categorized.

Commenting on the tier model, the librarian noted a certain similarity to traditional print pricing, which maintained different cost levels for individuals/members and institutions. However, librarians may now find it difficult to discern what criteria the publisher is using to establish tiers. Assuming criteria are understood, it can be difficult to develop the increasing specificity of information now being required for establishing FTE-based or other categories. It can be challenging to find and maintain FTE and other data for college, department, discipline or degree-granting levels, and it may not have the desired reliability or currency. Librarians wonder if pricing will be based on an increasingly complex matrix of criteria. Another concern is the perceived lack of transparency in the application of the criteria; that is, it can be unclear how the actual pricing is developed from the requested data. An overriding concern is whether tier pricing will become prohibitive for many institutions.

The publisher’s comments stressed that tier-model dynamic pricing is in a developmental stage. Ideally, the publisher will develop appropriate and flexible pricing for customers based on a range of relevant criteria or indices: usage, FTE, authors/publications, third-party
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classification (Carnegie), budget levels, and previous holdings. Publishers agree that it is important to develop acceptance by customer institutions for criteria used in pricing. They note that this model will introduce greater complexity to their operations in terms of subscription management, such as maintaining flexible price points and advanced customer data, and financial/business management, such as statistical analysis and market feedback. These responsibilities will require greater resources and expertise. The differential pricing of the tier model will allow for customized levels of service and content and potentially result in greater dissemination.

The consortia model is characterized by collaboration among institutions to negotiate as a unified entity for journal access. From the librarian’s perspective, this collaboration can provide increased negotiating leverage that can result in economies of scale and increased access for all levels of institutions. However, librarians are concerned about how costs can or should be equitably shared given the varying levels of size and usage among consortia members. Another concern is that the negotiating and licensing process can be demanding and time consuming. Additionally, librarians are concerned that restrictive license clauses, such as a no-cancel clause, may inhibit collection or budget management decisions. The question then remains whether some loss of control is a reasonable trade-off for increased access and stable pricing.

The publisher echoed the point of view that consortia pricing involves business trade-offs. The advantage of the secure subscription base that consortia licensing provides is weighed against the potential loss of other subscriptions due to bundling. The consortia customer base will provide for consolidation and outsourcing of some staff functions, but may require additional staff for technical, negotiation, and licensing responsibilities. The consortia market may provide beneficial exposure to new journals and products, but may be disadvantageous to well-established journals with strong identities. Publishers may provide increased services at the consortia level, but choice and service for an individual library’s needs may be compromised.

The session provided time both during and after the librarian/publisher presentations for questions and comments. This dialogue developed several relevant points, made all the more cogent by the strong publisher participation. One example of shared points of view dealt with the issue of licenses. Librarians noted the time and effort needed to review licenses and expressed a need for some standardization. Publishers in response noted that libraries often attach riders to licenses that in turn require staff time for review and revision on their side. Other topics included pay-per-view as a fourth pricing model, “google-ized” journal archives that can provide access and revenue, and usage data as a driver for dynamic pricing.

The moderator concluded by noting that pricing models will become consolidated and simplified, but these methods are now in an evolutionary stage. She summarized the broad issues of the presentation as predictability, fairness, complexity, workload, dynamism, and building a shared understanding. Participants in this session certainly came away with greater understanding of pricing issues for libraries and publishers.

**Hidden Costs of E-Journals**

*Rollo Turner, Secretary General, Association of Subscription Agents and Intermediaries*

Reported by Susan B. Markley

As the representative for the Association of Subscription Agents and Intermediaries, which is comprised of the leading vendors in the field, *Rollo Turner* offered a dynamic response to the question of whether a library still needs a subscription agent when dealing with electronic journals. Before the advent of e-journals, the acquisition and access process for print subscriptions—ca. 1984—mainly consisted of the library dealing directly with an agent who acted as the intermediary between the library and the publisher. By 2004, libraries were dealing with agents, aggregators, consortia, publishers, open access, and e-document delivery. Demands for better value and instant access to all content resulted in various pricing structures such as for Big Deals, by size of institution or FTE, or by type of organization.

Turner reported some interesting facts about e-journal growth that has expanded to include 75 percent of scholarly journals and 30-40 percent of all subscriptions. By 2008, this number should be up to 60 percent of all subscriptions. Of the 100,000 serials now available, 33 percent of them are held by just 5 publishers. Eighty percent of all titles are outside the Big Deals, yet libraries spend over 50 percent of their serial budgets on 33 percent of the content.

In describing the hidden costs of e-journals, Turner focused on the increasing amount of staff resources being expended on this format. The complexity of managing this media demands a more skilled workforce knowledgeable in dealing with complicated license agreements, involved pricing structures, registration and access issues, and consortial arrangements.

Turner sees even more problems developing in the future as many titles, now grouped in aggregator packages, break away, forcing libraries to selectively order individual journals. Expanded acquisition and evaluation processes will be required, along with a more complex
access route of registrations, cataloging, and authentication. There will also be increased demands for troubleshooting access denials, for more help desk support, and for greater promotion and marketing efforts by library staff. Even now, small publishers are using complex pricing structures, requiring licenses to match those of the larger publishers. All this only makes the administration of e-journals more complex and challenging.

The cost of negotiating with numerous publishers already requires some type of database to track publisher contact information, license requirements, pricing options, journal title content monitoring, payment schedules, access failures, publication changes, and internal cost allocations. Staff, proficient in print subscription procedures, will need extensive training to handle this new complex environment.

Turner summed up the advantages of using the services of a subscription agent to simplify this acquisition process by reducing the amount of time spent on the many detailed administrative tasks in acquiring and assessing journals. In the process, these administrative tasks can be performed more cheaply than if done by library staff. “Dealing directly with thousands of publishers, who invoice the library at different times, with different payment terms, in multiple currencies, using multiple communication protocols, dealing with multiple customer service staff, would all cost libraries far more in additional staff and systems than using an agent.” Resources could be maximized and costs minimized through the use of these intermediaries. He also forecasted that the future will not see a “scale down” of the labor intensive electronic journal administrative process as more and more periodicals become available online, but agents are responding to that increased complexity by developing new services and systems.

TALK ABOUT Images and Issues of Professional Librarianship: Professional Reflections in Turbulent Waters

Jeff Slagell, Assistant Director of Library Services, Delta State University
Reported by Molly Thomas

New to the NASIG program this year was the Talk About, which was envisioned as an open forum discussion about a specific topic. Jeff Slagell moderated the discussion, but the session was mainly a conversation between audience participants.

Slagell began the discussion by asking the audience members who were Northerners and who were Southerners and briefly discussed being a transplant to the South. He spoke on a few expressions and habits that are specific to the South which really caught his attention when he first moved to the South. Slagell used these examples to show that many people are usually aware of things on the surface, but many remain unaware of the subtle things. Then, by showing the audience the Nancy Pearl librarian action figure, Slagell opened the discussion to those present by asking what the image of the librarian is to the outside world and to library patrons, and how the action figure had affected that image.

Like many discussion boards and e-mail list discussions, the audience reaction was mixed. On one side of the agreement was the opinion that librarians have come a long way and are able to laugh at themselves about this stereotype that has dogged the profession since its inception. On the other side, many people believe that using the stereotypical librarian for the action figure set the profession back because this vast misrepresentation of a librarian is still how many library patrons and administrators see the profession. If a library or institution’s administration thinks that a librarian’s only job is to quiet library patrons (based on the “quiet, shushing motion” that the librarian action figure makes), then the profession has a problem. Slagell admitted that he thought the librarian action figure was funny and could not wait to get one. However, he pointed out, the profession needs to utilize the figure to communicate to the world outside of the library who and what librarians are. One member of the audience then asked if the plans to develop a Barbie librarian were still in the works and wondered if the Barbie librarian would resemble the stereotypical librarian, or would she have new characteristics and be accessorized with a laptop or PDA. Another viewpoint from the audience was that the image of the librarian is universally recognized, and this speaks of a certain amount of respect.

A male audience member raised the point that male librarians have it easier in respect to stereotypes because there really is not a stereotype for male librarians. The idea was raised that if librarianship was not perceived as just a woman’s profession, than the profession as a whole would garner more respect. Many felt that this could be achieved by recruiting more men to join the profession. Moving the discussion back to the stereotypical image of the librarian, one of the discussion participants commented that when she is traveling to conferences she likes to see if she can “spot the librarians” at the airport, and she is usually successful. For this reason, she tries to dress as “unlibrarianlike” as possible. Another person stated that the perceived amount of training was hurting the librarian profession. Many library patrons do not know that you need training to work in a library and just consider anyone who works in a library a librarian. Without a doubt, the one thing that the Nancy Pearl
librarian action figure did was to draw attention to the profession. Now it is up to the librarians to use that attention to reconstruct the image of the librarian and to make the world outside the library understand what librarians really do.

Slagell then turned the discussion to the issue of librarians having faculty status or tenure. Many of the discussion participants described what status the librarians at their institutions were given and how their systems worked. The question of what librarians have gained by having the opportunity to have tenure was raised. The idea that librarians can gain more respect was presented. Others believe that it is not fair that librarians are held to the same standards as faculty. A common argument is that librarians do not teach, but, in fact, most librarians do teaching one-on-one all the time. It was also pointed out that at many of the larger academic institutions, the “big-time” faculty does research instead of teaching. Many felt that the tenure process can take librarians away from their jobs, and in some places, you essentially lose full-time positions when 40 percent of a librarian’s time is spent on publishing and doing research. However, one audience member stated that she sees newer librarians having a changed view as to the nature of their job. Recent graduates see the research and publishing as part of the job, not in addition to it, but also usually wind up working more than the standard 40-hour work week. The discussion also touched briefly on the idea that the tenure process might be easier for librarians in reference and instruction than it would be for technical services librarians. One member of the audience cautioned that librarians need to be careful not to set the standards too low because that would do the library profession a great disservice. The need to have the support of the library’s dean or administrator was stressed.

Picking up on the thread of public services librarians versus technical services librarians, Slagell asked about the tension that exists within the library profession. There was some discussion around the idea that technical services librarians are often required to work the reference desk, but public services librarians do not contribute to technical services work. One audience participant commented that he has seen reference librarians who are interested in doing cataloging work, but the technical services people did not want to do the training because it would take too long. He emphasized that it was important to remember that these discussions have to go both ways. In general, reference librarians receive more respect than technical services librarians, and it was felt that this perception comes about because most people outside of the library do not have any idea what technical services librarians do. With the increasing reliance on electronic resources and metadata, people are finally beginning to realize what technical services librarians know and do, and respect is growing for them. Another way for technical services librarians to gain respect in the academic setting is by serving on university committees. Once people outside the library serve on a committee with technical services librarians, they want the librarians back on their committees because of the librarians’ attention to detail, ability to organize information, and ability to get things done. Unfortunately, there traditionally has not been a lot of communication about what technical services does, so those librarians are urged to speak up more and make their contributions known.

The session concluded with a discussion on the employment outlook, compensation, and advancement opportunities for librarians. The profession is seeing more and more librarians nearing or reaching retirement, but it has become difficult to hire new librarians, because new graduates are going into more lucrative allied fields. In addition, many library schools are closing, so there seem to be fewer applicants from which to choose. Also, the positions usually want experience, and paraprofessional work does not seem to be counted, so new graduates find it difficult to get experience and to find a job. There does not seem to be many entry-level positions, especially in technical services. The discussion then turned to the topic of salary compression and the impact it has on librarians who have been in their jobs for a long time. Although new hires are making a decent wage, there are no raises for longtime librarians. The closeness in the salary range often leads to tension between the new hires and the more senior librarians. Another trend that has developed is that librarians receive raises by moving from one institution to another. This constant turnover is very expensive for institutions. Slagell suggested that librarians approach this dilemma from a business standpoint and to encourage the library or institutions’ administrators to see it that way as well. Turnovers, recruitment, and training new employees are expensive, whereas retention is less expensive. Other audience members stated that their institutions do not really care that new recruits are only staying for a short time and then moving on, so they just have to get used to this new trend. The session ended with the thought from one audience member that there has been a generational shift in terms of loyalty. Loyalty used to be defined by a person getting a job and staying regardless of the situation, but is now seen as doing one’s best while in a job, and moving on to another job when the situation becomes necessary.
Are They Too Dynamic to Describe?
Bonnie Parks, Serials and Electronic Resources Catalog Librarian, Oregon State University; Jian Wang, Serials Catalog Librarian and Serials/Documents Cataloging Coordinator, Portland State University
Reported by Tina Herman Buck

The workshop leaders, Bonnie Parks and Jian Wang, both certified by the Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program (SCCTP), began with the definition of a new concept. An integrating resource (IR) is “a bibliographic resource that is added to or changed by means of updates that do not remain discrete and are integrated into the whole. An integrating resource may be finite or continuing.” Examples include updating databases, updating loose-leaves, and updating websites.

Why catalog integrating resources? Answers include the proliferation of electronic materials, changing collections, provision of one-stop access in PACs, inclusive and flexible catalogs, and new standards and rules.

The revisions to AACR2 (Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 2nd ed., 2002 revision) contain some new concepts pertaining to IRs in chapters 9, 12 and 21. Chapter 9 is now titled Electronic Resources (formerly Computer Files). Chapter 9 covers all electronic resources, whether direct (local) or remote (networked). The GMD (general material designation) for these is [electronic resources]. The chief source of information is now the resource itself, rather than the title screen. The best choice for chief source is the source which provides the most complete information.

Chapter 12 also has a new title: Continuing Resources (previously Serials). The new concept is that of Integrating Resources. “Integrating” is now an issuance, along with monograph and serial. Chapter 12 discusses transcribing the title proper, which can be a challenge to determine with electronic resources. The title bar is a good place to start. Similar to other formats, for IRs, additional title information should be transcribed if considered to be important. Subtitles for online resources tend to be changeable; include only if judged to be important.

Chapter 21, Choice of Access Points, prescribes handling title changes in IRs as follows: “If a change occurs in the title proper of the same integrating resource, do not make a new entry. Instead, replace the title proper with the new title and change the description to reflect the latest information. In general, give the earlier title in a note (see 12.7B4.2).”

In addition to AACR2, other tools are needed for cataloging IRs: LCRI (Library of Congress Rule Interpretations) 1.0, OCLC’s Bibliographic Rules and Standards, cataloging-entry conventions (fixed field S/L), MARC 21 coding changes, and the 006 coding sheet for serials.

To get started, LCRI 1.0, “Decisions before cataloging”, may help in determining if the resource fits the definition of an integrating resource: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/lcri1_0.html.

The strategy in using AACR2 for integrating resources is to consult Chapter 12 in conjunction with other chapters. For example, to catalog an updating cartographic website, use Chapter 3 (cartographic materials), Chapter 9 (electronic resources), and Chapter 12 (integrating resources).

Bibliographic Formats and Standards has been updated to include OCLC Phase 1 changes: www.oclc.org/bibformats/en. (Phase 1 refers to OCLC’s schedule of implementation for coding of electronic resources, due to be complete by July 2005.) There have been changes to fixed-field elements Freq, S/L, and SrTp. The scope of some variable fields has been updated to include continuing and integrating resources. Some fields to re-examine are: 022, 222, 247/547, 310, 321, 362, 550, 580, and 76X-78X. For further information, see OCLC Technical Bulletin 247, part 1, Coding Practice for Integrating Resources: http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/tb/247/.

In the record’s fixed field element S/L (entry convention), use code 2 to indicate that the record was formulated using the revised rules for integrated entry. This means that the record is cataloged under the latest title or issuing body. Use code 2 for continuing and integrating resources that do not retain their earlier titles.

What’s the difference between cataloging integrating resources and serials?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrating Resources:</th>
<th>Serials:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description based on latest iteration</td>
<td>Description based on earliest issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of integrated entry cataloging</td>
<td>Use of successive entry cataloging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fixed-field element Bib Level (BLvl), code “i” (for integrating resources) has not yet been implemented at OCLC. In the meantime, catalog IRs as “m” (for
monograph), and add a serials 006 to bring out the IR elements. Once code “i” is implemented, IRs will be coded “i”, and most will have a Record Type or “a” and a serials 008.

In OCLC’s “Type of record” (or leader 06), “a” indicates language material for textual electronic resources, while “m” indicates a computer file for non-textual electronic materials. One guideline in choosing is to use “m” for an electronic site that gives you a result unique to your search/experience (such as Amazon or Expedia). An example of type “a” is an electronic bibliography. If in doubt, use code “m,” according to the Library of Congress’ Guidelines for Coding Electronic Resources in Leader/06 (http://lcweb.loc.gov/marc/ldr06guide.html). Additional help in coding leaders can be found at http://lcweb.loc.gov/acq/conser/ffuse.html.

Other challenges in cataloging IRs include determining the publisher and place of publication. Remember that the publisher is not necessarily the same as the site host. The publisher is responsible for the site content. Copyright and domain name information are both clues. For place of publication, look for an “About” link on the site.

Linking between records was also discussed. In general, records can be linked:
- From IR to IR
- From IR to a serial
- From IR to a monograph
- But NOT from monograph to monograph

For more information about this presentation, including case studies and additional resources, find the PowerPoint handout at http://www.bonster.com/NASIG. (Note: capitalization as noted is required.)


Michael Markwith, President, TDNet; Dana Antonucci-Durgan and Ugen Gombo, Stony Brook University
Reported by Betty Landesman

Markwith opened this tactics session with an overview of the role of an e-journal provider and the service it provides by consolidating information: aggregator and publisher data, automatic tracking of publisher websites, link-checking software, and information from customers. It then provides the library with information on changes in titles added or deleted, URLs, coverage, name, publisher, ISSN/E-ISSN, or aggregator.

Gombo described how the work of electronic resources management has been getting more and more complex and challenging, and introduced Antonucci-Durgan. Antonucci-Durgan then gave the main presentation on the in-house strategies used by the Health Sciences Library to resolve e-journal access problems.

The library has 2,300 electronic journal titles. Over a six-year period they have seen an increase in titles, but a decrease in staff. They were finding out about access problems from users, and wanted to devise a better workflow to effectively manage the process. They looked at commercial vendors, but could not find any that met their needs. They proceeded to devise in-house strategies for tackling problems with access to electronic resources. The first strategy is to categorize the problem. Categories include:
- User-based
  - Information literacy problem
  - Hardware, software, or browser requirement
  - Authentication: not valid user, not accessing journal from library’s webpage or catalog
- Library-based
  - Server down
  - Problem with in-house programs
  - Incorrect URL displayed
- Subscription-based
  - Only subscribe to select number of years
  - Online access requires additional subscription and/or payment
  - Online access needs to be activated or registered
  - IP address outside of registered range
  - Payment not received or recorded by online provider
- License-based
  - Concurrent user limitations
  - Remote access not allowed
  - Location restricted
  - User-type restriction
- Vendor/aggregator/publisher-based
  - Server down
  - Direct linking utility (e.g., SFX) problem
  - Vendor subscription database down
  - Changed servers
  - Changed URL
  - Changed online content host or aggregator

The second strategy is to create a workflow.

1. Determine potential user contact point(s): e-mail notification system, electronic resources manager, reference staff, systems staff, chat reference service
2. Funnel all E-journal problems to one centralized department or person: at the Health Sciences Library, this is the Electronic Resources Manager
3. The centralized department or person determines best course of action: may contact systems staff,
The third strategy is to create electronic journal management tools. The Health Sciences Library had a list of journal subscriptions in Excel, which formed the main source of data for the e-journal management team. They are currently migrating the spreadsheet data to a relational database. They are adding some license and payment information to the acquisitions module of the integrated library system and adding coverage years and content host information in the 856 field in the cataloging module. There is also a Web form template for e-journal updates, and they will be moving to real-time webpage updating.

The fourth strategy is to keep track of problem titles and frequently asked questions. This helps to anticipate potential problems and is a good source of training for new staff.

In summary, e-journal management requires effective problem solving, efficient workflows, communication with various individuals, and creative management tools. Centralizing the troubleshooting process is one efficient way of managing staff time. The creation of e-journal problem categories helps to define the workflow architecture. They are not meant to supply comprehensive lists of every type of access problem that may or may not exist. The decision to create or purchase an e-journal management system depends on your library’s users, staff size, finances, technology level, and library mission. The most important factor for new staff is training.

Working Collaboratively with Vendors to Create the Products You Want: Smooth Sailing Ahead

Yvette Diven, Director of Serials Product Management, R.R. Bowker; Cathy Jones, Beta Software Manager, Sirsi

Reported by Andrée Rathemacher

Yvette Diven, Director of Serials Product Management at R.R. Bowker, and Cathy Jones, Beta Software Manager at Sirsi, collaborated on their presentation of how librarians can work collaboratively with vendors.

For collaboration to be successful, both libraries and vendors must benefit, and both must be willing to transcend any cultural barriers that separate them. Potential areas of collaborative product development fall under the categories of workflow (e.g. management of serials, cataloging, acquisitions), administration (e.g. collection assessment and electronic rights management), and service (e.g. tools for patrons and other end users and archiving or digitization projects).

Partners in any collaboration must make a genuine commitment of time and resources and set priorities, with the understanding that vendor resources are not inexhaustible, and librarians are busy doing their jobs. Successful products developed in collaboration must first and foremost be useful and usable. A need must be identified, and potential solutions proposed. The scope of the need must then be defined; for example, it must be decided whether the product is one that would be marketed industry-wide or if would be customized for the needs of one library. The value of the product must also be determined: How important is it? Those involved in the product development process must also keep in mind that successful products are likely to be standards-based so that they are interoperable with other products, and that the development of any new product is likely to take 15-18 months. The final step is to set a viable price in the marketplace. Vendors and librarians can work together to address all of these concerns.

Besides developing a useful product, collaboration has other benefits. Partner organizations can establish ongoing relationships, while the individuals involved get to network. In some cases, one partner can get a special status; for example, a library may be chosen to beta-test the product. Price discounts might also result from collaboration.

Since most products under development will be software, the speakers explained the five key phases of bringing a software package to market. First there is the development phase, which is where goals are stated, proposals are made, specifications are listed, and initial programming takes place. The second phase is the alpha testing phase, during which the software developer tests the performance of the software in-house. The third phase, the beta testing phase, involves customers in testing the product. During the fourth phase the product is released for sale. The fifth phase, maintenance, is ongoing, and consists of the improvement of the software through regular upgrades.

Next, the speakers outlined the vendor’s goals in collaboration. Vendors hope for open communication, to develop better products that meet the needs of libraries, to provide quality, and to develop standards. Strategies for successful collaboration include commitment, being vocal, being professional, providing specific details, providing visual examples, sharing knowledge and expertise, mentioning other products, friendly reminders, updates, visits, and Web conferencing. Behaviors that do not facilitate successful collaboration would be a lack of communication, being unprofessional, not providing
details, a lack of prompt feedback, being unable to work well with others, and being timid.

How can vendors and libraries interested in collaboration connect with one another? Opportunities exist through users groups, conferences, and community-wide groups such as NASIG (http://www.nasig.org), which includes vendors as active members; COUNTER (http://www.projectcounter.org), which addresses usage statistics; NFAIS (http://www.nfais.org), which looks at standards across the industry; NISO (http://www.niso.org), which is an organization of information aggregators; and through ALA (http://www.ala.org), which has a Publisher/Vendor-Library Relations Interest Group and a joint committee with the American Association of Publishers.

The speakers ended by providing examples of successful collaboration between vendors and libraries in various categories. Specifically, in the category of “pricing,” there is PEAK, a project between Elsevier, the University of Michigan, and Vanderbilt University, among others. “Publishing” collaborations include the journal Organic Letters, a project of ACS with SPARC; BioOne, a project of AIBS, Allen Press, and SPARC; and Project Muse, a collaboration between JHU Press and the Eisenhower Library. One collaboration in the area of “standards” is SISAC, which is involved with the development of EDI initiatives. A “licensing” collaboration would be Faxon’s Klibrary, a bibliographic/account management service, while an example of a collaboration on “distribution” could be in the realm of hosting, such as OhioLINK. Finally, examples of collaboration involving “archiving” would be LOCKSS, a partnership between Stanford University and several publishers, and Mellon Foundation-based efforts between Yale and Elsevier.

**Faculty Collaboration in Serials Collection Development and Management: Great Visions of a Shrinking Lake**

*Sandyha D. Srivastava, Serials Librarian, Hofstra University; Nancy Linden, Science Librarian, University of Houston*

Reported by Christie Ericson

Budget cuts have had a great impact on most serials collections over the last few years, leaving faculty and librarians struggling to cope. In this session, two librarians discussed the approaches they used to involve faculty in the serials collection review process.

Serials librarian Sandyha Srivastava began the session with an overview of the serials review process at Hofstra University. Faced with a diminished serials budget, major criticism over the lack of journal titles in the collection, and little response from surveys sent to faculty, the library decided to reorganize its serials review process. The first goal was to re-establish communication with departmental faculty by using the Faculty Senate Library Subcommittee to act as a go-between between the library and teaching faculty.

The dean of the library then proposed prioritizing title lists by subject discipline as opposed to the inclusive A-Z list that had been used previously. Each department was then able to prioritize its own title list and use a “zero-sum” approach to acquiring new titles. Anything gained in cuts that the department made could be applied to new titles. This method allowed the department to have more control over what titles it selected and encouraged the department to choose titles that would serve the most students or faculty.

Srivastava then went on to outline the steps involved in the revised serials review process. The new process involves the collaboration of the library dean, the serials librarian, the subject specialist, the chair of the Faculty Senate Library Subcommittee, the library liaison, and the department chair. This group then meets periodically for the purpose of balancing cuts and new additions and prioritizing new titles for the time when additional funds can be obtained.

Srivastava concluded her presentation by emphasizing the role that the Faculty Senate Library Subcommittee played in facilitating an atmosphere of trust between the library and the teaching faculty. Departments now have a greater stake in the serials collection process and increased accountability for expenditures. The opportunities for discussion have increased the level of understanding among all of the parties involved, particularly in regard to library budget limitations and departmental needs.

Science Librarian Nancy Linden of the University of Houston approached the serials review process from the collection development perspective. Instead of conducting an annual review of what titles should be cancelled based on budget cuts, Linden felt that a more proactive method of serials review was needed. She designed a survey for the faculty of the five departments of the School of Engineering with the question, “What journals do you use for teaching and research?” and asked that they rank their titles in some fashion. Linden made sure to emphasize that this was not a budget-driven project, that there was no deadline, and that it was not a campuswide survey.

The goals of the survey were threefold: 1) to identify “dead wood”—titles no longer needed or being used by faculty, 2) to obtain department consensus, and 3) to determine the school’s priorities. Upon completion of the survey, which took about two years, it was determined
that about $76,000 in “dead wood” could be cut, but that faculty wanted about $170,000 in new titles. A meeting was then held with the department chairs, but no consensus could be reached on how to divide the $76,000 among the five departments. One department felt that it should receive more money for research, while another department wanted to develop a new program, etc. Linden then decided to go the dean of the School of Engineering, who made the final decision on how much money each department would receive.

Linden concluded her presentation by sharing the lessons that she learned throughout the project:

- Get buy-in from the top. (Going directly through the faculty didn’t work.)
- Plan for much longer time than you think to complete the project.
- Spend extra time on communication. Linden met with the faculty every few months, but most of her communication was by e-mail. Every time you contact faculty members, reiterate what you are doing, and make it clear what you are asking from them.

Linden felt that the outcome of the project was very beneficial: Since the review was not budget driven, it raised the visibility of the library in a positive manner and established solid relationships between the faculty and the library. Linden suggested repeating the survey every five years or so, as the focus of faculty research changes quite often.

**Nuts and Bolts of Linking: Understanding Context Sensitive Linking Services and Implementation**

Rachel Frick, Head of Bibliographic and Digital Access Services, University of Richmond; Cheri Duncan, Library Management Systems Administrator and Head of Serials, James Madison University

Reported by Gail Julian

Rachel Frick and Cheri Duncan led an informative discussion concerning the challenges and results of implementing a link resolver. Frick and Duncan represented institutions of different sizes: Frick, a small, private institution; and Duncan, a mid- to large-sized public institution. Frick began the discussion by distinguishing between the DOI and the open URL. Frick defined the DOI as a “unique alphanumeric string, persistent through ownership changes.” According to Frick, the open URL corrects problems inherent in the DOI, mainly the inability of the DOI to identify the user and his/her affiliated institution. In order for a link resolver to be effective, database providers must be open URL compliant, and the resolver must be populated with accurate information concerning ejournal collections and titles. Use of a link resolver reduces the need for multiple searches by a user and increases the use of available resources. Later in the discussion, Frick emphasized the amount of maintenance involved in running a link resolver and the many “opportunities for information breakdown” that exist.

Duncan further elaborated on the benefits and limitations of a link resolver. She also discussed the staff time and skills needed to successfully implement and maintain a resolver. Duncan emphasized, as did Frick, the benefit to the user of having to execute only one search in order to be presented with available options, whether that be full-text, a link to the online catalog, a populated ILL form, or a Google search. Duncan also emphasized that linking tools previously maintained are no longer necessary, PubMed’s Linkout as an example. Vendor assistance may be available for set up and maintenance of sites, title lists, and coverage, and the ability to include free internet resources in the resolver could also be an advantage. Duncan as well as Frick emphasized the importance of serials expertise when installing and maintaining a resolver. Knowledge of open URL, XML, XSL, SQL, and JavaScript are important as well. Duncan also mentioned some roadblocks or limitations present with resolvers. She emphasized that the quality of resolvers varies by vendor. More local expertise is required if the resolver is hosted locally; others may be accessed remotely with accompanying vendor support. Duncan indicated that the knowledge database in a resolver is “never complete” and “that exceptions such as embargoes and broken holdings are not handled well.” Duncan listed other limitations from the database vendor side as non-open URL compliance and incomplete or inaccurate metadata. Duncan emphasized the need for multiple match points, both ISSN and title for example, in order to avoid problems that become readily apparent when using a resolver. Frick suggested lobbying vendors to become open URL compliant. In addition, no standardization currently exists as to the location or method of activation of link resolver buttons within vendor databases. Some activation may be done locally through admin modules, others activated by the vendor’s staff.

Frick and Duncan credited the use of link resolvers with exponentially increasing ejournal usage and with increasing ILL requests. Questions and discussion at the end of the presentation revolved around populating resolvers using A-Z lists provided by commercial companies. Frick felt that XML reports generated from an A-Z list could be used for this purpose. A question was raised concerning resolver links within the online catalog. There was concern that as few as 10 percent of records could have links.
Floating Funds in a Shrinking Lake
Sharon McCaslin and Bridget Clark, Longwood University
Reported by Joe Becker

This session described a method that provides flexibility and yearly adjustment for a library’s materials budget allocations. Longwood University is a residential four-year university, with 4000 FTE and colleges of Arts and Sciences, Education, and Business.

The presenters, McCaslin and Clark, sought to address common concerns in serials acquisitions and management: How to make equitable adjustments in budget allocations to allow for acquisition of new resources to support changing curriculum emphasis, new academic programs, and new research areas? How to make collection decisions at the departmental level among competing demands for serials, monographs, and databases? How to develop collaborative rather than confrontational relationships between librarians and academic departments in regard to these often difficult collection decisions? The presenters discussed a straightforward procedure they have developed to deal with these concerns.

The assumption was made that credit-hour production could be a reasonable indication of current developments in curriculum and research and changing demand for resources. In order to allow allocation adjustments to reflect these changes, fund amounts for each department are tied to the credit-hour production of the department. The percentage of total credit hours that each department produces annually correlates directly to the percentage of the library’s materials budget allocated to that department. Initially, the formula was a one-to-one correlation, but it was decided that additional weight should be given to upper division and graduate-level credit hours. Factors of 1.5 and 2, respectively, are applied to these segments of credit hours to arrive at a weighted total, which percentage is then applied to the budget to determine each departmental fund amount.

According to the Longwood University procedure, each department is then given full discretion for the use of their allocation and full responsibility for collection decisions. The library collaborates with departments in allocation decisions by providing a serials review, with current or projected pricing and usage data for serials, standing orders, microforms, and databases. (The library encourages a maximum level of 90 percent for serials within each allocation). The department then makes the decisions for expending their allocation. The library materials budget provides 75 percent of total yearly allocation for academic department use. The remainder is expended by the library to support the general collection.

Therefore, this procedure provides annual flexibility for adjusting expenditures among monographs and serials. Since fund allocations are tied to credit-hour production, funding will potentially move to new subject areas being represented in the curriculum. It encourages—even requires—academic department participation in making these decisions. Librarians have a collaborative role, but academic faculty must resolve their disputes on adding or canceling titles.

The question of the ability of department faculty to make collection decisions in the timely manner needed for renewals or new purchases of resources was raised. Longwood initiates the annual review in early spring and has not yet encountered problems in providing timely information to vendors.

Another concern discussed was whether multidisciplinary materials might be lost if a particular department chose not to fund those resources. The presenters acknowledged that librarians do need to maintain oversight for departmental decisions in this regard and to provide this information to other departments for further review. In cases where a high-use resource is not claimed by any department, the library general fund will be used to continue funding the title.

But Isn’t It All Available for Free on the Web?
Leslie Horner Button, Head of Acquisitions Department at University of Massachusetts Amherst
Reported by Virginia Taffurelli

Using Science Direct as a model for aggregated databases, Button conducted a cost/benefit analysis for print journals versus the electronic version. University of Massachusetts Amherst subscribes to 585 print journals available in this database for an average of $1686 per title. The cost for the electronic version averages about $602. But when you compare the cost of staff support for license negotiation, ordering, cataloging, issue check-in, claiming, bindery preparation, database management linking, server support, authentication tools, shelving access, troubleshooting, e-journal locator, and context-sensitive linking, the results are staggering. Staff support for print averages $43.85 per title, while support for electronic averages $174.81 per title—22 percent of the total cost.

Button then compared the costs for a non-aggregated journal, Music Cataloging Bulletin. Once again, the cost for the print subscription was higher than the electronic,
$35 versus $25. And once again, the total staff support was much higher for the electronic versus the print. Even when the electronic subscription comes “free with print,” staff support is the same as with a paid subscription.

Button concluded that although print was less expensive, the value-added features clearly made electronic access the preferred format in an academic library where students want remote access 24/7. Many print subscriptions were cancelled in lieu of electronic access. Due to instability, however, Button warns against canceling print for titles available in aggregated databases. Other considerations include embargo periods, images, and format (PDF or HTML).

Following the presentation, the audience asked several questions related to staff costs and morale. Staff costs for electronic access were calculated by keeping a log of problems and based on the hourly wage of the electronic resources librarian. The average time to resolve electronic resource problems was about 15 minutes. Database maintenance averaged $3.58, and access troubleshooting averaged $5.76.

Staff morale issues arose as a result of massive print cancellations. Early retirement was offered, and some positions were left vacant. Job descriptions were rewritten, and many staff were redeployed. More technical skills were required, and retraining became necessary.

ISSN, What Is It Good For?
Reported by Christie Ericson

This session, intended for new serialists, gave a broad overview of the International Standard Serial Number, or ISSN, and the National Serials Data Program. The ISSN is a standardized international code that uniquely identifies a serial publication and is structured in the form of two groups of four digits separated by a hyphen. The eighth digit of the ISSN is a control digit, which is calculated using a “modulo 11” algorithm based on the other seven digits. If this control digit equals ten, an “X” is used to avoid confusion.

The ISSN is also linked to a “key title,” which is a standardized form of the publication title and can be qualified to distinguish it from other identical titles. Any time there is a change in the key title, a new ISSN must be assigned. Separate ISSNs are generally required for serials issued in different formats (except microfilm reproductions) and for different language, geographic, or audience editions. Eventually, ISSNs will be assigned to integrating resources upon the implementation of OCLC’s Bibliographic Level “I.”

Some of the advantages of using the ISSN as a standard numeric identification code are:

- Providing useful and economic communication between publishers and subscription agents
- Accurate citations by scholars, researchers, abstracters, and librarians
- Simplifying interlibrary loan and union listing
- Identifying, ordering, checking in, and claiming serials
- Quick searching and retrieval in large databases
- Linking mechanisms
- Second-class postal rates for publications through the U.S. Postal Service

The ISSN Network, an international collaboration, began in the 1970s and is coordinated by the ISSN International Centre, located in Paris. Currently, there are 77 national centers worldwide, and each center is responsible for assigning ISSNs to publications of its respective country. (The International Centre assigns ISSNs for those countries that do not have their own centers.) The U.S. center for the ISSN Network is the National Serials Data Program (NSDP) and is a cataloging section in the Serial Record Division at the Library of Congress. The NSDP staff currently consists of the director, catalogers, cataloging technicians, and a publisher liaison assistant. The NSDP assigns ISSNs to serials published in the U.S. and ensures that U.S. ISSNs are entered in the ISSN Register, the official database of the Network. The NSDP also educates and advises publishers and other ISSN users and participates in the development and use of ISSN-related standards.

ISSN Home Page http://www.issn.org
US ISSN Center Home Page http://www.loc.gov/issn/

Implementing a Serial Work in an Electronic Resources Management System
Presented by Kristin Antelman, Associate Director for Information Technology, North Carolina State University Libraries
Reported by Marsha Seamans

E-Matrix is the electronic resources management system that is being developed at North Carolina State University. Its development is being driven by the needs of acquisitions staff to manage electronic and print subscriptions both as individual acquisitions and bundles, and collection development’s needs to support licensing, product evaluation, and in managing and using faculty-
provided data. Its design incorporated both the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) and a user-centered approach to develop a hierarchically controlled system that is not bound by MARC or ILS functionality. It would also serve to enhance access points and improve user displays.

The development incorporated three principles for sustainability and data quality: the migration of legacy applications into E-matrix, definition of a single authoritative data store for each data element, and the ability to query existing data stores in real time wherever possible. The databases that fed into E-Matrix included the library catalog, MARCXML files for database display, SFX, a local e-journal database (Serials Solutions), local subject terms and keywords, use statistics, journal bundle contents, an acquisition “shepherding” form, journal prices evaluative data, and the licensing database. All of those databases, except for the catalog and SFX, will be going away and will reside within E-Matrix.

The FRBR document refers very little to serials and focuses largely on monographs and music, but it appears that serials would be considered aggregate works. Combining FRBR principles with the user perspective challenges two assumptions in FRBR. The first assumption is that all journal “versions” are manifestations of the same expression of the work, and the second that, contrary to the user perspective, a title change creates a new work.

One of the challenges in E-Matrix was to create displays that reflect key relationships, both horizontally—as in equivalent and derivative relationships—and chronologically—as in title changes. Starting from the acquisitions perspective, a modified FRBR model for serial description would include manifestations and expressions, or “manifexpressions.” From the user perspective, displays should draw on all three levels: work, expression (i.e., full text and selected articles), and manifestation (i.e., e-copy and print of the full-text and multiple sources for selected articles). As information providers, we have a responsibility to acknowledge differences in “versions.”

Finally, in order to draw all the expressions and manifestations of a work together, a work identifier is needed, and that identifier needs to be something not related to the title. E-Matrix uses a work identifier that is automatically generated by the Oracle software. In the staff view, all manifestations of a work are retrieved using the work ID. The public view and user interface are still in development and will require significant usability testing.

In closing, Antelman pointed to the importance of opening up conversations about managing bibliographic items in the electronic environment and identified E-Matrix as a fertile test bed for experimentation and innovation.

Comparing and Contrasting Serials in Public and Academic Libraries: How the Other Half Live

Stephen Headley, Manager of Magazines and Newspapers Department, Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County

Reported by Julie Harwell

The impetus of Comparing and Contrasting Serials in Public and Academic Libraries: How the Other Half Live, led by Stephen Headley, was Stephen’s experience as a “novelty” at the 2003 NASIG conference, which was his first NASIG conference. After commenting during a 2003 NASIG conference session and identifying himself as from a public library, he received a round of applause. When he had conversations during the remainder of the conference, he often heard, “Oh, yeah, you’re that public library guy.” While he enjoyed the 2003 NASIG conference and found it generally valuable, he did find that there were no sessions which directly related to his job. So, Stephen was inspired to take a more active role in NASIG and submitted the proposal for Comparing and Contrasting Serials in Public and Academic Libraries. Stephen joined NASIG in 2001 when he was promoted to manager of the Magazines and Newspapers and Department of the Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County.

In this session, approximately 20 people learned the differences and similarities among public and academic libraries regarding serial issues. Participants were almost evenly split between academic libraries and public libraries, with a handful of attendees from special libraries. Stephen drew his comparisons based on a large, urban public library and a large academic library.

Stephen found four primary similarities: problems involving publishers and vendors, issues involving electronic access to periodicals, archival concerns, and budget woes. Six differences were observed among public and academic libraries regarding serial issues. Those were: collection development, issues with branch libraries, competition for patrons, arrangement and storage of materials, e-journals, and clientele.

Both academic and public libraries have the same procedural issues involving publishers and vendors with regard to ordering, claiming and frequency/title changes. With electronic full-text access issues, the serials path of
academic and public libraries begin to diverge. While both parties use full-text databases and share the challenges of title, back file, and embargo changes, public libraries rely almost exclusively upon full-text databases for providing local and remote access to serial content. Academic libraries are not as dependent on databases to provide local and remote access to serials or serial content. Public libraries also struggle with the decision to maintain or cancel print subscriptions where titles are available in full-text databases. Headley found that archival concerns are somewhat comparable: Both library types debate binding over filming; however, public libraries rarely have the long-term storage capabilities of academic libraries. It was no surprise that both academic and public libraries share, in Headley’s view, shrinking budgets that cannot keep up with rising serial and electronic resources acquisition costs.

The greatest difference found among public and academic libraries regarding serial issues was collection development. Stephen indicated that while an academic library might often have a full-time individual or even a small group responsible for serials collection development that collaborates with faculty members, public libraries will have one person who has many other tasks in addition to collection development. This limited staffing issue is most apparent in the rapid growth of electronic resources manager or e-journals coordinator positions within the academic setting: No special, full-time comparable position is normally found within a public library. Instead, there is usually collaboration between technical services and reference with the acquisition and management of electronic resources.

An unusual, fun collection development difference is the hunt for materials which meet the needs of a public library’s clientele. Headley advocates shopping where your patrons shop: at the grocery store, pharmacy, and video stores. Headley found Tracks (ISSN 1547-6979) and In Touch (ISSN 1540-8280) this way. Headley’s collection development choices are largely influenced by his view of the public library as the popular culture archive of a community. This philosophy is evident in his predecessors as well, as he has received feedback that his library has an exceptional collection of motorcycle magazines.

Collection development with branch libraries is also different in a public library, due largely to scale. The Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County has 41 branches (http://www.cincinnatilibrary.org/info/locations.asp); an attendee from New York Public Library shared that they have 5 central and 80 branch libraries within their system (http://www.nypl.org/branch/local/index.cfm). The public library has a higher demand to serve multiple communities with diverging interests, including language and format issues (for example, larger print collections for populations with a higher elderly concentration).

A significant difference among public and academic libraries is the public library’s challenge to survive. Headley has tried to address that in his department. Stephen noted that public libraries face more competition for their clientele from bookstores and the Web, and many branch libraries are fighting to survive. In addition to increasing visibility within library displays and catering to lunchtime window shoppers to combat the threat of competitors, Stephen encourages levity to help engage patrons. At the Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, two wings of the library are connected with a bridge/walkway where they display the Bridge Collection, current issues of approximately 1,500 titles arranged by 22 subject categories and then alphabetically by title. The magazines are displayed facing out, as you find in a bookstore. Stephen’s sense of humor can be seen in this collection by the placement of End of Life Choices (ISSN 1541-1168) within the library’s Health and Fitness category.

The arrangement and storage of materials is another major difference among academic and public libraries. Unlike academic libraries that usually shelve items by call number, public libraries almost exclusively shelve materials alphabetically by title for current and bound/archive copies. Offsite storage, while popular in an academic library, generally does not occur as often in a public library. This is due to the additional costs as well as the effect such storage has on providing information. Since most of their users need instant answers and are not driven by long-term research needs, the Public Library of Cincinnati and Hamilton County prefers a 20-minute delay using their closed stacks, rather than a 24-hour delay that often comes with remote storage.

The question-and-answer portion of the meeting included questions regarding archive formats and policies, open access e-journals, and challenges of using a subscription agent with popular titles. When deciding on which titles and how long to retain a title, Headley considers the indexing available for the title and tries to use microform whenever the subject/content (e.g. photography journals) is conducive to microform. Headley does not currently use e-journals from open access sites or print journals with a free, online equivalent. One attendee shared the challenge she faces subscribing to the popular titles her patrons need. Many of these publications are like shooting stars, by the time they learn of a title and arrange a subscription via their agent, the title has ceased publication. To address this issue, they initiated a contract with a local kiosk to provide delivery of popular titles and to alert them of new magazines of interest.
Headley closed the session by encouraging more public library staff and librarians to “shine the light on public libraries at future NASIG conferences.”

Making the Most of Your Usage Statistics
Alfred Kraemer, Medical College of Wisconsin; Abigail Bordeaux, Binghamton University (SUNY)
Reported by Kitti Canepi

Alfred Kraemer started off the session with an overview of the process and reports used at the Medical College of Wisconsin. Kraemer pointed out how good data can help answer a number of questions: prioritizing acquisitions, trouble-shooting access problems, which titles are getting used heavily or not at all, what is the impact of access improvements, and how electronic usage compares to other types of materials. Unfortunately, most of the data is first used when the library has to make a cut.

Kraemer recommends inputting usage statistics in a spreadsheet or preferably, a relational database. Raw data is usually available from vendors in delimited format, so it’s easy to import. The more adventurous can use Perl scripting. Vendors are starting to come into compliance with the COUNTER (Counting Online Usage of NeTworked Electronic Resources) Code of Practice, but the code isn’t very detailed, and you still cannot necessarily merge data from one vendor with that from another. Kraemer showed some examples of reports he has produced from his database. He pointed out how the ability to analyze trends is becoming more and more challenging; most critical is the ability to develop quick scenarios as pricing models change.

Abigail Bordeaux talked about how usage statistics are used at Binghamton University. One advantage of the COUNTER requirements has been more timely reporting of data by the vendors. Currently, Bordeaux imports the delimited files into an Excel spreadsheet, although she is hoping to create a database such as presented by Kraemer. Data is organized by consortia and by database and placed on an intranet for the subject liaisons to review. She has also been able to get a large number of statistical reports through the library’s current link resolver. A lot of useful and interesting things have been learned through analysis of the data. It has been used to update subject webpages with frequently used databases, to highlight less frequently used products (and how to use them) on the News & Features webpage, and to promote electronic resources within the university community.

Information from both presentations is available at http://library.lib.binghamton.edu/presentations/nasig04.html.

Creatively Coping with Your Subscription Agent’s Bankruptcy
Sue Wiegand, Periodicals Librarian, Saint Mary’s College; Vanessa West, Customer Service Representative, Choice/ACRL Subscriptions
Reported by Emily Waitz

Commonly referred to as “a divine mess,” this session reviewed how libraries and publishers dealt with the biggest scandal in the serials world: the bankruptcy of a major subscription vendor.

The session began with a description from Vanessa West and the publisher’s point of view. Their first goals were to identify their affected subscribers, find a way to contact those subscribers, and determine the costs they would be facing. Vanessa said this was a publisher’s “most feared event.”

To identify and contact subscribers, they ran internal reports, mailed letters with a response form, established cut-off dates for responses, and tracked responses. They identified 450 customers, and then compared their data to payment data from Rowecom. This was a difficult process for Choice/ACRL, because they only received an average of 38.06 percent for their four publications. Then they began to process graced subscriptions, eventually gracing 494 non-renewed subscriptions. Their attention to the problem seemed to pay off: Of the graced subscriptions, 78 percent were renewed.

Next, Sue Wiegand described the situation from a library’s point of view. She first outlined the steps she took for sorting out her subscription problems. She contacted her financial and legal people, documented everything (notes of conversations, etc.), made lists, joined the Rowecom creditors listserv, made shortcuts to pertinent websites, and maintained a sense of humor.

After putting together a foundation to work from, she knew she had to stay informed and keep others informed, too. To do that, she followed articles in publications like Library Journal, and kept in contact with her director, financial people, legal counsel, other librarians, and her library patrons. Behind the scenes, she continued to document actions and worked with publisher representatives, vendor representatives, and the bankruptcy court. Wiegand saw a plan emerging for coping that was based on creativity, patience, communication, and growth. The same types of communication and information along the way have allowed her to keep her head above water and move ahead.
The current activities related to the bankruptcy that Wiegand continues to perform are dealing with the bankruptcy court and subrogation options, claiming missing issues and looking for alternative formats and using duplicate exchange programs.

The goal of the session was to offer ideas of not only how to cope with the current problem, but of finding ways to deal with it better in the future. Some suggestions were to secure vendor contracts, escrow accounts to protect money, ordering direct and monitoring vendor financial information. The session was opened to the crowd to suggest additional ideas, mostly revolving around the libraries need to stay on top of vendor activities. Several website addresses were offered to help with this new responsibility, including links to the SEC and the Association of Subscription Agents and Intermediaries.

Serials Standards: Envisioning a Solution to the Online Serials Management Mess

*Theodore Fons, Product Manager, Innovative Interfaces; and Regina Romano Reynolds, Head of National Serials Data Program, Library of Congress*

Reported by Debra Skinner

This tactics session began with **Ted Fons** presenting background information regarding progress of the NISO/EDIlEUR Joint Working Party, or JWP, related to the development of standards for exchanging data for online serials. The problem with exchanging holdings information is that libraries, publishers, and publications access management services (PAMS) are using different communication formats that are akin to speaking in different languages. There needs to be a standard way to exchange information such as titles held by a particular publisher, print or electronic holdings, A-Z listings, lists of titles by publisher, and price lists. A single standard would make the exchange of information more efficient and thus less expensive.

Tasks to be addressed by the JWP include proposing new standards to support the exchange of information between libraries and publishers. The JWP will propose enhancement to ONIX for Serials, meaning standards for describing serials metadata, including title records, item records, and subscription package records. With new standards for serial online holdings, libraries might be able to generate serials A to Z lists, populate resolution service coverage, or populate an electronic resource management system (ERM). The Library of Congress is conducting pilot tests, using the same format to generate an A to Z serials listing and to populate a link resolver database.

**Regina Reynolds** elaborated on the current ideas about the ISSN and the need for revisions regarding its use. A subgroup of the JWP is looking at identifiers for organizations, packages, and journal titles, including what level of serial the ISSN identifies. Although revision of the ISSN will not solve all of the standardization issues, there is a need for change. Several needs regarding the ISSN have emerged including the inclusion of electronic resources that do not fit the traditional definition of a serial, decisions about what types of resources should have an ISSN assigned, and especially, how many ISSNs to assign to titles issued in more than one format or version.

ISO/TC 46/SC9/Working Group 5 (WG5), a group composed of various types of ISSN users, has met twice to discuss revision of the ISSN standard. At the first meeting in Paris in January 2004, four possible solutions were raised, including maintaining the status quo, changing the ISSN to a title-level identifier, using a base ISSN for content with a suffix to indicate the format, and finally using a title-level ISSN plus an ISSN for the particular manifestation. An informal survey was conducted regarding the four possibilities, with the resulting conclusion that none of these proposals would meet the needs of all the parties involved.

At the second meeting of the WG5 in May 2004 in Amsterdam, several possible solutions were considered. These possibilities include allowing publishers to determine how many ISSNs are assigned based on their own requirements, using a title level ISSN within a product identification system, and using the existing identifier system to contain an ISSN functioning as a title-level identifier. Stay tuned for the next meeting to be held in October 2004 in Washington, D.C. Subgroups of the WG5 are preparing reports for this meeting. The meeting in October will result in the preparation of a draft standard if the issues surrounding the revision can be resolved, or the work to find a solution will continue. A final draft will be given worldwide review and perhaps some test implementation before the final approval.

Although a consensus has not been reached, there is a clear indication of a need for title level identification, comprising a higher level of granularity than the physical format level. In addition, an identifier is needed at the product level, as more and more titles are part of a package. The general directions for ISSN revision now include using the ISSN for functional granularity, including a title-level identifier, and better accessibility of the ISSN Register. Without a title-level identifier, the ISSN cannot meet the needs of the ISSN user community.

Why does the ISSN need revision and how will the new standard be utilized? The ISSN will link to content
including Open URL resolution, and for collocation in library catalogs and lists such as A to Z title listings. The revised standard must provide solutions that libraries can use for applications such as generating title lists and as a source of coverage information.

E-Journal Management and Access Methods

Melissa Holmberg, Electronic Resources/Science Librarian, Minnesota State University, Mankato; Bobby Bothmann, Electronic Access/Cataloging Librarian, Minnesota State University, Mankato

Reported by Sandy Roe

Melissa Holmberg began by acquainting the audience with Minnesota State University, Mankato (MSU). It is a comprehensive Masters-level university with 12,500 FTE students and over 150 programs. The campus is wireless. The College of Business has a laptop initiative. Extended learning is available for education, nursing, and general education courses. The library has over 130 electronic resources, more than 25,000 unique online serials, and 1 million volumes of print materials. It provides an A-to-Z list of available online serials as well as an OpenURL linking service.

Bobby Bothmann explained that the purpose of their research project was to compare e-journal usage from a fee-based e-journal management tool, OCLC’s Electronic Collections Online (ECO), with usage from a free one, EBSCOhost Electronic Journals Service (EJS). To do this, 30 unique print-plus-free online titles were identified in each tool and another 30 that could be found in both. They chose 90 titles that could be equally divided between MSU’s six colleges (Allied Health and Nursing; Arts and Humanities; Business, Education; Science, Engineering & Technology; and Social and Behavioral Sciences) based on each title’s Library of Congress Classification. Within each subgroup of 15 titles per college, 5 were selected in EJS, 5 in ECO and 5 in both. Because the library already subscribed to the print version of each journal, circulation and browse statistics were available for each. These statistics were consulted in an effort to select titles that already had high use in print.

After the titles had been selected and the online access turned on, redirect pages were set up for each title in order to track a user’s choice of tool (EJS or ECO) and origination point (A-to-Z list or library catalog). A spreadsheet was created with the redirect URLs, holdings information, etc. for inclusion in the library’s A-to-Z list, and separate electronic journal bibliographic records with the redirect URLs were created and added to the catalog. The order of the links was manually manipulated in both the A-to-Z list and catalog.

Work began on this project in January 2003, and title level hit rates were collected from April–December 2003. This study was not publicized either within the library or across campus. During the course of this study, the library brought up an OpenURL service and a lot of library instruction was offered—both about the A-to-Z list and OpenURL linking. Hits from the A-to-Z list and from OpenURLs were counted together.

Bothmann and Holmberg presented a great many screens of data that they summarized into three overall findings: 1) Link order makes a difference (patrons choose the first: the tool doesn’t matter), 2) the patrons are primarily using A-to-Z and/or OpenURL access for e-journals, and 3) patrons are using online journals. As a result of this study, they will be recommending a fee-based e-journal management tool because of the help it provides with notification of changes. They intend to turn on all the free e-journal access that they can. They found the separate record cataloging approach provides easier maintenance and is compatible with the purchase of vendor-supplied records for e-journals, and they are recommending that the library subscribe to a MARC bibliographic record service for e-journals.

How to be a Good Customer

Rick Anderson, Serials/Electronic Resources Coordinator, University of Nevada, Reno and Jane F. White, Wiley Interscience

Reported by Jeanne Langendorfer

Rick Anderson opened the session saying there are two sets of obligations: one is to the institution and patrons to spend the dollars wisely, the other is to the vendor to work with them in an honest, legal and ethical way. A good customer is a good shopper, buying the right stuff from the right vendor. Be reasonably demanding and don’t otherwise interact with vendors in ways that interfere with getting what you want. Make it easy for the vendor to give you what you want.


1. Assertiveness --- Pay up front and get your service later: it gives us a moral advantage. Know your rights and stand up for them. Bring problems to your vendor’s attention quickly, professionally, and without apology. If you don’t get an appropriate response, start climbing the ladder.
2. Reasonableness --- Be aware that your vendor has rights and don’t trample them. Don’t demand more than you’re entitled to. Report problems promptly
and thoroughly, and give the vendor a chance to solve them. Don’t make your dissatisfaction public except where there are severe problems or ethical lapses about which others should know.

3. Preparation (vendor visits) --- Have an agenda for meetings with your vendor. Use the vendor representative’s time wisely. Know your vendor’s services and their value to you. Remember the Gas Theory of Meetings: every meeting will expand to fill the time allotted.

4. Toughness --- This is the ability to keep standing up even when it gets unpleasant or difficult. If negotiating prices or contract terms, don’t back down until you must. Be prepared to walk away if necessary. Don’t let yourself be bullied or emotionally manipulated.

5. Willingness to be in Charge (vendor visit) --- Take responsibility for your vendor’s visit and be in charge of the meeting. Don’t just prepare the agenda, control it. Arrange for all present to air their concerns, but if necessary, act as the bad cop to keep people in line. Provide parking information, directions and maps to your vendor representative.

6. Knowledge --- Know your vendor’s services and how they fit your needs (or don’t). Know how to use your vendor’s website and who to contact and how. Keep a record of significant interactions with the vendor. Know the serials business and have at least a basic grasp of economic principles.

7. Honesty --- Deal fairly and ethically with vendors at all times. Don’t engage in “sharp practice,” which may not be illegal but is unfair and unethical.

8. Smarts --- Know your rights under the law. Know how to deal with unsolicited material, how to track vendor performance, how to negotiate, how to think strategically, and how to weigh costs and benefits dispassionately.

9. “On-the-Ballness” --- Catch problems quickly and act on them promptly wherever they originate. Monitor your voice mail, email and postal mail continuously and respond to all messages that require a response within one business day. When you don’t know the answer, say so and then promptly find the answer. When a “fire” erupts, put it out quickly and completely.

10. Kindness/Professionalism --- Recognize that vendors and vendor representatives are honorable professionals and treat them as such unless you are given good reason to do otherwise. Even when faced with a genuinely corrupt or unethical vendor, maintain a professional demeanor.

Jane White addressed the topic based on her varied experience as a librarian and vendor representative. As a vendor representative, she needs information from us to help present the library view to her management.

The different stages of the sales process include identifying the product, familiarizing yourself with the product, and using the website to get answers. If you have a contact, use it. Provide a timeline for purchasing the product. Request a trial access. Be prepared to provide basic information, such as FTE count, number of users, number of locations, and IP addresses. If arranging for the electronic version of the print, do you have a subscription to the print? Is the subscription with the vendor? Are you a member of a consortium?

When preparing to negotiate the contract, know the requirements of your institution—for example, regarding governing law. Be able to address confidentiality. Will the agreement be a multiple-year license or a license with an automatic renewal clause? Know your deal breakers. If legal counsel will review the license agreement, do you know the length of time it may take for them to do so? Know who will sign the agreement and his or her schedule, if timing will be tight. Be prepared to provide multiple contacts for questions on access, billing, and technical issues. If you decide not to proceed with negotiations, explicitly tell the vendor so.

When working with a vendor, return calls promptly, if possible within the day. Your sales representative should do this for you, too. Know your sales representative’s supervisor, and that person’s supervisor. Get information in writing, as this provides a paper trail to help keep communication straight. The representative should summarize phone calls in an email to help keep track of progress across time. This also provides documentation of the negotiations, which would be helpful if you become unavailable. It would facilitate a colleague continuing the process without starting over.

Read the license agreement and understand its terms. Remember that the representative works for his or her company and that you as the librarian work for your library. After the agreement is signed, clarify expectations, such as desired frequency of contact. Schedule training sessions and strategies. If a problem arises, get help from the account manager to resolve the problem. Be as specific as possible and provide as much information as possible. Don’t hesitate to request marketing information, such as user guides and brochures, or trinkets such as pens, highlighters, etc. Remember to ask for the resource to be branded with the library name and/or logo, and link the resource URL from the library’s webpage.

Try to resolve problems with the account representative. Being discreet can help you get what you want. If the response is not helpful, go to your account representative’s supervisor. If you still do not get a resolution, go the CEO. Contact information for the CEO
A lively question and answer session followed the presentations.

Marketing Models of Assortment Planning – Applicable to Serials?
Steve Black, Serials, Reference and Instruction Librarian, The College of Saint Rose
Reported by Virginia A. Rumph

Steve Black examined three factors that help determine the optimum assortment of goods offered to consumers: Consumer perceptions of choice, efficient allocation of limited shelf space, and formulas to find the most efficient variety of products that satisfy consumers. He asked the audience if, and how, these concepts apply to serials.

Consumer perceptions of choice could be thought of in the library setting as the psychology of patrons. The marketing rationale for providing a large assortment of items includes: better chance of matching each consumer’s choice with available items, more confident choices when the alternatives are obvious, more purchasing flexibility, anticipation of future decisions, and greater freedom of choice for its own sake. The basic assumption underlying the creation and maintenance of large research collections seemed to the audience directly related to this marketing rationale. Conversely, Black presented two rationales for providing a smaller assortment of items. The seller benefits from increased profits if the consumer doesn’t perceive a reduction in assortment quality. Research shows that consumers do not seem to notice reductions of up to 25 percent in the number of items on display. They also place greater value on finding their favorite product. If their favorite brand is not available, many consumers will purchase an alternative. The library analogy mentioned is a collection development model that stresses quality instead of quantity. The second rationale for smaller assortments benefits the consumer. Large assortments often confuse some consumers by offering too many choices; they make more confident and satisfying choices from smaller assortments. There have been mentions in the library literature recently of patrons (particularly students) being overwhelmed when conducting research by too many choices. Knowing the focus or content of each journal in the collection is important to an evaluation of its quality and usefulness. Indexing databases are helpful in giving patrons information that will assist them in refining searches to retrieve items that best meet their needs. Consumers who are unsure may buy many items at once for future use as a “safety in numbers” strategy. This attitude relates directly to the creation and purchase of package deals, the increasing problem of patrons’ excessive printing from online sources after shotgun searching, and the patron habit of checking out many items on the chance that a few will have some relevant content.

Black next talked about efficient allocation of limited shelf space. Models for allocating shelf space include item profit margins, handling costs, space elasticity (sales changes caused by change in location of items on shelves), and cross elasticity (sales changes that occur when one item is near some related but different type of item). The audience found many applications to libraries: link resolvers making a title visible, library browsing collections, patrons browsing the shelves are more apt to see items at eye level, increasing book circulation when serials are intershelved with books.

Third, Black looked at formulas to find the most efficient (cost-effective) variety of products that satisfy consumers. Their satisfaction can vary depending on situations (which classes students take), choices (online or paper), tastes (change as scholars develop), as well as variation for its own sake. Marketing research has found that consumer preference for one item from a group of similar items depends on: attributes of the item (more or less desirable), past experience (good or bad), and desire for stimulation (through acquisition). In the library context patrons who have had good results from using a particular journal or database in the past will continue to use that journal or database in the future even when it is not an appropriate choice. Research has also found that the preference for an assortment of items increases when additional acceptable items are added, higher-valued assortments are preferred to lesser-valued assortments, and when two items are added, the more dissimilar or unique item is preferred. This attitude reinforces the importance of a focus on quality in collection development, as well as real variety instead of more of the same thing. Black concluded that inelasticity still exists in serials collection development even with the advent of aggregated databases, but to a lesser degree now that librarians have more choices.

Using Collaboration to Counteract Inertia in a Small Library
Sarah George, Serials Librarian, Illinois Wesleyan University; Julia Dickinson, Public Services Librarian, Illinois Wesleyan University
Reported by Bridget Clark
If the quote by Brian Joyner, “Most people are too busy working to get their jobs done,” ever needs to be proven, Julia Dickinson and Sarah George proved him correct!

This presentation demonstrated that by stepping back from the daily routine of one’s own worktable and viewing a task that has been put aside for too long, much can be learned and achieved. It proved that teamwork and individual specialties can work miracles. In the dynamic duo’s small library of Illinois Wesleyan University, the team set in action a plan that would manage their e-databases and e-journals that had been unsatisfactorily dealt with for over five years.

By researching other libraries, looking for a clear focus and deciding what would best benefit their library users, they set up a “hot group” for the task at hand. It was explained that a “hot group” spontaneously grows from an informal collaboration among people dedicated to rapid problem solving.

They explained that a “hot group” is a team of people that is spontaneously grown from the mere discussion of ideas that need to be dealt with. This like-minded group shared a commitment, the ability for self-sacrifice and a determination that was astonishing. The organized “hot group” proved that achievements can be made and seemingly unmovable mountains can be moved!

**After the License is Signed: Collaboration to Resolve License Breaches**

Ellen Finnie Duranceau, Digital Resources Acquisition Librarian, MIT Libraries; Deanna Graham, Journal Sales Manager, Blackwell Publishing; Stephen Martin, User Services Technical Assistant, JSTOR

Reported by Morag Boyd

Libraries, vendors, and publishers all struggle with breaches of electronic resource license agreements. Representing all of these perspectives, this tactics session helped all participants understand the issues.

Ellen Finnie Duranceau is responsible for dealing with breaches for MIT Libraries. She stressed that MIT Libraries views their role in this process as an educator, not an enforcer. Therefore, the first step towards collaboratively resolving license breaches is to begin with a compliance-friendly license agreement. Licenses should have appropriate provisions for fair use and clearly explain rules of use. The license should also limit the role of the library to educating users, reporting known misuse, and assisting with investigations of misuse; MIT Libraries avoids agreeing to block individuals from products or to carry out disciplinary action.

In their role as educators on the use of licensed electronic resources, MIT Libraries provides access to these resources through VERA (Virtual Electronic Resources Access database http://libraries.mit.edu/vera/). In addition to generic statements about use, VERA also offers links to product specific restrictions where appropriate. The MIT Libraries also disseminates information about appropriate use to their community through on-campus presentations and articles in campus publications.

Duranceau also suggested that libraries prepare for potential breaches. Having a protocol for responding to breaches, including written documentation, is important. Identifying people in the library and other parts of your institution, such as network security, who need to be involved before problems occur can be very helpful. The protocol should balance the role of library as an information provider with the obligation to resolve breaches.

Duranceau then discussed some of the patterns they have seen in license breaches. She identified three types of breaches they have seen in their library. The first breaches were seen in 1999, and these breaches were the result of legitimate scholarship that overstepped the limits of licenses. Educational efforts are the response to this type of breach. The second type of breach appeared in 2002 when faculty began doing statistical analysis of full-text news sources. MIT Libraries are still working with providers to facilitate this kind of research with appropriate licensing. The third type began in December 2003 with people coming through open proxies from other areas of campus and accessing library content, apparently looking to gather larger quantities of data. An open proxy is a server that lets off-site users onto an institution’s network without authenticating them. Many of these incidents have been classified “suspicious.” Interestingly, audience members noted similar activity beginning around the same time at their institutions.

Even with all three types, the number of breaches is not great, with a range from a low of one breach in 2000 to a high of six breaches between January 1 and June 7, 2004. Although the growth in collection size may account for much of the increase, there does seem to be an overall increase.

Duranceau said she would like to see publishers have clear language in licenses, tell libraries what the thresholds that trigger a breach report are, and develop business models that accommodate statistical analysis such as additional fee services. Market wide solutions rather than provider-by-provider options would be preferable.
**Deanna Graham** from Blackwell Publishing brought the publisher’s perspective. She gathers information from customers about the kind of licenses that work for them so Blackwell can respond to the market. Graham stressed that there have been no legal challenges in the Americas as a result of breaches; nevertheless, publishers still need to protect the content. Blackwell is flexible in their license agreements, but does monitor activity.

Blackwell monitors activity through detection software mainly designed to protect against automated harvesting of content. Graham described the scenarios that trigger a breach for them and gave some typical statistics for a month. Blackwell is also noticing an increase in breaches. If the number of PDF documents downloaded in one hour exceeds the limit (which is high enough that a human being could not download at that rate), the IP address of the activity is shut down and must be manually unblocked after the library is contacted. There were seven cases, and most were the result of proxy servers funneling to one IP address. Three were possible robots.

Blackwell also embeds “spider food” links that are not visible to users. If these links are triggered, then the library is contacted. They had 47 of these incidents.

The third automatic trigger is a single user session that is in operation for more than two hours. In this case, the session is blocked for two hours and then reinstated. The library is not contacted in these cases.

**Stephen Martin** from JSTOR discussed their process. They do not use automated detection and response, but human beings monitor activity. The staff gets reports of usage activity. If there is particularly high usage at an IP address, they may shut down that IP, contact the institution to inform them of the activity, and request that all stored PDFs be removed. JSTOR reinstates access when they receive confirmation that saved items have been deleted.

JSTOR has also experienced a recent rise in proxy servers. They first experienced this when a massive download occurred in fall 2002, which resulted in 50,000 articles being downloaded before they were able to stop that activity. Analysis of that experience revealed a tell-tale probing activity that occurs before the downloading begins. JSTOR can now usually detect the probing and shuts down printing and download from that IP before any harm is done. They will contact a site to let them know an open proxy was detected so they can take steps to close the proxy. They typically see about 90 per month.

Open proxies can result from misconfigured Web servers or viruses. To prevent this, institutions need to ensure that out-of-the-box configurations are altered to require authentication, systems administrators need to know that they need to check for open proxies, operating systems must be kept up to date, and anti-virus and anti-spyware programs must be used.

Martin also discussed Shibboleth as the most promising development in authentication to prevent abuse. Rather than IP authentication, Shibboleth authenticates individuals locally and allows local Shibboleth services to communicate permissions to resource providers. Shibboleth is technically similar to Athens in the UK, but does not use a central authentication repository like Athens. Although Shibboleth does not send personally identifiable information, it does tie persistent user IDs to particular users. While this could help the provider and the institution with information to locate violators, there are significant privacy concerns.

In the discussion following the presentation, the question was raised about whether excessive downloading harms the market for vendors. Martin responded that JSTOR is a partner with publishers and so must protect their interests. Graham agreed that they have to protect their authors and emerging markets. Audience members also stressed the importance of using authoritative and persistent sources for information.

Audience members had several questions about Shibboleth. A suggestion was made that small publishers could collaborate, possibly with third-party providers, to reduce the technological barriers to participation. Other questions led to discussion about privacy concerns using Shibboleth, particularly under the terms of the Patriot Act and the potential commercial value of users’ interests. The audience and panelists seemed concerned with finding mutually acceptable license terms and agreed that this is an area for continued development.

### Developing a Distributed Print Depository System: Challenges and Opportunities

**Melissa Trevvett**, Vice President and Director of Programs and Services, Center for Research Libraries; **Barbara DesRosiers**, Project Coordinator, Distributed Print Archives, Center for Research Libraries

Reported by Gail Julian

**Melissa Trevvett** and **Barbara DesRosiers** from CRL led a discussion concerning the challenges involved in creating and maintaining a print archive centrally or through partnership with other institutions. Although CRL’s role is to conserve print materials, due to limited space and the volume of material to be archived, Trevvett and DesRosiers promoted the concept of distributing responsibility to partners with whom they contract and to other state consortia. Trevvett and DesRosiers also hope to raise awareness among the membership of the
complexity of creating and maintaining such an archive. Legal agreements among partner institutions will hopefully provide assurance to the library community of the safety and reliability of a distributed archive and give libraries the confidence needed to deaccession locally or to contribute holdings to a local archive.

A number of factors have led to the need for developing a print archive. These factors include the need to “preserve legacy materials,” the lack of confidence in electronic journals and the corresponding need to provide a print archive as a back up to the electronic, and the concern that some materials may not be appropriate for digitization. Many states have already begun initiatives to archive materials, many beginning with JSTOR journals. Trevvett put forth several criteria that would provide the framework for creating a successful archive within a consortium. These criteria include “deep collections, close proximity, a history of working together, flexibility, knowledge of holdings and coverage, and written agreements.” A consortium would need to decide if developing a print archive is a priority for them, and if so, proceed to determine which institution will maintain which titles and how to complete holdings. Transferring holdings could be problematic for some state institutions. Both Trevvett and DesRosiers emphasized the importance of written agreements in regard to a distributed print depository system. Legal agreements should address factors such as environmental conditions in which materials will be housed, the security level of the storage facility, any disaster plans, retention schedules, dark or light archives, plus many other issues. The legal agreement should provide the assurance libraries need that an archive is reliable and stable. DesRosiers emphasized that audits of the archives provide additional assurance and queried the audience as to opinions of the number of dark and light archives that would be ideal. A dark archive is accessed only in the event of a catastrophe, while a light archive may be accessed and loaned.

According to DesRosiers, the current focus at CRL is archiving the JSTOR collection. Due to space limitations at CRL, some titles are archived centrally while others are archived by their current partners: Michigan State University, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and Yale University. Costs to CRL for this project include staff, legal fees, travel, and hardware and software. The travel costs are incurred for educational presentations as well as donor solicitation, site visits, and audits. Some costs incurred by the partners may include staff or students, storage space, and conservation measures. Future CRL archiving initiatives will be determined by the wants and needs of its membership and the associated costs. DesRosiers expressed interest in “developing print archives for those materials likely not to be digitized.” For more information on the CRL/JSTOR Print Archive Project see the CRL website at http://www.crl.edu.

**NETWORKING NODES**

**Cataloging**  
*Moderated by Evelyn Brass, University of Houston Libraries*  
*Reported by Christie Ericson*

The Cataloging Networking Node was well attended and focused on three main areas of discussion: Revision of the ISSN, major and minor title changes, and FRBR-like display issues.

Regina Romano Reynolds, head of the National Serials Data Program (NSDP), presented an update on the progress of the ISSN revision. Some of the issues being looked at are: enlarging the scope of ISSN to cover all continuing resources, dealing with multiple formats, and finding solutions that will work for all communities. According to Reynolds, the ISSN is a victim of its own success: This very useful identifier fulfills a wide variety of divergent uses, and any future changes will impact a great number of users. It is becoming increasingly crucial, especially in the digital environment, to decide just exactly what the ISSN will identify.

Although some attendees have not had to deal with minor title changes as of yet, other members of the group expressed frustration over major and minor changes. Some libraries have had trouble with acquisitions staff or consortia members mistakenly thinking a serial has undergone a major change, when in fact, there has only been a minor change. Some have solved this problem by training acquisitions staff to recognize minor changes and to bring questionable titles to the serials cataloger.

In addition, libraries that file alphabetically are having difficulty deciding how to shelve and bind serials with minor title changes, especially when the initial wording has changed. Some libraries employ a “latest entry cataloging, earliest entry shelving” method. Many have been reluctant to inflict too many “see” references on patrons, while others have added a “filing title” field to their OPAC. Other libraries have not had a problem dealing with minor title changes. Many feel that patrons do not care about title changes and that the trend toward a one-record approach is much more user-friendly.

The discussion then turned to the current structure of the catalog. What items in our catalogs are based on outdated
practices and are no longer needed? As catalogers, we have a responsibility to produce a catalog that meets our users’ needs, yet is still cost-effective for our institutions. One attendee suggested that cataloging efficiency might be a possible topic for next year’s conference.

The complex relationships and multiple formats of serials continue to pose a challenge for catalog design. There has been a great deal of discussion lately about implementing a FRBR model to improve catalog organization. It was suggested, however, that instead of trying to force serials to fit such a model, we should decide first what it is we want to achieve and how we want our display to look. The debate over the advantages and disadvantages of successive and latest entry cataloging continues, and despite the increasing prevalence of multiple formats, the tendency to base cataloging principles on the print format will become an even larger issue in the future.

E-Resource Management
Moderated by Anna Creech, Eastern Kentucky University
Reported by Kitt Canepi

Anna Creech, moderator of the E-Resource Management Networking Node, started the discussion by asking a series of questions that had appeared on the ERIL-L electronic resources discussion list (eril-l@listserv.binghamton.edu) and requesting a response by show of hands. How many libraries have homegrown systems for managing e-resources? How many have purchased systems? How many libraries include acquisitions information in their system? How many libraries keep ERM information in their integrated library system (ILS)? How many would like to see it integrated with their ILS? This last question had the largest showing of raised hands.

A longer discussion ensued when Anna asked the “big” question: What things would libraries want to see included in an ERM system? Answers from librarians included the following licensing information: Where a product was in the licensing/acquisition process, which consortia brokered the license (including past history of consortial subscriptions), whether a title is subscribed through an aggregator or a publisher, when the license agreement expires and/or is up for renewal, how much advance warning is needed for cancellation, whether archival access and/or backfiles are included (and the dates), what the library’s obligations/options are when the license is up, the number of simultaneous users permitted, if permission was granted for ILL and/or E-Reserve, and any restrictions against canceling print (or a percentage of print) subscriptions.

Librarians also wanted the ERM system to be a tool for making future subscription decisions by containing information on how much the subscription cost goes up each year (so they can detect patterns); whether the price is broken out per title or for a set package (how much overlap is there and what choices do they have); the kinds and ways to access usage statistics (several attendees also expressed the desire for statistics to be standardized); changes to content (what was gained/lost over time); and any embargo period, rolling dates, and/or backfile dates.

Attendees with homegrown systems touted their strength for including local information, although many considered it a stop-gap measure until their ILS vendor developed a system. It was noted that it would be unwise to benchmark management of online full-text journals against management of print journals as the business model is vastly different; we need to look at what makes the most sense for the media. Many librarians expressed a desire for global general information to be available in a database similar to OCLC’s bibliographic database from which they could pick and choose the elements that match the local situation.

Several vendor representatives in attendance presented their concerns about how to build an ERM system (vendor-librarian collaboration was suggested), what the value of such a system would be (what would libraries be willing to pay to balance what it would cost to develop), and whether or not librarians wanted it to be an ILS module (in which case it wasn’t worth it for subscription agents to develop). ILS vendors who currently have or are developing an ERM system include Innovative, Endeavor, Ex Libris, Sirsi, and Dynix. Their challenge is to create something sophisticated and flexible that still works with the existing ILS. Comments were made that subscription agents have a wealth of knowledge to contribute, although problems in sharing confidential pricing information and the impact of consortia purchases were discussed.

Several people noted that a lot of vendor-library collaboration is already going on. Additionally, the DLF Electronic Resource Management Initiative Steering Group has identified data elements and workflow schedules that it has made available to vendors over the last year (http://www.diglib.org/standards/dlf-erm02.htm). Other standard groups, such as the NISO EDItEUR Joint Working Party, are looking at format requirements for individual pieces of data.

Other discussion included ERM centralized vs. decentralized functions in various libraries. A large number of the libraries represented had a separate e-resources librarian position so different parts of the process could be overseen by one person. In other places, ERM was parcelled out to acquisitions, cataloging, and/or serials staff and was a collaborative effort. A point was made that public service staff also played a role in ERM,
particularly with decisions about the interface. Some libraries see an ERM system as a public tool. In response to a question, most of the libraries represented indicated they vetted license agreements through their institution’s legal department before the agreements were signed. New upcoming pricing models indicated by subscription agent representatives included discounts for print versions with online (instead of the other way around) and rolling coverage dates (as publishers build their archives).

The overall impression of the session was that electronic materials require a lot more support than print materials for librarians, subscription agents, and publishers. The ILS vendors are working as quickly as they can on creating the tools that libraries need. The comment that summarized it all was that “everyone is sharing the pain” while we all wait for the next development.

**Preservation Issues**

*Moderated by Fran Wilkinson, University of New Mexico; Linda Lewis, University of New Mexico*

Reported by Fran Wilkinson and Linda Lewis

The Preservation Issues Networking Node met on Friday, June 18, 2004, from 10:30 a.m.-12 noon, with 27 participants in attendance. While the attendees consisted mostly of librarians, we were pleased to welcome a publisher, a back-issue journals vendor, a microfilming and digitization vendor, and a commercial binder to the group. Fran Wilkinson and Linda Lewis introduced themselves, shared a little about their backgrounds, and asked attendees to do the same and identify their interests. Topics of interest included the organizational structure of preservation and related units, preservation of digital resources, digitization projects, where preservation of hard copy materials meets electronic resources—what to keep, who is responsible for preserving electronic archives—the role of microfilm as a preservation tool in the advent of digital technology, preservation considerations in planning an offsite storage facility, changes in the amount of commercial binding being done by libraries, changes in commercial binders’ business roles, deciding what to bind, the balance of print vs. electronic purchasing, and training issues.

Again this year, the enthusiastic group shared their concerns and knowledge on these issues. No one had a crystal ball to predict the future, but exploring questions and venturing educated guesses on preservation trends proved informative and satisfying for the group.

The organization structure in various libraries was shared. Only one attendee’s library had a preservation librarian, others had teams or committees from multiple departments responsible for preservation. Some felt that the trend seems to be moving away from having a full-time preservation librarian; others mentioned that they never had one due to budget constraints. One participant stated that, “Preservation is not a function, it is a goal.” Preservation of digital resources continues to be a concern of both librarians and publishers. Who is responsible for this: all libraries, consortial or regional library groups, or publishers? What happens if a publisher who maintains the electronic archive goes out of business? While the large publishers may ensure preservation of major electronic titles, should librarians be the ones to ensure that local materials, especially ephemeral local materials, are preserved? What is the official copy of record anyway: the print copy, the electronic copy, or the publisher’s database? Do libraries need to retain the print copy of materials that they also receive electronically? Will their budgets continue to allow them to receive both print and electronic copies of anything? One attendee stated, “We do not call it, ‘serials cancellation’: We call it, ‘transition to online.’” All of these questions were discussed, but no definitive answers were found.

Information on several library’s digitization projects was shared. The standards for digitization are changing quickly (where there are standards at all), requiring that the data be regularly refreshed and migrated to the latest format—ever try to play an eight-track tape or open a 5¼ inch floppy diskette? The role of microfilm as a preservation format was discussed. For some materials—newspapers, for example—it continues to be the medium of choice.

The preservation concerns to be considered when planning an offsite storage facility depend on the type of facility being planned. Will the materials be shelved or placed in bins? Will it be retrieved by staff or mechanically?

The commercial binder reported that he is seeing less binding of serials, partly due to declining budgets and partly due to libraries relying on the electronic version; however, he is beginning to do more binding of the paperback versions of books and more binding of print-on-demand books for publishers. The back-issue vendor reported that he is beginning to work with libraries on digitization.

Finally, the group agreed that training library staff about preservation must include every aspect of library work from selection to shelving and beyond.

Once again this year, everyone enjoyed the Preservation Issues Networking Node and agreed that it should be repeated again next year!
Public Libraries
Moderated by Blythe Kropf, Head of Serial Ordering, New York Public Library; Tina Buck, Reference & Serials Selection Librarian, Hennepin County Library, Collection and Bibliographic Services
Reported by Virginia Taffurelli

This session was well attended by representatives from small, medium, and large public libraries, as well as the Mexico Student Grant recipient and representatives from vendors serving public libraries. Common concerns included how to promote usage of electronic databases, staff training, community outreach, federated searching, user authentication, print versus electronic, archiving, and access to e-books. In essence, these are the same concerns academic and research libraries face, both large and small. Taffurelli announced that she will be on the Program Planning Committee for next year’s conference and solicited program ideas addressing public library concerns and encouraged participants to consider submitting a formal proposal. Steve Headley announced that he will be presenting a Tactics Session, “Comparing and Contrasting Serials in Public and Academic Libraries,” the next day and invited everyone to attend.

Practical Things for the New Serialist to Know
Moderated by Dennis Bernards and Dalene Hawthorne
Reported by Dalene Hawthorne

Dalene Hawthorne welcomed the group and introduced herself as Ordering Librarian at Stanford University. She also introduced Dennis Bernards as Serials Department Chair at Brigham Young University.

Bernards began the informal discussion by describing the networking node format. He then asked the 30 or more NASIG members in attendance several questions. Most serialists in the room were attending NASIG for the first time. Most were from either academic or special libraries. There was a mixture of professional and support staff. Finally, Bernards asked the attendees how many worked with serials and how many became involved with serials by default. Several hands were raised, including the facilitators. Bernards then shared a little of his background and how he became involved in serials management.

Bernards asked the attendees what questions they had about managing serials. Several of the questions were about the serials supply chain, so Bernards suggested starting with an overview of the industry. He described some of the services that subscription vendors provide. For example, vendors develop relationships with publishers and maintain data about publishers, including the titles and formats they offer and pricing. They place subscription orders and claims on behalf of the library. By using subscription vendors, libraries can communicate with one or maybe a few vendors rather than hundreds or thousands of different publishers. Hawthorne added that by paying one or two invoices to a vendor per year rather than paying hundreds or thousands of different publishers, the library is saving the costs of payment processing, which have been estimated at $75 per transaction for an institution.

A question was asked about whether EDI claims work or disappear into the ether, or whether they are as substantial as regular claims. Brigham Young University has actually done EDI claiming and has found that claims submitted in this way receive as much attention as print or e-mail claims.

Someone asked a question about whether it is better to go directly to the publisher. Both Hawthorne and Bernards explained that whenever possible, it is better to go through a subscription vendor. They maintain databases of titles, where they are available, prices, etc. Some vendors have entire research departments that maintain their publisher information and add new titles. Vendors have automated ordering and payment systems set up with some of the major publishers. It is more cost-effective for vendors to do this kind of work with publishers than it would be for each library to do so, because the vendors handle many orders per publisher.

Sometimes it is not possible to go through a vendor. Usually this is because the publisher won’t work with a vendor. Sometimes vendors won’t handle titles for which there is no charge. In those cases, going directly to the publisher is the only option.

Hawthorne mentioned that back-issue dealers can help libraries obtain issues that they have not been able to claim successfully. Absolute Backorder Service, Inc. and Alfred Jaeger, Inc. are two back-issue dealers she has worked with.

Hawthorne also mentioned “grace” issues and asked if everyone knew that term. Some attendees were not familiar with the term, so she explained that often when a subscription has lapsed or been cancelled, the publisher will continue to send a few issues with the hope that the subscriber will change their mind and renew the subscription.

Bernards talked about how serials units vary in organizational structure from institution to institution. Some serials departments include serials cataloging staff and some don’t. Some serials librarians are responsible or
partly responsible for collection development and some aren’t. License negotiation is sometimes handled by the serials librarian and sometimes by staff in collection development. Generally, serials librarians in smaller libraries tend to handle a wider variety of responsibilities, and serials librarians in larger organizations tend to specialize more.

Someone asked about free online with print. Bernards, Hawthorne, and others in the group agreed that often the first year of online access is offered free of charge, but then the next year, payment is required. Bernards explained that Brigham Young does not add free-of-charge online journals unless they would be selected for the collection even if they had to be paid. BYU has had problems with users who get used to having the online journal available, and then when it disappears the next year, they get upset. So most of the time when the costs of processing are considered, free-of-charge is not stable and isn’t really free.

Someone asked how e-journals are handled. Hawthorne mentioned that the Stanford University Libraries Payment Unit is now claiming invoices from the publisher three months before the expiration date to avoid embarrassing lapses. Lapsed electronic subscriptions are much more noticeable than lapsed print subscriptions.

Both Bernards and Hawthorne agreed that their libraries generally only subscribe to online resources that can provide access via an IP address or IP range of addresses, and that dealing with logins and passwords is too clunky and time-consuming to be practical.

Someone asked how to decide when to cancel the print if the electronic journal is available. Hawthorne mentioned that it really depends on the goal of the organization. In the case of a research library, one of the goals is to archive information, and that until archiving of electronic journals has been settled, there will be some libraries that will continue to acquire the print as the archival copy. In some settings, archiving is not as important, and it may be fine to go with online only. One factor to consider is that, in many cases, the library is leasing access to the electronic journal and not purchasing the actual content. In those cases, if the subscription is cancelled, access to past data is also no longer available to the library.

A participant shared his expertise in this area since neither Hawthorne nor Bernards has a cataloging background. He explained that serials cataloging is different than other cataloging in three ways: There is less detail, cataloging of a serial is not done until the title ceases (and sometimes not even then), and cataloging of serials requires close communication with serials check-in staff.

Someone asked if there is an easy way to generate lists of e-journals. The answer is that it is generally not easy, but there are services available such as TDNet and Serials Solutions that can make it easier. Other methods of generating lists of e-journals include locally developed databases and lists generated from online catalogs.

Some serials publications are only available as the result of becoming a member of an organization. Libraries can join as institutional members. Memberships bring their own special problems for libraries. Often the library will receive publications that the library does not want to add to the collection as part of the membership. Handling these materials takes time.

Packages range from “comes with” titles where you must buy one title to get the other, to very large “big deal” packages that include hundreds of print titles plus electronic journals. Stanford and Brigham Young try to track these packages by creating a dummy package record and linking it to all the titles in the package. These packages change frequently and the records require maintenance. Sometimes packages are more costly to maintain than if the titles are purchased separately.

Libraries are finding that gift subscriptions are becoming less necessary since the breakup of the Soviet Union. Gift and exchange programs are a relatively expensive way to acquire materials due to the amount of labor involved in maintaining them. It has become easier to locate vendors who handle materials from all over the world now due to the Internet. Therefore, some libraries are opting to purchase subscriptions rather than rely on gift or exchange programs.

Bernards finished the discussion by thanking everyone for attending and participating in a lively discussion. Most of the questions raised by the attendees were at least touched upon, but not all.

LUNCH CONNECTIONS

Staff and Workflow Reorganization for E-journal Deployment
Reported by Paula Sullenger

This topic ended up with seven full tables. The table moderators felt that since there was such high interest in the topic that a report should be made. The following report is a synthesis of the main ideas brought out at the seven tables.
Electronic resource management

The areas identified with electronic resource management (ERM) include acquisition, licensing, and public display issues. A significant amount of time is also spent on problem resolution. Many participants were frustrated with some aspect of their existing workflow and came to hear how other libraries had resolved similar problems. One described ERM as “scattershot.” Each library has a somewhat different setup and situation, complicating the process of sharing ideas and workflows. Keeping up with holdings is still a problem for many.

Participants were concerned that they still lacked an efficient method for updating catalog records, A-Z lists, and link resolution databases and particularly for harmonizing the data in these separate knowledge bases. Several people felt that because of the technology involved, many of these routine maintenance functions are still taking place at too high a level of the organization.

Participants noted that their workflows are often convoluted as a result of ERM functions being distributed too widely across the organization. As a related issue, several people noted that ERM functions in their organizations had coalesced around particular units or individuals that had spearheaded early ERM initiatives, but were not necessarily the most appropriate locus for ERM responsibility in the current environment. In several places, ERM falls on one person and it is too much. In most places, public services units seem to be disconnected from ERM.

Only one participant was using a license tracking system, and this was a homegrown database that required a fairly high level of ongoing maintenance and development. There was a lot of interest in commercial ERM products, and several people expressed the hope that these products will alleviate inefficiencies and miscommunication throughout the ERM work cycle.

The process used for paper format doesn’t work for e-journals, and we should not try to pattern a new workflow on that model.

Problem management

After the e-resource has been acquired and set up by whatever means the library has, even more time and effort is spent on problem resolution. Many participants identified this as a major concern and said that this is not adequately handled. Libraries are still struggling with questions such as where problems should be referred. Should problems be directed to the systems librarian or systems department to determine whether there are technical reasons before passing the problem to acquisitions? Or should acquisitions receive it first to determine if there are subscription or licensing problems? For big problems, should the point of contact be the “publisher” or the vendor/subscription agent responsible for managing the subscription? Another issue in problem management is the difficulty in prioritizing problems. The “urgency” issue often overrides the ability to identify what the actual priorities need to be.

Staffing levels

Many libraries are struggling to determine appropriate, or even adequate, staffing levels for the new tasks involved in ERM. There was general agreement that we have to reorganize staff and workflow. Some libraries feel more confident of being able to make these changes than others. Some have retirement issues, while some will be able to cut staff to make higher-level positions. Those who were more confident of being able to make changes point out that librarians have to be willing to let go of some tasks and give them to staff. Librarians are struggling with determining how much they can give their staff.

Other participants did not feel that they have much flexibility. Some would like change and have ideas about how to go about it, but do not feel they have the power to make drastic changes in their organizations. Some have staff members who may not be able to make the transition from the print to electronic environment, especially if ERM requires higher-level staff or staff with technical skills. Participants felt that the work with e-resources has yet to become routine, and a different, more advanced skill set is needed. Generally, high-level support staff or librarians are doing the work. In some cases, upgrades have been possible because of the IT skills involved. However, there was a minority opinion that too many of these new tasks are performed at too high a level. We need training to be able to “bump things down” and enable serials staff to handle all aspects, such as acquisition, troubleshooting, etc. In general, participants would like to see librarians involved in the decision-making issues, not tasks.

Some Strategies and Policies

For general ERM issues, one person’s library has documented the paper workflow and has a committee to do this with e-journal workflow, which is currently a mess. Several participants were using OpenURL systems and third-party serials management systems as a complement or alternative to cataloging their aggregator journals.

For problem resolution, a few libraries are using commercial products intended for customer service
departments. These software products can be used for tracking e-management problems. Others have developed an internal e-resources listserv for reporting/tracking/resolving problems and e-mail management software to help organize messages on e-resources lists by topic/problem.

One library has formed a Digital Problem Solving Team that continues to grow larger as staff members are borrowed from other areas. Another has formed an Off Campus Problem Team of systems staff to deal with remote users and proxy configuration.

There were several participants who would like to change their current process, but don’t know how. Examples from libraries who feel they have good workflows or ERM processes would be very welcome. Some feel that the proposed workflows they are seeing are too convoluted to be useful in some organizations. A variety of workflows should be demonstrated. There was considerable interest in seeing published workflow schemas or checklists. Some felt the serials community should determine the core competencies for the component tasks. This would aid in determining the staffing levels needed for successful ERM. Some want basic guidelines that can be fine-tuned as necessary at their libraries.

In conclusion, it seems that “Staff and Workflow Reorganization for E-journal Deployment” is a topic of intense interest by many NASIG attendees. Participants at the lunch tables spoke of the need for more discussions in this area.

FRBR (Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records) as it Relates to Serials (Table III)

Moderator: Sandy Folsom, Cataloger/Reference Librarian, Park Library/Clarke Historical Library, Central Michigan University

Reported by Christie Ericson

FRBR is currently a hot topic in the serials world, and there was such an overwhelming response to this Lunch Connection session that several additional discussion tables had to be added. The discussion was very informal, although it was rather difficult to hear at times over the din of the lunchtime conversation.

Most of the participants at the table had heard of FRBR, an “entity-relationship model” that uses a hierarchical record structure, but very few felt that they really understood the concept, especially in terms of “expression” and “manifestation.” While many agreed that FRBR might have the potential to improve the catalog, most felt that it appeared to apply more to monographs. There was also some speculation as to how serials are handled in other countries. As the discussion came to a close, most participants agreed that while FRBR is an interesting concept, it is still highly theoretical, and they were skeptical about its ability to describe the complex relationships of serials.

MENTORING PROGRAM

Alice Tucker, co-chair

The NASIG Mentoring Program is designed to match first-timers to the NASIG Conference with members who have attended more than one conference. Partners contact each other before the conference to “chat” about how the conference works, what to wear, etc. They then meet at the Mentor Reception and have a chance to get to know each other.

The 2004 Mentoring Program and Reception in Milwaukee was a great success. We had over 66 mentor/mentees sign up for the program. Evaluations of the program indicate a general good feeling about the Mentoring Program. Most people feel that the program was very beneficial for both newcomers and longtime conference attendees.

Some comments from participants:

“It was very gratifying to see my mentee throughout the conference and hearing him say, ‘The conference is everything you said it would be. Thanks!’ He’s a librarian and I am a publisher, and I had a good opportunity to offer him a slightly different expression of the NASIG conference ‘experience.’”

“It’s really nice to have time to meet the first-timers at the reception and get acquainted with faces that you can then talk to during the conference, making sure they are getting the information they need and want.”

“My mentor was a great help and made sure to introduce me around to other NASIG members, checking in with me periodically to make sure that I had a great conference experience.”
CONFERENCE PHOTO WEBSITE

Don’t miss some of the great photos from the Milwaukee conference on NASIG’s conference photo website at http://www.nasig.org/conference/photos/index.html. Do you have photos of NASIGers enjoying the conference or sites around Milwaukee? See http://www.nasig.org/conference/photos/submit.html for information related to submitting photos.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS
NOMINATION DEADLINE MOVED FORWARD
Kathryn Wesley, Chair, Nominations & Elections Committee

In order to accommodate the earlier conference date for 2005 (May 19-22) and the NASIG Bylaws, the deadline for nominations has been moved from October 15, 2004, to September 15, 2004. A nomination form is included in this edition of the Newsletter. An online form is also available on NASIGWeb at http://www.nasig.org/members/forms/nomform.html. If you are planning to nominate someone for President/Vice President-Elect, Treasurer, or Member-at-Large, please keep this earlier deadline in mind.

Also keep in mind that nominees must be current members for the year of election and that only members who have renewed for the year of election may vote. This means that timely return of membership renewals for 2005 will be particularly important this year. Rene Erlandson, Chair of the Database & Directory Committee, will send renewals out in the fall.

NASIG PROFILE
STEVE SAVAGE, NASIG PRESIDENT
Maggie Rioux

One of the best things about writing this profile column is finding out interesting things about other people (especially people I’ve known for a long time) and then sharing them with the rest of you. Take this issue’s subject, for example: I’ve known Steve Savage, our current NASIG President, for ages, but I never knew until I started working on this profile that he started out in life intending to become a piano teacher. Yes, a piano teacher…our Steve. Boy, am I glad he didn’t, because then I would have never had him as a friend, NASIG would have lost him as Newsletter Editor and President, and the serials field in general would never have had him as a colleague.

So how, I hear you ask, did Steve get from piano to serials? As usual with our complicated lives, it was a combination of things: In this case, a badly timed injury, and a bunch of good luck. Steve was nearing the finish of a Doctor of Musical Arts program in applied piano at the University of Kentucky. As a matter of fact, he had just his final recital left to complete when he injured his arm to the point of not being able to play well enough to pass the recital requirement. He had been working part time in the library (reshelving periodicals and making photocopies) while going to school and had just been hired for a full-time paraprofessional position there, supervising the periodicals public service unit. This had been intended as a temporary slot while his arm healed, but it turned into a career. During the next year off from school, he learned a) his arm was not going to come back to pianist quality, 2) he didn’t want to be a piano teacher anyway, and 3) working in serials in a library was fun. Under the inspiration of Judy Sackett, Head of Periodicals at Kentucky, and despite being totally burned out on school, he entered and made it through Kentucky’s MLS program.

Here’s where it really gets good: Steve had one course to go on the MLS when Ms. Sackett moved to Reference. Our Steve, in a moment of total wildness, volunteered as Interim Head of Periodicals. Not only was he accepted as interim head, but he got hired for the permanent position. What a climb: 3½ years from part-time student shelve to head of the department. Good timing, too: He got to have his graduation and promotion parties all in one. And not only that, along the way he discovered that serials and libraries are a heck of a lot more fun that teaching piano! Hey, Steve, I could have told you that!

And how did he get hooked up with NASIG? A bunch of the folks there at Kentucky kept telling him it was a great organization. Another colleague finally talked him and a buddy into submitting a proposal for a possible workshop. The proposal got accepted for the 1991 Trinity conference, and off he went. Again, this was a really, really good piece of serendipity because it was at Trinity
that Steve met Tom Champagne, his life partner. They were introduced by that same colleague who’d talked him into submitting the proposal. Thirteen years later, Steve, Tom, and NASIG are all still going strong together.

Steve Savage and Tom Champagne dressed like you’ll never see them at NASIG

After such an auspicious beginning to his NASIG membership, Steve could hardly help but get more heavily involved in the organization. He’s served on a few task forces, presented at a few conferences, and been a member of the Publications, Conference Planning, and Program Planning committees. But the way, I first met Steve and came to count him as a friend via the Newsletter Editorial Board.

Steve was Production Editor from 1994-1997 (before serving as Special Assignments Editor and then as Editor-in-Chief from 1998-2002). About this same time I was Co-Chair of the Electronic Communications Committee, and in that role served first as Gophermeister (remember Gopher?) and then as NASIG’s first Webspinner. Back then, the ECC person was responsible for converting the Newsletter documents to the proper format for putting up on NASIG’s electronic site. Also, Maggie Horn, now in New York but then in Arizona, was Editor-in-Chief. Poor Steve. I think he felt like a rose between two thorns as he tried to keep both us Maggies straight in his head and also happy and off his back. He took to referring to us as Maggie West (her) and Maggie East (me). Within a few years, Steve succeeded to the top Newsletter job, and I got elected to the NASIG Board. We had a lot of fun sitting in the corner together and making wisecracks to each other when things got a little boring (apologies to Steve Oberg, Dan Tonkery and Connie Foster: we really were paying attention, I swear).

Steve’s career has progressed nicely over the years as well. In 1995, he moved from Kentucky to Michigan. He worked at the Library of Michigan, then at Wayne State University in various positions, including various aspects of technical services. In 1999, he joined Tom at the University of Michigan where he was head of Monograph Acquisitions. In 2003, Steve and Tom decided it was time to head for somewhere with nice weather all year round and where they’d be close to some of their longtime friends. Their destination was San Diego, where NASIG had met in 2000. Steve says he’s happily discovering the wonders of the beach and hoping for the installation of a wireless hotspot near his favorite patch of sand so that he can work from the beach a couple of afternoons a week (right, Steve—in your dreams). He still does manage to get away occasionally from his job, which he loves, as Head of Cataloging at San Diego State University. He’s even getting to use the music background as bibliographer for music and dance and liaison to that department. A project to work on is cataloging 85,000 pieces of uncataloged sheet music (that’ll get him in off the beach). Tom took a while longer to find a job that seemed right, but after a year of continuing to catalog for Michigan via telecommuting, he has just started a job at the Thomas Jefferson School of Law doing both cataloging and managing their integrated library system.

Sounds to me like Steve is doing pretty well these days (I know he seemed to be smiling a lot in Milwaukee). He’s got a great job, a great partner, no more Michigan winters, and the worst part of the NASIG Presidency is behind him—he’s got all those committee appointments done. Now all he has to do is write four President’s Corner columns and try not to get in the way of the really great people he put on the committees. And next year, when we all meet in Minneapolis, he should be smiling even more brightly because he won’t have even that left to do, but instead will be looking back on a great presidential year. Way to go, Steve!
COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORTS

ARCHIVES
Holley Lange, Archivist

Board Liaison: Bea Caraway

Activities since last report:
1. Over the year, again reviewed materials in the collection and finalized folder listing for the transfer of materials to the University of Illinois.
2. On January 30, 2004, eight boxes comprising the NASIG archives were sent to the Archives at University of Illinois. Those materials were processed promptly, and there is a description of the collection on their website.
3. Throughout the year, received and filed materials into the collection.

Action items:
[none]

Budget:
FedEx charges for the transfer of materials went directly to the treasurer.

Acknowledgments:
Thanks to Bea Caraway for all her hard work.

Statistics:
No requests for material were received.

Requests for Archival Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Requestor</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Date Rec’d or Date Forwarded to U of IL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter v.19 #1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwartz Scholarship Misc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Harvell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Discs 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter v.18 #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Cook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Savage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter v.13 #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>8 boxes archival materials</td>
<td>1/04 shipped to University of Illinois Archives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Checklist for Receipt of Archival Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Description of Material</th>
<th>Date Received or Date Forwarded to Permanent Archive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Newsletter v.19 #1</td>
<td>Printed by Archivist when announced on list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECC</td>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>5/03 Printed when received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>Schwartz Scholarship Misc.</td>
<td>2/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Harvell</td>
<td>Misc. Discs 2000</td>
<td>2/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Newsletter v.18 #4</td>
<td>Printed by Archivist when announced on list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC</td>
<td>Evaluation Reports</td>
<td>12/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Cook</td>
<td>Misc. Materials</td>
<td>11/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Savage</td>
<td>Newsletter v.13 #4</td>
<td>10/03--to replace one missing from the files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>8 boxes archival materials</td>
<td>1/04 shipped to University of Illinois Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shipping list as sent to U of I, attached.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AWARDS & RECOGNITION COMMITTEE
Rachel Frick, Philenese Slaughter, Co-Chairs

Committee Members:
Rachel Frick (Co-Chair)
Philenese Slaughter (Co-Chair)
Randi Ashton-Pritting (University of Hartford), 00/02-02/04
Susan Chinoransky (George Washington University), 03/05
Susan Davis (SUNY-Buffalo), 02/04
Jessica Gibson (University of Illinois-Champaign/Urbana), 02/04
Carol Green (University of Southern Mississippi), 00/02-02/04
Tony Harvell (University of California, San Diego), 03/05
Joseph Hinger (St. John’s University), 02/04; Judy Irvin (Louisiana Tech University), 01/03–03/05
Janice Krueger (University of the Pacific), 02/04
Smita Parkhe (Arizona State University), 03/05
Cheryl Riley (Central Missouri State University), 01/03–03/05
Priscilla Shontz (U of Houston System at Cinco Ranch) 02/04
Jeffrey Slagell (Delta State University), 02/04 [Web Liaison]
Kaye Talley (University of Central Arkansas), 00/02–02/04
Part I: Continuing Committee Activities and Recommendations

Electronic submission/distribution of award applications:

For the 2004 awards cycle, the electronic process went amazingly well. Receiving applications and supporting documentation in electronic format allowed the co-chairs very easily to do a “baseline blinding of the documents” with a simple find and replace command. Rachel Frick created a spreadsheet that managed the identity matrix for the applications and a scoring spreadsheet that committee members used to score the applications for all awards. These worksheets were then combined in one workbook that tabulated the final scores. Jeff Slagell, the liaison to the Electronic Communications Committee, mounted all of the applications for review on a password-controlled website accessed by members of the committee.

Recommendation:

For next year, we recommend the continued use of the identity matrix to track the blinding process of applications, the master scoring workbook, and—in order to improve the ease of review applications—combine the application and all supplemental documents into one electronic file, as opposed to the Horizon award, for example (four separate files per applicant). We also would like the Board to reconsider the necessity to blind student applications. The volume of applications was huge, and the risk of a committee member knowing one of the applicants is slim.

Mexico Student Conference Grant:

Joseph Hinger joined the 2002/03 Awards & Recognition Committee as an understudy to the Mexico Student Conference Grant liaison, Lisa Furubotten, who is a member of the Continuing Education Committee. The responsibility for the award has moved to the Awards & Recognition Committee for 2003/04. Mexico Student Grant expenses were absorbed into the Awards & Recognition Committee’s budget.

Recommendation:

We recommend that the award continue to be managed through the A & R committee, with the understanding that more communication between the Mexico Grant liaison and the committee co-chairs is paramount. Deadlines of communicating with the committee need to be firmly established and adhered to. Also, for next year, we advise that the timeline for managing the award needs to be moved forward in order to adequately manage the application and award process. Attached are the award procedures, respectfully submitted for the Board’s approval.

Two miscellaneous recommendations:

First, the chairs feel that it is important to reduce the size of this committee. At the present time the committee has 16 members plus the co-chairs. We recommend that this be done by attrition until the committee is reduced to a more manageable size.

Second, the chairs feel strongly that it is inappropriate for persons currently part of the committee to write recommendations for applicants. During the screening process this year, it was noticed that two of the current committee members wrote recommendations for applicants. This also occurred last year. We recommend that a formal statement be made by the Board expressing this.

Part II: Completed Action Items

The committee reviewed 48 applications that were screened for eligibility and blinded by the committee co-chairs. Winners were chosen by each individual member reviewing the electronic documents on the Web and scoring the applicants on a standardized Excel worksheet. The worksheet was then submitted to the co-chairs, and the scores were then tabulated. This new process was very successful and reduced the amount of work done by the co-chairs. Winners were approved by the Board, notified and registered for the conference, and announced to the membership via NASIG-L and the Newsletter.

The committee made recommendations for continued service on the committee and for the co-chairs for 2004/05, and the appointment of new members was made to the president-elect. The co-chairs strongly believe that the work of this committee can be fulfilled with fewer members.

Part III: 2003 Awards

For 2004, Frick received and compiled the ratings for the student grant and Schwartz scholarship. Slaughter received and compiled the ratings for the Horizon Award and coordinated the review of the Tuttle application.
Marcia Tuttle International Grant Award:

Only one application was received and reviewed. The candidate’s project was reviewed for suitability, value to the profession, and methodology, and upon the recommendations by her peers, the application was unanimously submitted to the Board for approval. Regina Romano Reynolds is the Head of the National Serials Data Program, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. The work to be accomplished is to draft the content and the wording of the revised edition of ISO 3297 on the International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) for subsequent consideration and approval by the member bodies of ISO/TC/46/SC 9.

2004 NASIG Conference Student Grant Award:

Twenty-two complete applications for the three student grants were received and reviewed. The three highest-ranked candidates for the award are listed below along with the library school each is attending:

Christopher Brady, University of Maryland
Eve Mitt, North Carolina Central University
Andrea Wirth, University of North Texas

2004 Horizon Award:

Fourteen completed applications for the single award were received and reviewed. The winner of the award is Rocki Strader, who is the Electronic Resources Manager in the Serials and Electronic Resources Department, Ohio State University Libraries of the Ohio State University in Columbus.

Fritz Schwartz Serials Education Scholarship:

Eleven completed applications for the single scholarships were reviewed and reviewed. The winner of the scholarship is Sandra Lorraine Wiles, who is a Canadian citizen and currently enrolled at University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Graduate School of Library and Information Science.

Mexico Student Conference Grant:

Ruth Zamora Piña was selected from many qualified candidates. She is pursuing her Licenciature in Library Science (equivalent to U.S. Master’s level) at the Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, Colegio de Bibliotecologia.

Conclusion:

We were successful with our move to an online forum for all committee work. The new online submission process resolved many problems discovered in the online review process last year.

We worked out a process to blind and track the identities of all applications for all awards. This process needs to be fine tuned and formally documented next year.

The co-chairs of the Awards & Recognition Committee would like to extend special thanks to those members cycling off the committee and extend a warm welcome to the members of the 2004/05 committee.

CONTINUING EDUCATION COMMITTEE
Robert Alan, Meg Mering, Co-Chairs

Committee members for 2003/2004

Co-Chairs:
Robert Alan (Pennsylvania State University), 03/05
Meg Mering (University of Nebraska), 02/04

Members:
Janie Branham (Southeastern Louisiana University), 03/05
John Buelow (Virginia Tech University), 03/05
Maria Collins (Mississippi State University), 00/02-02/04
Deberah England (Wright State University), 00/02-02/04
Wen-Ying Lu (Michigan State University), 00/02-02/04
Kim Maxwell (Massachusetts Inst. of Technology), 02/04
Keiko Okuhara (University of Hawaii), 02/04
Victoria Peters (Minnesota State University), 02/04
Nathan Rupp (Cornell University), 02/04 [Web Liaison]
Marsha Seamans (University of Kentucky), 01/03-03/05
John Wiggins (Drexel University), 03/05

Mary Williams (Minot State University), 00/02-02/04
David Winchester (Washburn University), 03/05
Pashan Yue (University of Nevada, Reno), 03/05

Board Liaison:
Carol MacAdam

Incoming Committee Members for 2004/2005

Chairs:
Robert Alan (Pennsylvania State University), 03/05
Nathan Rupp (Cornell University), 02/04; 04/06

Members:
Linda Blake (West Virginia University), 04/06
Cris Ferguson (Furman University), 04/06
Tim Hagan (Northwestern University), 04/06
Lei Jin (Ryerson University), 04/06
Kay Johnson (University of Tennessee, Knoxville), 04/06
Sheila Moran (Massachusetts General Hospital), 04/06
Keiko Okuhara (University of Hawaii at Manoa), 02/04; 04/06
C. Rockelle (Rocki) Strader (Ohio State University Libraries), 04/06
Sarah Tusa (Lamar University), 04/06
Elizabeth Urbanik (Mississippi State University), 04/06
John Wiggins (Drexel University), 03/05
David Winchester (Washburn University), 03/05
Paoshan Yue (University of Nevada, Reno), 03/05

Board Liaison:
Judy Luther (Informed Strategies)

CEC Events and Projects Successfully Sponsored and Completed

October 2003
SCCTP Integrating Resources preconference at the Kentucky Library Association Annual Conference, Kentucky ($750)

E-journal cataloging and management workshop: “Managing, Controlling, and Cataloging the Elusive Electronic Journal,” as part of the Pennsylvania Library Association Annual Conference, Pennsylvania ($1,000)

March 2004
New York Technical Services Librarians Spring Reception, New York ($50)

April 2004
SCCTP Serial Holdings Workshop, Lincoln, Nebraska ($750)
SCCTP Advanced Serials Cataloging Workshop, Honolulu, Hawaii ($1232.72)
SCCTP Serials Holdings Workshop, Montreal, Quebec ($653.19)
North Carolina Serials Conference, Chapel Hill, North Carolina ($600)

May 2004
Association for Caribbean University, Research and Institutional Libraries Annual Conference: “Electronic Information Resources in the Caribbean: Trends and Issues.” Port-of-Spain, Trinidad and Tobago. NASIG supported attendance by conference speaker Steve Shadle. ($500)
“Discover the Magic of Electronic Journals,” Mississippi State University, May 2004 ($1000)

AMBAC (Asociación Mexicana de Bibliotecarios) Annual Meeting: “The AMBAC and the Libraries: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow,” Cancun, Mexico ($1200)

Events in the Pipeline

October 2004
Potomac Technical Processing Librarians (PTPL) Annual Conference. Co-sponsor preconference on archiving electronic serials. ($600+)

Events with Budget Allocations, Lacking Firm Dates or Commitments

SCCTP Advanced Serials Cataloging Workshop, Las Vegas, Nevada ($500)

Events cancelled: funds reallocated

PTPL (Potomac Technical Processing Librarians) 2003 annual conference support withdrawn. Funding reallocated to SCCTP workshop in October 2003. PTPL 2004 is scheduled for October 2004 and NASIG will provide support for preconference on archiving electronic serials.

Western Canada licensing workshop not developed, and funds reallocated to support Mexico and Caribbean outreach. This idea will be carried over to 2005.

Conclusion

Committee Co-Chairs Robert Alan and Meg Mering want to take this opportunity to thank CEC members for their efforts this past year. 2004 CEC programming focused on providing outreach to Mexico, Canada, and beyond. Wen-Ying Lu and John Wiggins worked with conference planners on NASIG support for the AMBAC meeting in Cancun. In addition, NASIG supported workshops in Canada and the Caribbean in 2004. Let’s not forget the SCCTP workshop in Hawaii organized by Keiko Okuhara.

In addition to geographic outreach, the committee continued to strive for balanced programming (an ongoing CEC goal). In addition to support for the popular SCCTP workshops on serials cataloging and holdings, CEC supported programs on electronic journals, archiving, and other topics.

The committee put out a call for programming proposals and ideas in July 2004 but received a limited response. CEC will send out another call this summer and hopefully receive a better response. Next year, the committee will
request sufficient funding to support programming contingencies throughout the year, as it may be difficult for program planners to plan a year in advance.

Lastly, we would like to thank the Board for their generous support this year and look forward to another successful year in 2004/2005.

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE
Rick Anderson, Marty Gordon, Co-Chairs

New Projects

Our new projects are ongoing; see below.

Ongoing Projects

Anne Mitchell is working with Sarah George to improve the Human Resources page and perhaps make its content searchable by means of a relational database. The NASIGGuide to Serials Holdings is about halfway built, and we expect that it will be completed by late August of this year.

Potential Projects

We are currently considering the possibility of making the NASIG Proceedings available online along with the conference handouts, using a single search-and-retrieval interface to integrate access to both classes of documents.

The Publications Committee will likely have a role in the creation and publication of a NASIG history, a project which is currently in the early stages of conceptualization and planning.

Decisions or Activities of Note: In 2003, our most exciting accomplishment was the implementation of online conference handout distribution, replacing an expensive and inefficient service with a free (to NASIG members), customizable, and efficient one.

Statistics: N/A

Committee Members:
Bob Boissy
Morag Boyd
Lillian DeBlois
Dalene Hawthorne
Betty Landesman
Anne Mitchell
Donna Packer
Peter Picerno
Michelle Seikel
Marit Taylor
Susan Wishnetsky

NASIG PUBLICIST ANNUAL REPORT
Eleanor Cook, NASIG Publicist 2003/2004

The NASIG Publicist duties are assigned to the Past President. Responsibilities include sending out English, French, and Spanish brochures to members as requested and posting official press releases to a set of predetermined electronic lists.

Distribution of brochures for July 2003-June 2004

30 English brochures to a member in Pennsylvania (CEC event)
50 English and 10 Spanish brochures to a member in Texas (CEC event)
50 English brochures to a library science professor in North Carolina
20 English brochures to a member in Hawaii (CEC event)
60 English and 25 French brochures to a member in Nova Scotia, Canada
30 English brochures to a member in Pennsylvania
25 English brochures to a member in Nebraska (CEC event)
100 English brochures to members in North Carolina (CEC sponsored event)
80 English, 80 Spanish, and 40 French brochures to a member in Washington (CEC event in the Caribbean)
25 English brochures to a former member in Kentucky
50 Spanish and 10 English brochures to a member in North Carolina (CEC-sponsored event in Mexico)

All requests for mailed brochures were sent through regular, first-class U.S. mail (with one exception that was sent UPS). Two requests were direct delivery and did not need mail. All mailing expenses were picked up by the publicist’s institution.

Electronic list message distribution

The publicist subscribes to 16 electronic lists. Four professional liaisons also are copied. The Mexican list is copied through a NASIG member who subscribes, due to difficulty getting on and off this list. This year, the
publicist used a private e-mail address through a local ISP for the purpose of sending out NASIG-related press releases. This was to keep the list digests separate from her main burgeoning e-mail account. Between July 2003 and June 2004, the publicist sent out 17 postings. The purpose of these postings was to alert non-members of happenings and information concerning NASIG. Typical topics include calls for conference ideas and proposals, award program announcements, conference information, and announcement of election results.

Other activities

The publicist investigated the possibility of having a generic publicist’s e-mail account through NASIGNet. This was set up by Merle Steeves, Co-Chair of the Electronic Communications Committee, in March 2004. It was tested once using the announcement of the opening of conference registration. In order for this arrangement to work in the future, each listowner will need to be contacted and informed of this new address, since some lists may perceive this address as spam. Eleanor Cook will work with ECC in July 2004 to make sure this transition occurs smoothly. Using this address will eliminate the need for the new publicist to resubscribe to all the lists each year and will place the maintenance of the lists with an ECC member. This arrangement will be fully operational for Anne McKee next year and for other future publicists.

Another activity this year was to canvass the listowners of the electronic lists, asking for their input concerning NASIG postings.

Though setting up the lists initially was time consuming and monitoring the additional e-mail account was some work, I do not want to leave my colleagues with the impression that I did not enjoy this responsibility. It was a pleasure and an honor to serve in this capacity, and I will miss representing NASIG in this fashion. I will not, however, miss all the extra spam, viruses, and such to which my home computer was subjected! Having the lists monitored through NASIGNet in the future should assist with this.

NASIG AWARDS

REPORT FROM THE 2004 AWARD WINNERS
Rachel L. Frick, Awards & Recognition Committee

For the 2004 NASIG awards, grants, and scholarship, the Awards & Recognition Committee received scores of applications from worthy candidates. This was the first year that the review process was blind for all awards. The identity of the winners was not revealed to the committee members until the scores were tallied and the winners selected, according to established criteria. For 2004, the committee awarded one Fritz Schwartz Serials Education Scholarship, Horizon Award, and Marcia Tuttle Award, and four Student Grants, including the Mexico Student Grant. The awards, excluding the Marcia Tuttle Award, covered the cost of travel; room; board; registration for the 19th NASIG Conference held June 17-20, 2004, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and a one-year NASIG membership. In addition, the Fritz Schwartz Scholarship winner received $2,500 to help defray library school tuition. The 2004 Marcia Tuttle Award was a $2,000 grant towards an international serials collaborative research effort and a one-year free NASIG membership. The 2004 award winners are as follows:

NASIG Conference Student Grant Award:
Christopher Brady, University of Maryland
Eve Mitt, North Carolina Central University
Andrea Wirth, University of North Texas

Fritz Schwartz Serials Education Scholarship:
Sandra Lorraine Wiles, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Graduate School of Library and Information Science

The 2004 Horizon Award
Rocki Strader, Ohio State University Libraries of Ohio State, Columbus

The 2004 Mexico Grant
Ruth Zamora Piña, Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, Colegio de Bibliotecologia

2004 Marcia Tuttle International Grant
Regina Romano Reynolds, Head of the National Serials Data Program, Library of Congress

One of the requirements of the student grants, including the Fritz Schwartz Scholarship and the Horizon awards, is to provide feedback about the conference experience. Below are their responses to the Awards & Recognition Committee’s questionnaire:

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

• In library school, students often wonder what the “real world” is like for librarians and whether the materials covered in our classes truly reflect what we will be doing. I found the issues covered and concerns expressed at NASIG were quite similar to...
those covered in much of my MLS degree work. It was a confirmation that I had been preparing for a real job in my MLS studies. This conference was my first “professional” experience, as I had just completed my MLS the month before. I found it very beneficial to have this as my first experience of being included in the profession. Many, many NASIG members congratulated me during the conference and welcomed me to the profession. Though I would be unable to thank them individually, I am grateful to all of these well-wishers for the encouragement and welcome they extended to all of us.

• I think the NASIG conference is particularly beneficial for students who also work at a library because the topics covered are very practical, and a library staff member can benefit from the knowledge gained and apply it immediately. For students who do not or have not worked in a library setting, the conference provides a very different educational experience than library school. The conference, in my opinion, definitely complements coursework in reference, collection development, cataloging, and other classes that cover components of serials work.

• Attending a NASIG conference is a good way to exchange information with others working in the serials field as well as to learn new skills. The knowledge that one gains from college is very general—not very specific and detailed in regards to working with serials. The conference takes you in the “serial world.” You have a chance to communicate with all the professionals in this area and to get updated about trends, issues, and developments. You see different sides of the serials world through different people’s experiences, knowledge, ideas, and successes. You can participate in discussions that delve deeply in this field and update your knowledge while getting experience that is useful in the workplace. This is a good opportunity to make contacts and set the plans for future.

• It is worthwhile, because the NASIG conference gives to the students a new vision on the magazines and the libraries.

• It’s an opportunity to meet other people who are in the same boat! The NASIG conference is a gathering of folks who are doing the same tasks and dealing with the same issues and problems. New serialists (like me) learn that they are not alone and that they don’t need to reinvent the wheel—they need to talk to experienced serialists, to know that they are also asking some of the same questions, and to learn and contribute to solutions. NASIG conferences provide exactly that sort of forum for discussion and learning.

• Students benefit from an introduction to the wide range of professional opportunities represented by conference attendees. I was amazed at the variety of careers available to serials specialists. As well, the sharing of information, strategies and experiences between NASIG attendees was invaluable. The enthusiasm each person showed for his or her own work and for the future of the whole field was infectious. Coming in contact with so many fun and focused individuals promotes a wonderful feeling of “social capital.” This connectedness not only creates the family-like atmosphere of the NASIG conference itself, but it also benefits the health and well-being of the whole serials field and the entire library profession.

How did attending the conference benefit you personally?

• For years, I had heard of NASIG, having worked for several years as a paraprofessional at a university library serials department. NASIG has always been highly regarded by all I have heard comment on it. I thought that one day I might attend NASIG, but had no firm plans to do so. Had I not received the award, I would most likely have attended ALA in Orlando. After attending NASIG, I am very glad I attended NASIG as my first professional conference rather than ALA. The time for ALA will come, but at this point, I was much happier attending a conference like NASIG where the emphasis is on learning and professional development rather than vendor relations and board meetings.

• An immediate benefit I gained from the conference was hearing new ideas to apply to my job as a staff member at the UNLV Libraries. I came away from the conference with new ideas for my current job. For example, some of these ideas were improved usage statistics compilation and alternative ways to involve faculty in serials review processes. The discussions of the newest technologies were helpful, too. This area has not been covered in my library school program in detail but is highly relevant to my current library work. I feel like the NASIG conference has given me the advantage of knowing what some of the most up-to-date technological issues and products are in the library world. I also have a better understanding of the technology that my library is either implementing or considering implementing such as link resolvers and ERM products. Lastly, I enjoyed the programs that were on topics completely new to me. I highly recommend that other students attend a program or visit a poster on a subject with which they are completely unfamiliar.

• Attending the conference helped me to more deeply understand serials issues and different aspects of serials world. The conference gave me a lot of ideas and showed me different solutions for different problems and issues. It updated me on new trends. When I attended the conference I felt like I was not alone; there are so many professionals out there who
are open to help and share their knowledge and experience in this field. I benefited from talking about problems and issues and sharing my opinion and knowledge. Having such a positive experience at this conference has me looking forward to the next conference and the opportunity to meet all those nice people and talk about working with serials. Attending the conference has helped me to keep updated and caused me to continue to look for more information from online and print sources about this field.

- Gave me an ample panorama to see options to apply them in the libraries of Mexico.
- I got to meet a lot of people. I got to put faces to names and voices and e-mails…I attended sessions where I learned more about issues that I’d read or heard about.
- As I noted in the first question, I learned that I am not alone! My understanding of the current issues in serials work was expanded tenfold within the first 20 minutes of the first session (and continued to grow throughout the conference)! I was also delighted to see that the camaraderie and cooperation that I value so highly in my degree program is also the backbone of the NASIG membership. Since the conference, I have been able to share what I learned with my workmates and my classmates, and I am also planning an independent study program that ties directly to the sessions I attended.

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

- I have always been attracted to serials and technical work in libraries and do seek to include that in my work when I can. But I am attracted to several areas of librarianship. Presently, I am working at a digital library working on cataloging issues. While serials management presents issues that digital libraries are also dealing with (such as handling electronic media for long-term access and archiving), serials themselves are not currently central in my job. Perhaps they will be again in the future. It was a confirming experience for me and what I will be doing as a librarian. I am unsure if other types of conferences would have been a confirming experience.
- The conference reinforced my career plans. I think serials work is tremendously important in both collection development and reference and these are the areas that I am most interested in working. Many topics presented at NASIG were geared towards acquisitions and cataloging librarians and staff. However, I could easily relate to the topics that were discussed and found it helpful to see some of the issues I am aware of presented from different viewpoints. Also, I realized how fluid serials librarianship can be and how similar positions and responsibilities can be organized differently in different libraries. I benefited from meeting people with varied serials backgrounds, and this will influence how I proceed with my job search.
- I am already working with serials like a paraprofessional. The conference helps me understand what I really like to do like a professional. I would definitely like to stay in the field and work as a professional serial cataloger.
- Yes, to promote my creativity to make new projects in the Mexican libraries contributing ideas for its benefit.
- I do not have a specific career plan yet, but I do know that any job I may take would surely benefit from the scope of NASIG’s conference coverage. I cannot think of any library or information science position that is not directly connected to the resources and technologies discussed in Milwaukee. The name says it all: North American Serials INTEREST Group. You’ve certainly won my interest for life.

**Additional perspective from the Horizon award winner: Did attending the conference change your views and expectations of what it means to be a serialist?**

- It did not really change my views and expectations; rather, it confirmed them. I went in expecting a fair amount of dialogue between librarians and vendors, and I witnessed that. I’m primarily involved with electronic resources, and the discussions and presentations about them, as well as serials and scholarly communication in general, were about what I expected.

**What suggestions do you have for the 2005 NASIG Conference Award Program?**

- First, if there is any way possible, please do increase the participation. All three of us thoroughly benefited from the experience. I know that listservs through MLS programs were used as a primary method in publicizing the award. I learned about the award in this manner. However, that does depend upon the participation of the individual MLS programs, which cannot be controlled by NASIG. The other two winners this year were informed of the award through work situations. One difficulty I detect among fellow MLS students and librarians is a fear of serials. Thus, it is hard to get those who have no prior experience with serials to become interested in NASIG. The organization has a stellar reputation in the field, but at the MLS student level it is relatively unknown (at least at my program), while special libraries, archives, and school media were much more popular. There may need to be an educational effort directed at the MLS program level to remedy this.
• One improvement I can think of for the program is to make sure mentors are assigned to all the student award winners. Also, it might be helpful for the Mexican Student Grant winner if the selected mentor spoke Spanish (unless the student is fluent in English, of course). That is just a suggestion based on my observations from this conference and is not based on anything that this year’s Mexican Student Grant winner communicated to me. Also, having excursions for both free evenings would have been helpful. I really enjoyed having events to select from on Friday evening and was unsure why the same type of thing was not arranged for Saturday evening—there was definitely plenty to do around town. Maybe there could be a newcomers’ night out (where everyone is invited). Also, I liked what someone mentioned at the town hall meeting—having a late night area in the hotel where people could relax, play cards, whatever. In addition, if the student grant winners’ membership to NASIG started before the conference, they could sign up for the NASIG listserv and get the updates that other conference attendees get.

• This is a great program, and I would encourage every student to apply to get an opportunity to participate, because I think it will benefit students a lot to start their career or at least be more interested in this area. I would suggest having a meeting or lunch or little event, where all the award winners and NASIG Board members participate. Then students will get a chance to know more about Board members and Board members more about their student winners, to whom they gave a great opportunity to participate in the conference.

• For the Horizon Award, I can offer no suggestions at this time, other than changing the mentor assignment (see #3) [Ed. note: refers to suggestion to assign a Spanish-speaking mentor to the winner of the Mexican Student Grant Award.] I found the application process to be thorough, and I enjoyed writing the essay.

• I cannot think of a thing to change. The people on the awards committee were fantastic—such warm, pleasant people. Using them again will give future recipients a wonderful reception, equal to my own.

Comments and suggestions
• Again, a wonderful conference and a wonderful gift you gave me. I cannot make any promises about Minneapolis, but I have been talking up NASIG at the digital library where I am working. If I am able to attend next year, I look forward to packing my Birkenstocks.

• The travel arrangements were wonderful. Susan Davis did an excellent job of getting me onto good flights (i.e. good departure/arrival times) and was very willing to adapt when my plans changed after I decided to attend a preconference. I hope to be a NASIG regular and will not forget my first NASIG conference. I will definitely spread the word about NASIG in general, and the Student Grant in particular, to my library school and home library.

• I am very grateful for this opportunity. It was my first conference I have ever attended and I really enjoyed it a lot. I did meet a nice group of people, who are so friendly and freely share their thoughts, knowledge, and experiences. I had some difficulties in choosing between the sessions, to get out as much as possible from this conference. But I tried my best. I did like the hotel environment and that all the sessions were set up close to each other. By having the sessions in close proximity it is possible for people to change the sessions, if they find out that the session wasn’t exactly what they were looking for.

• It is very important for me, that the information that I receive in these conferences was developed according to which lives at the moment, without forgetting that it has been presented by professionals of the area, which causes, in my opinion, it to be reliable and of quality. My attendance in this event has been pleasing and unforgettable.

• This community certainly likes to talk about ALL the issues involved with serials and related materials, scholarly communication, etc. There were no real surprises. I was very comfortable with the range of topics and the general easygoing and informal atmosphere. If anything, attending the conference has made me realize that this is a group I really want to hang out with for a while!

• The Town Hall Meeting was an excellent, casual introduction to the philosophies of the membership and the collective goals and aspirations of NASIG. Of the suggestions tabled there, I thought the idea of a “drop-in” room, where attendees could meet, talk and socialize at anytime throughout the conference, was a clever one. Thank you so much for your support, your hospitality, your generosity, and your friendship. I’m planning on attending in 2005, and I’m bringing friends!

ERRATA

The NASIG Newsletter Editor regrets the omission of Maggie Rioux, profiles editor, from the list of Editorial Board members in the Newsletter Annual Report from the June 2004 issue. This oversight has been corrected in the HTML version of the report.
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Susan Davis
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Fang H. Gao
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Ladyjane Hickey
Wendy Highby
Christee King
Bob Persing
Alison Roth
Virginia Rumph
Adolfo Tarango, Chair
Carol MacAdam, Board Liaison
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Robert Alan, Co-Chair
Linda Blake
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Tim Hagan
Lei Jin
Kay Johnson
Sheila Moran
Rocki Strader
Sarah Tusa
Keiko Okuhara
Nathan Rupp, Co-Chair
Elizabeth Urbanik
John Wiggins
David Winchester
Paoshan Yue
Judy Luther, Board Liaison

CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE (CPC)
Cecelia Boone
Cecilia Genereux
Fariha Grieme
Anna Hood
Linda Hulbert, Co-Chair
Betsy Polakowski
Dani Roach
Miki Scholl
Jenni Wilson
Jill Yaples
Susan Rom Zuriff, Co-Chair
Steve Savage, Board Liaison

DATABASE & DIRECTORY COMMITTEE (D&D)
Pamela Arroues
Jana Brubaker
Daisy Cheng
Rene Erlandson, Chair
Smita Joshipura
Jo McClamroch
Myrtle Myers
Sandhya Srivastava
Jill Emery, Board Liaison

EVALUATION & ASSESSMENT (E&A)
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Marla Baden
Joe Badics
Carole Bell
Sandy Folsom
Ann Ercelawn
Leanne Hillery
Lanell Rabner
Tina Shrader, Chair
Veronica Walker
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Stephanie Schmitt, Board Liaison

ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS (ECC)
David Burke, Co-Chair
Kitti Canepi, Co-Chair
Robert Congleton
Anna Creech
Jennifer Duncan
Terese Jerose
Marina Oliver
Ruth Richardson Scales
Laura Sheble  
Sheila Tawney  
William Walsh  
Margaret Willingham  
Kevin Randall, Board Liaison  

**FINANCE COMMITTEE**  
Joe Becker  
David Bynog  
Nancy Cunningham  
Felicity Dykas  
Patti Thorne  
Mary Ann Urka  
Xiaoyin Zhang  
Denise Novak, Chair and Board Liaison  

**NOMINATIONS & ELECTIONS COMMITTEE**  
(N&E)  
Ladd Brown  
Karen Jander  
Catherine Nelson  
Philenese Slaughter  
Martha Spring  
Christine Stamison  
Kathryn Wesley, Chair  
Peter Whiting  
Susan Williams  
Anne McKee, Board Liaison  

**NASIG NEWSLETTER**  
Susan Andrews  
Beth Bernhardt  
Pam Cipkowski  
Sharon Heminger  
Mykie Howard  
Kathy Kobylyanec  
James Michael  
Maggie Rioux  
Char Simser, Editor-in-Chief  
Joyce Tenney, Board Liaison  

**PROCEEDINGS EDITORS**  
(for 2004 Conference Proceedings)  
Pat French  
Meg Mering  
Kevin Randall, Board Liaison  

**PROFESSIONAL LIAISONS**  
Heidi Arnold, American Theological Library Association (ATLA)  
Buzzy Basch, American Society for Information Science & Technology (ASIST)  
Keith Courtney, United Kingdom Serials Interest Group (UKSG)  
Connie Foster, American Library Association, Serials Section (ALCTS-SS)  

Julia Gammon, Association of American University Presses (AAUP)  
Trina Grover, Canadian Library Association (CLA)  
October Ivins, Society for Scholarly Publishing (SSP)  
Jenni Jeremy, Australian Serials Special Interest Group (ASSIG)  
Hien Nguyen, Library of Congress, CONSER  
Frank Richardson, American Association of Law Libraries (AALL)  
Hartmut Walravens, German Serials Interest Group (GeSIG)  
Veronica Walker, Special Libraries Association (SLA)  
Judy Wilkerson, Medical Library Association (MLA)  
Stephanie Schmitt, Board Liaison  

**PROGRAM PLANNING COMMITTEE (PPC)**  
Norene Allen  
Michael Arthur  
Marilyn Geller, Co-Chair  
Sarah George  
Tonia Graves  
Joe Harmon  
Kittie Henderson  
Lee Kreiger  
Pat Loghry  
Emily McElroy, Co-Chair  
Paul Moeller  
Bonnie Parks  
Erika Ripley  
Rose Robischon  
Allison Sleeman  
Virginia Taffurelli  
Dana Walker  
Mary Page, Board Liaison  

**PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE**  
Bob Boissy  
Morag Boyd  
Peter Picerno  
Dalene Hawthorne  
Betty Landesman  
Marit Taylor  
Elna Saxton  
Paula Webb  
Lillian DeBlois  
Donna Packer  
Anne Mitchell, Co-Chair  
Rick Anderson, Co-Chair  
Michelle Seikel  
Jill Emery, Board Liaison  

**SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE**  
Mary Page  
Judy Luther  
Joyce Tenney  
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Several new groups have been added to NASIG’s working structure this year. Most are intended to handle short-term projects, though two may become standing committees if this year’s experiments with them work out well. Four of these groups that have already been appointed—or are in the process of being appointed now—are listed below. In addition to these, at least two other task forces will be created very soon. The Online Survey and Evaluation Task Force will look at online options for ad hoc polling of the membership, improving the process of the annual conference evaluations, etc. The Proceedings Task Force will look at options for our Conference Proceedings when the current contract with Haworth Press ends.

**ANNIVERSARY TASK FORCE**

**MEMBERS:**
- Gale Julian
- Beverley Geer
- Deberah England
- June Garner
- Marty Gordon
- Alice J. Rhoades
- Anne McKee, Board Liaison

**CHARGE:**
- Compile a recommended plan for celebrating NASIG’s twentieth anniversary conference before, during, and/or after the conference in Minneapolis in May 2005. Items in the plan may include activities; presentations; written, media, or other visual materials; an online exhibit; or any other type or variety of scenarios.
- Implement any recommendations adopted by the Board that are not assigned to other committees or task forces.
- Work as needed with other committees or task forces charged with any twentieth anniversary celebration tasks (whether they were initiated by the Anniversary Task Force or any other source), including the History Task Force, Conference Planning Committee, and Program Planning Committee.

**REQUIREMENTS OF TASK FORCE MEMBERS:**
- Ability to work well collaboratively within a geographically dispersed project.
- Sufficient time to complete the charge successfully by the deadline.
- Convenient access to e-mail, fax and phone.

**DEADLINE FOR REPORT:**
- Plan to be submitted to the Executive Board by the fall Board meeting. This meeting is not yet scheduled but most likely will place in late Oct. or early Nov. of 2004.
- Deadlines for projects to be implemented by the Anniversary Task Force will be determined by the specific projects.

**HISTORY TASK FORCE**

**MEMBERS:**
Not yet appointed.

**CHARGE:**
The NASIG History Task Force is charged with researching and producing a history of NASIG during its first two decades. This history will include concise narratives about the organization, an overview of the serials world during the same years, and the impact it and NASIG have had on each other. The history will primarily consist, however, of lists compiled from various sources, such as lists of major events and accomplishments from each year; rosters of various groups such as the Board, committees, task forces, and award recipients; chronologies; etc.

**PURPOSE OF THE DOCUMENT:**
The document is being planned as a key part of NASIG’s twentieth anniversary celebration during the 2005 conference in Minneapolis.

**PUBLICATION OF THE DOCUMENT:**
The final product of the task force will be published in NASIGWeb and may also be published as a special issue of the *NASIG Newsletter*. The task force will be the document’s author, with the names of the task force members and Board liaison included with the task force name in the chief source of information.

The manuscript will be written in English and ideally will also be translated to Spanish and French. Inclusion of Spanish and/or French versions will depend upon language skills included among the task force volunteers.

**RESOURCES:**
- Various documents available in NASIGWeb, including all *NASIG Newsletters* (1986-) and most *Conference Proceedings* (1992-).
- Most materials in the NASIG archives.
- NASIG members willing to be interviewed, etc.
- Any information available through other sources.
**REQUIREMENTS OF TASK FORCE MEMBERS:**

- Ability to conduct organized research successfully.
- Ability to write well in English.
- Ability to work well collaboratively within a geographically dispersed project.
- Sufficient time to complete the charge successfully by the deadline, including time for review of the penultimate version by the Board and completion of any subsequent edits.
- Convenient access to e-mail, fax and phone.
- Proximity to the NASIG archives at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is not required but would be advantageous (all requests for materials in the NASIG archives will be facilitated by the NASIG archivist).
- Members responsible for translation to Spanish or French may not need the research or English writing skills listed above on scales comparable to those of the other members but will need to meet the other requirements listed above, as well as have a good knowledge of written English and strong writing and translating skills for the language to which they will translate the original English manuscript.

**DEADLINE:**
Final version to be completed by April 1, 2005.

**ONLINE REGISTRATION TEAM**

**MEMBERS:**
- Anna Creech, ECC
- Marina Oliver, ECC
- Stephanie Schmitt, Consultant
- David Bynog, Finance Committee
- Bonnie Parks, PCC
- Fariha Griemes, CPC
- Denise Novak, Board Liaison

**CHARGE:**
The Online Registration Team is charged with implementing the enhancements for NASIG’s online conference registration system which were recommended and adopted at the June 2004 Board meeting. These enhancements are:

1. Study the current Linkpoint services and workflow to maximize use of the company’s services.
2. Improve communications functions within the system, including confirmation forms sent to registrants.
3. Convert the membership database to ASP files to support added registration functions, such as automatic membership verification/validation check.
4. Create an automatic, dynamic membership verification/validation check function within the system.
5. Create online functions allowing new members to join and continuing members to renew their memberships, including online payment functions using Linkpoint, and live, dynamic membership verification/validation for conference registration purposes.

**DEADLINE:**
Enhancements to be implemented, tested, and ready for real-life use by the date conference registration opens: March 1, 2005.

**STRATEGIC SUPPORT TASK FORCE**

**MEMBERS:**
- Katy Ginanni, Chair
- Clint Chamberlain
- Bob Schatz
- Lu Rossignol
- Steve Shadle
- Steve Savage, Board Liaison

**CHARGE:**
The task force is charged with assisting the Executive Board in its management of NASIG by presenting to the Board reports of conclusions and recommendations for any topics assigned by the Board. These conclusions and recommendations should be based on research (including hard data whenever possible), analysis, interpretation, and discussion. The task force may also recommend to the Board new topics for the task force or any other NASIG committee, task force, etc.

**REPORTS TO THE BOARD:**
Each report should be as succinct as possible given its topic and the Board’s needs. They need not be polished, written products as long as the meaning and intention of all content is clear. For example, narrative prose is neither necessary, nor preferred, when bullet points, diagrams, charts, etc. will suffice. In addition to conclusions and recommendations, reports may also include, as needed, descriptions of resources and processes used, outlines of analyses, supporting documentation, etc. In cases for which the task force does not reach consensus for its conclusions and/or recommendations, reports may include “minority opinions” if clearly designated as such and desired by either the task force or the Board.
DEADLINES:
The task force will be given a separate deadline for each topic assigned. Whenever possible, the Board will set deadlines in consultation with the task force chair, will avoid giving deadlines close together, and will be as flexible as circumstances allow with modifying deadlines if needed for its own purposes or those of the task force.

EXPERIMENTAL NATURE OF THE TASK FORCE:
This task force will experiment with a new concept within NASIG, namely providing research and intellectual support to the Board in a systematic and ongoing manner. The experimental aspect of this endeavor requires, among other aspects:

- Closely monitoring and managing the amount of time needed for the group’s work (both cumulatively and for individual assignments)
- Assessing the usefulness and appropriateness of the task force’s role within NASIG, especially in supporting the Board’s work.
- Maintaining a good working relationship among:
  - members of the task force,
  - its chair and Board liaison,
  - the task force and the Board,
  - the task force and all other NASIG committees, task forces, etc.
  - the task force and NASIG as a whole.

OTHER SERIALS NEWS

NASIG SENDS MEMBERS TO THE MEXICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE
Reported by Allan Scherlen and Julia Gammon

Courtesy of the Continuing Education Committee of NASIG, with guidance from the committee’s hardworking Mexico/PR Outreach Team of Wen-ying Lu and John Wiggins, Julia Gammon and I attended the 35th meeting of the Mexican Library Association (La Asociación Mexicana de Bibliotecarios, A. C. (AMBAC)). The meeting was held in Cancún, Mexico, May 11-14, 2004.

Julia presented on the OhioLINK Consortia, and her topic was translated as, “Administración de colecciones en consorcios: OhioLINK.” My talk, which was translated as, “En Busca del Acceso Gratis y Facil: Una evaluación del movimiento por el acceso abierto desde el punto de vista de un bibliotecario,” addressed issues related to the Open Access movement. We both presented our talks in English with Spanish PowerPoint slides and were assisted by simultaneous translators. Joe Hinger (St. John’s University) and Carlos Munroy (Texas A & M), both active NASIG members, assisted us in many ways, including translations in formal and informal settings.

While we had been expecting only to speak at one session each, upon our arrival, we found we were each also scheduled for an informal session called, “Preguntale al experto,” or “Ask the Expert.” Both the formal and informal sessions we conducted allowed us the opportunity to interact with many individuals and share ideas on many library issues.

In summary, let us just say that the librarians of Mexico compete with NASIG in making sure their attendees are happy. Besides providing us with excellent accommodations at the Hilton Beach Resort, the conference organizers were kind and attentive to our technical needs and ready to assist us in any way. While there were many similarities to a NASIG conference, there were also some differences, which made it more interesting. The opportunity to see former NASIG student grant winners from Mexico was an added bonus. The conference had no shortage of evening entertainment either, which included a performance by a world renowned Ballet Folklorico group and a boat cruise to a tropical island, where we were given an elegant meal followed by a Cuban style stage show. Of course, the conference was replete with interesting library presentations, networking opportunities, and, of course, vendor booths.

Both of us were honored to have our program proposals accepted by AMBAC and to have the support of both NASIG and AMBAC so we could attend this meeting and promote NASIG. The co-chairs of the Continuing Education Committee worked long and hard, with the assistance of Lisa Furubotten, to make this all happen.

We both appreciate the professional opportunity this provided. We enjoyed meeting our librarian colleagues in Mexico, making friends and establishing ties for future collaboration and cooperation. Next year, the conference will be held on the Pacific coast in Ixtapa, and the deadline for submitting proposals, by the way, is November 15, if you are interested in attending. Besides your PowerPoint slides, remember to bring your swimwear and a camera!
WHO COULD ASK FOR MORE?
BEAUTIFUL SITE, COOL TRAINERS, AND PLEASANT TRAINEES:
Reported by Keiko Okuhara and Robert L. Bothmann

The Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program’s (SCCTP) Advanced Serials Cataloging Workshop was offered on April 15-16, 2004, at the University of Hawaii at Manoa Campus, Hawaii. Two distinguished trainers—Jean Hirons, the former CONSER Coordinator, and Patricia French, Head of Serials Department, Shields Library, University of California, Davis—as well as enthusiastic trainees surrounded by Aloha spirits, made this a special workshop. Out of 17 attendees, we had 5 registrants from the mainland who came to Hawaii just for the workshop.

The day began with presenting lei to our instructors according to Hawaiian custom and tradition as a token of our appreciation to them. Hirons began the workshop with discussion on “what is a serial.” After taking a break, French talked about sources and titles, numbering, and publishing statements. Since the full issues about numbering and publishing statements were not covered in the morning, discussion continued into the afternoon session. As the day progressed, trainees participated more in discussions and raised some nitty-gritty questions. No matter how tricky the questions, the trainers always had cogent answers to help us calm down. You can imagine how knotty it was when we got to the major and minor changes. Thanks to the well-organized schedule, the major and minor riddles were covered by the beginning of the second day. Our brains were still fresh, and there was a lot of reciprocating interaction between instructors and trainees. After each session, we did exercises to deepen our understanding. After the full two-day workshop with ten sessions, Hirons reported on the CONSER Summit on Serials in the Digital Environment, which was held March 18-19, 2004, discussing the highlights of the summit, the recommendations from participants, and possible implications for the future.

We are really grateful and fortunate to have had this workshop in Hawaii. Special thanks goes to Jean Hirons and Pat French for their great spirits, wonderful instruction, and sincere concern by conducting the needs assessment in advance to make this workshop more useful and concise and to keep us moving right along. Also, we are very thankful to OCLC Western and the NASIG Continuing Education Committee for their generous financial support to allow us to hold this workshop on this isolated island, as well as thanks to the Continuing Education Committee co-chairs, Bob Alan and Meg Mering, for their kind encouragement despite two chances of canceling the workshop due to early lack of registrations and a possible strike at the Manoa Campus. The key for the success of holding this workshop was being patient and persistent and working with cooperative colleagues with a strong commitment. These positive factors came together, and all efforts fell into place well. All of us learned a great deal, and each participant was able to bring their new knowledge back to their own institution or department to share and foster enhanced serials cataloging practices. Last but not least, we wish Jean a happy and fulfilling retirement life!! Aloha!

ELECTRONIC INFORMATION RESOURCES IN THE CARIBBEAN:
TRENDS AND ISSUES
Reported by Steve Shadle

[Report of the XXXIV Annual Association of Caribbean University, Research and Institutional Libraries.]

As someone who knows very, very little about the Caribbean region, I was surprised to be invited to speak at this year’s ACURIL conference, which was held May 23-29 in Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago. With assistance from Lisa Furubotton, Wen-Ying Lu, and John Wiggins, I was provided with partial support from NASIG’s Continuing Education Committee. In addition, the American Library Association provided partial support through the Bogle-Pratt Award, an annual award given by the International Relations Committee to support an ALA member’s first-time attendance at an international conference. Shamim Renwick (2003-2004 ACURIL President) and I would like to extend our most sincere appreciation to these two organizations in providing support for my attendance at this meeting. What follows is a non-Caribbean, non-Latin American specialist’s first impressions and naïve comments on my experience of the last week.

The two conferences that I attend regularly are those of ALA and NASIG, and this meeting had some similarities to the annual NASIG conferences. ACURIL has been in existence for 35 years, and just as with NASIG, the close friendships and professional relationships that have developed over this time were in obvious evidence as I attended meetings and social events. The program is also structured in a manner similar to NASIG, with plenary and panel discussions focused on big-picture issues and
workshops; and concurrent sessions, poster sessions, and special interest group presentations focused on specific issues, projects, etc. In size, ACURIL is smaller than NASIG, with approximately 400 attendees at the conference, and longer (five days vs. three).

As an ACURIL novice, I had some unique first experiences:

- **A multilingual meeting with simultaneous interpretation.** The official languages of ACURIL are English, French, and Spanish. The ACURIL organizers are very good about making simultaneous translation available for all meetings of the whole and for any sessions they think will draw a large audience (including mine: I have no idea how the interpreters did with terms like integrating resource, updating website, monographic series, or the MARC 516 field). I quickly learned to pick up a portable receiver every morning—not just for the presentations (which were predominantly in English), but for audience comments and questions. Initially, hearing two different languages simultaneously (one in each ear) was very distracting, but as the week went on, I became accustomed to it. I would have liked to have had an additional translator to help me understand West Indies English, as there were times (especially during informal conversations) when I had difficulty understanding my English-language colleagues.

- **The Casual American.** As an organization, ACURIL members have developed close personal and professional working relationships, but the workings of the organization are quite formal. Both opening and closing ceremonies are very formal affairs with many speakers conveying their messages of greetings and good wishes from a particular organization or community. Most sessions had a moderator and a reporter. One of the purposes of the moderator was not only to introduce the speaker, but also to provide a summary of the speaker’s presentation and to encourage questions and comments from the audience. In addition, most sessions were formal presentations of published papers, rather than the more informal presentations I’ve experienced at NASIG and ALA.

- **The Caribbean Experience.** This was my first time in the Caribbean and my first real exposure to Caribbean culture. Even though the Caribbean region shares a colonial heritage, the cultures of each country (and really each island) are very different and distinct. Some are independent nations, some are not. Some are more politically stable than others. There are vast differences in the economies of the region and in where libraries fit in the funding priorities of individual countries. However, one of the common themes running through much of the conference was the need for more collaboration between countries and institutions. To illustrate the benefit of multilingualism, one audience member told the following story:

  One day, Mama Mouse and Baby Mouse were in the house. Cat came into the house and saw them. Now Cat wants Baby Mouse, so he started walking toward them. Mama Mouse walked up to Cat and said *Woof!* *Woof!*
  Cat got scared and walked away. Baby Mouse asked, “*Why you say ’Woof! Woof!’ to Cat?”* Mama Mouse replied, “It’s always useful to know a second language.”

In terms of cooperative digital efforts, the Publication of Archival Library & Museum Materials (PALMM) cooperative (http://susdl.fcla.edu/) was presented as one model for a future Digital Library of the Caribbean. In addition, a number of other digital projects with a regional focus were presented, and in every one of those presentations there was serious discussion about the contributions of other countries to these efforts, the barriers to these contributions, and the needs of potential project partners. The general themes expressed in these discussions included the lack of information technology (IT) infrastructure in most of the Caribbean and the sustainability of such projects.

The lack of library institutional involvement in the planning and development of national-level information and communication technology (ICT) efforts appeared to be a common experience among ACURIL members. Dr. Gillian Marcelle spoke persuasively about the lack of leadership within the Caribbean and talked of not waiting to be “invited to the party,” but instead, library leaders needed to “storm the gates” and make it clear to national policy makers what the library profession can bring to the table. One of her suggestions that immediately caught on among the audience was developing e-commerce and e-tourism projects in association with the Cricket World Cup in 2007 to be held in the West Indies (I hadn’t realized the passion that West Indians had for cricket: It obviously is more than just a sport!) It’s this kind of innovative thinking regarding Caribbean intellectual property that Dr. Marcelle suggests library leadership needs to develop in order to cross the digital divide.

My presentation, “New Rules for Cataloging Internet Resources: The 2002 AACR2 and MARC21 Revisions and How They Have Affected Electronic Resource
Cataloging,” was well-received, with approximately 70 people in attendance. Like many library conferences, there are typically few cataloging presentations, and since there are many small libraries with only one or two certified librarians, I believe that cataloging duties are generally more a part of librarian’s duties in the Caribbean than they are in the United States, where there is a designated cataloging staff in all but the smallest of libraries. In consultation with Dr. Luisa Vigo-Cepeda, I also presented a lunchtime session on the new AACR2 major/minor change rules. She felt this would be good preparation for a Caribbean response to the upcoming IFLA discussion on ISBDs. This presentation was also well-received, with one attendee telling me she felt like “she was back in her cataloging class” (I’m not sure if this was a good thing or a bad thing).

Besides the previously mentioned presentations and discussion, other personal highlights included:

- Professor Derek Law’s (University of Strathclyde) keynote address where he discussed the changing digital environment we all find ourselves in (including a new class of user he called the “satisfied inept”).

- The meeting of the Academic Libraries Special Interest Group where there was a presentation titled, “Book Jacket Imagery as a Cultural Resource: A

INTERNATIONAL AND FOREIGN PUBLISHERS AND VENDORS:
THE GOOD, THE BAD, AND THE UGLY
Reported by Michele Pope

[Presented at the 97th Annual Meeting & Conference of the
American Association of Law Libraries, July 10-14, Boston, Massachusetts]

Coordinator and moderator Carmen Brigandi, Acquisitions Librarian at California Western School of Law, introduced Pamela Bluh, Associate Director for Technical Services and Administration at the Thurgood Marshall Law Library, University of Maryland, and recipient of the 2004 Bowker/Ulrich’s Serials Librarianship Award. Bluh analyzed the acquisitions process, beginning with a historical review of book publishing and vendor mergers and their impact upon library transactions. Over ten prestigious independent legal publishers have merged over the last 24 years, and prices of materials have risen steadily. Book jobbers and subscription agents have also consolidated, while the average journal cost has risen 500 percent over the last 17 years. According to Bluh, approximately a dozen companies control most of the world’s scholarly output. A worrisome outcome is that parent companies often have little experience in the book trade and are more interested in the bottom line than in fostering customer service and satisfaction.

In today’s business environment, librarians need to evaluate their acquisition decisions, placing decisions into context and capitalizing on the options available. The Internet has made the most influential and advantageous impact upon the streamlining of acquisitions by leveling competition for small or remote foreign publishers, digitizing financial transactions, and consolidating detailed information. Acquisitions are a global business, and the limitations inherent in doing business according to language groupings or by country of publication are quickly being superseded in favor of a more universal approach. Although dealing with a specialty publisher or vendor may be a better choice in light of the complex seriality of legal materials, the global information marketplace provides alternatives to the acquisitions decision-making process.
But before you make your purchase, consider the context of your transaction. A number of factors can influence the acquisitions process prior to your final decision. Should orders be consolidated with one or two vendors, be sent directly to multiple publishers, or placed with vendors according to their special expertise, language, country, or subject matter? Some publishers insist on being the sole source for material. Is there a local sales force or representation in the United States? Are approval plans or deposit accounts available, with pre-processing or cataloging? Is trade in U.S. currency, online by credit card, or snail mail by check feasible? Is the material from regions in political conflict or in languages that require special skill? Are there internal institutional requirements of an offsite central procurement office or preferences for consortia purchasing? Are there discounts or unforeseen service charges? All are viable questions in our current marketplace, and more will develop as technology and the pool of Internet-savvy vendors and publishers grows.

Although Bluh says she can’t predict the future, she ventures to say that current global and fiscal trends will most likely continue. Googlization and Amazon clones will play a greater role with transactions being handled electronically. Although prices will rise, vendors will design systems to help libraries expedite the ordering process. For now, she says, understand your buying habits, evaluate your collection development policies, familiarize yourselves with the needs of your clientele, know your fiscal responsibilities and institutional requirements, and make decisions on how to acquire materials based on knowledge of the environment in which we work. This should allow capitalization of your options in making acquisitions decisions.

TECHNICAL SERVICES = USER SERVICES:
MAKING THE CONNECTION

The Ohio Valley Group of Technical Services Librarians (OVGTSLS) met for their 2004 annual conference May 12-14, 2004, at the Galt House in Louisville, Kentucky. The conference title was, “Technical Services = User Services: Making the Connection,” and that theme was carried throughout the conference program.

The speaker for the first general session was Janet Swan Hill, Associate Director for Technical Services, University of Colorado Libraries at Boulder. Professor Hill’s talk, titled, “Fast Times In Technical Services: Learn it. Know it. Love it,” focused on the importance of core values in the face of budget cuts, conflicting priorities, and changes related to automation. She identified core values as: 1) connection of people to ideas, 2) unfettered access to ideas, 3) learning in all its contexts, 4) respect for the individual, 5) freedom of expression, 6) preservation, 7) professionalism, and 8) interdependence.

In light of budget woes, personnel shortages, changes such as off-site storage, digitization, website development, licensing issues, and the dearth of qualified technical services librarians, it is important to keep in mind our core values. Decisions and priorities need to be made based on access. Technical services librarians and staff provide indirect user services without which libraries would be a warehouse—or worse, a “data dump.” As more radical changes come, more cooperation between public and technical services will be imperative.

The second general session, “Useful Anger: Fighting for the User in the War Over Scholarly Communication,” was presented by Lee Van Orsdel, Dean of Libraries at Eastern Kentucky University. Van Orsdel addressed the crisis that libraries are facing in providing access to scholarly journals in light of ever-increasing costs. Pointing to the different values and priorities between academics and publishers, particularly STM publishers, Van Orsdel pointed out that libraries have done little to deter publishers from raising prices.

Scholars and researchers are beginning to realize the seriousness of the situation, and many ARL libraries have passed resolutions to halt the excesses of publishers. Additionally, scholars, as editors of journals, have begun to recognize their power, and in some cases, to form their own publications. Initiatives such as SPARC and the Open Archives Initiative (OAI) are providing some solutions which libraries, scholars, and publishers need to explore. Librarians need to get informed, recruit faculty to the cause by building awareness, and join the revolution to say no to profiteers and develop campus models.

In the third general session, “What’s FRBR and Why Do I Care?” Glenn Patton, Director of OCLC’s WorldCat Content Management Division, defined IFLA’s Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) as a conceptual model and tool to help us think about current standards and practices and to clarify how catalogs should function. Patton outlined the Group 1 bibliographic entities of work, expression, manifestation, and item, and the Group II responsible entities and subject entities, and addressed the attributes of each group. The benefits of FRBR were explored and include: 1) a clearer understanding of why we do what we do; 2) better collocation and navigation for users; 3) clearer, more
useful relationships; and 4) more controlled, authoritative information for productivity.

In addition to the general sessions, there were 12 workshops offered in pairs of concurrents, which left no doubt as to the importance of technical services staff in providing and improving access for library patrons. Four of the sessions dealt with the management of periodicals and electronic resources, two with digital initiatives, three with making materials available more quickly, two with cooperation and collaboration between units within libraries, and one with the development of Web forms to improve access to library media. A listing of all sessions and presenters is available on the OVGTSL website at http://www.wku.edu/Library/ovgtsl/Home.html. Complete proceedings of the conference also will be available there in the future.

**TITLE CHANGES**

[Note: Please report promotions, awards, new degrees, new positions, and other significant professional milestones. You may submit items about yourself or other members to Susan Andrews (Susan_Andrews@tamu-commerce.edu). 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.]

**KAREN AUFDEMBERGE** began her new position as Production Librarian at JSTOR on July 1, 2004. She was previously the Serials and Electronic Resources Cataloger at the University of Toledo. Her updated contact information is:

JSTOR  
301 E. Liberty Suite 310  
Ann Arbor, Michigan  48104-2262  
USA  
Phone: (734) 998-9106  
Fax: (734) 998-6547  
E-mail: kaufdemberge@jstor.org

The former Electronic Resources/Serials Cataloging Librarian at Washington State University, **MARK JACOBS** wrote, “I began my new position at the University of Wyoming 3 May 2004. It is a big change for me in duties and responsibilities. I am the point person for everything pertaining to e-resources, i.e., vendor liaison, collaborative purchasing, e-resource management, etc. Other duties include subject bibliography and reference.” He is now Electronic Resources Librarian at the University of Wyoming Libraries. His current addresses are:

University of Wyoming Libraries  
Dept. 3334, 1000 E. University Ave.  
Laramie, Wyoming  82071  
USA  
Phone: (307) 766-5560  
Fax: (307) 766-3062  
E-mail: maj Jacobs@uwyo.edu

**PAULINE LA ROOY** was pleased to let us know that she has moved from Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, where she was Serials Librarian, to the National Library of New Zealand. Her current job title is very long: “Serials and Electronic Resources Acquisitions Librarian.” She says, “The National Library of New Zealand is doing some very exciting things at the moment and it is great to be part of it. My new job description takes a modern approach to serials librarianship, which I really like.” Her new contact details are:

National Library of New Zealand  
P.O. Box 1467  
Wellington 6001  
NEW ZEALAND  
Phone: +64-4-4743000 xtn8831  
E-mail: pauline.larooy@natlib.govt.nz

Formerly the Manager, Library Operations, at Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., **NANCY A. LOESCHER** is now Technical Librarian at the Unisys Corporation. About her change in jobs she wrote, “I started my new job July 6 after being laid off for a year and a half. It’s good to be working again. I manage a small corporate library that does not have a very large serials collection, so I will probably not be as involved with serials as much as I was when I was with BMS. However, I am still interested in
the field and plan to continue my membership in NASIG to keep abreast of the latest trends.” The new addresses for Nancy are:

Unisys Corporation
2476 Swedesford Rd.
Malvern, Pennsylvania 19355
USA
Phone: (610) 648-3742
Fax: (610) 695-5239
E-mail: nancy.loescher@unisys.com

JACQUELINE SAMPLES was happy to report, “I started my new position as Metadata Librarian at the North Carolina State University Libraries in April 2003. I graduated from the University of Iowa School of Library and Information Science in December 2002 after having worked as a Library Assistant at the University of Iowa Libraries for over ten years; most of that time was spent working in the Serials Department. The change in job title represents a big move for me, both geographically and professionally. I won’t be as closely involved with serials cataloging, but my new position offers a lot of opportunities and challenges as a professional librarian. I am working on various projects and initiatives to explore and develop current and emerging models for organizing information and resources in a user-centered environment.” Jacquié’s new contact information is:

NCSU Libraries, Cataloging Dept.
Box 7111
Raleigh, North Carolina 27695-7111
USA
Phone: (919) 515-3732
Fax: (919) 515-8264
E-mail: jacquie_samples@ncsu.edu

Formerly Electronic Resources Cataloger at the University of Kentucky’s W. T. Young Library, VERONICA WALKER wanted to tell NASIG that, “I started my new position at North Carolina State on December 29, 2003. The change is a promotion for me and also gives me the opportunity to focus on monographic materials of all types. Even though I’m currently not cataloging serials, I plan to stay involved with NASIG because it’s such a wonderful avenue for learning, networking, and volunteering to the profession.” Veronica is now Head, Monographs Cataloging, at North Carolina State University Libraries. Her current contact information is:

N.C. State University Libraries
Campus Box 7111
Raleigh, North Carolina 27695-7111
USA
Phone: (919) 515-6329
Fax: (919) 515-8264
E-mail: veronica_walker@ncsu.edu

A very busy CATHY WENG e-mailed, “I started my new job as Head of Cataloging at The College of New Jersey in April 2004 after 13 years of service at Temple University Library. My new responsibilities are providing leadership in cataloging and authority control, developing policies and procedures for cataloging materials in all formats, coordinating the work of a team of professional catalogers, training and supervising paraprofessional catalogers, creating original cataloging, and revising copy cataloging. Although I had to learn to use various new systems, I enjoy my new job very much. The best part of all is I will continue to work with continuing resources, which I have loved to do for many years.” Previously, Cathy was Head, Serials Cataloging Unit, at Temple University’s Library. Her current job is Head of Cataloging at the College of Jersey’s Roscoe L. West Library. She can be contacted at:

College of New Jersey
Roscoe L. West Library
P.O. Box 7718
Ewing, New Jersey 08628
USA
Phone: (609) 771-2491
E-mail: weng@tcnj.edu

CALENDAR
Kathy Kobyljanec

[Please submit announcements for upcoming meetings, conferences, workshops and other events of interest to your NASIG colleagues to Kathy Kobyljanec, kkobyljanec@mirapoint.jcu.edu.]

September 25-26, 2004
The Serials Ecosystem
UNB Libraries
Fredericton, New Brunswick, Canada
http://www.lib.unb.ca/SEC

October 7-10, 2004
Library and Information Technology Association (LITA)
National Forum
St. Louis, Missouri
October 14-15, 2004
*Potomac Technical Processing Librarians (PTPL)*
Charlottesville, Virginia
http://www.lib.virginia.edu/ptpl/news.html

November 3-6, 2004
*Charleston Conference Issues in Book and Serials Acquisitions*
24th Annual Conference
Charleston, South Carolina
http://www.katina.info/conference/

January 14-19, 2005
American Library Association
Midwinter Meeting
Boston, Massachusetts
http://www.ala.org/ala/eventsandconferencesb/midwinter/2005/home.htm

May 19-22, 2005
*NASIG*
20th Annual Conference
Minneapolis, Minnesota

See also the *American Libraries “Datebook.”*
CALL FOR NOMINATIONS
2005/06 NASIG EXECUTIVE BOARD AND OFFICERS

Members of the Nominations & Elections Committee may not be nominated. Committee members for 2004/05 are Ladd Brown, Karen Jander, Catherine Nelson, Philenese Slaughter, Martha Spring, Christine Stamison, Peter Whiting, Susan Williams and Kathryn Wesley (Chair).

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: 


Send this form to N&E Chair:

Kathryn Wesley, Serials Cataloger
Clemson University Libraries
Box 343001
Clemson, SC  29634-3001
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