



The CHARLESTON REPORT

Business Insights into the Library Market

SEPTEMBER / OCTOBER 2000

VOLUME 5, NO. 2

Canadian Libraries Protest Contentville.com

Copyright issues can arise from many directions. A recent uproar on academic campuses concerns the reselling of master's theses and doctoral dissertations by American and Canadian scholars on Contentville.com, which features these publications on a special "button" on its multi-format content Website. While Contentville states that its purpose is to "expand scholarly communication and improve access to academic research," many faculty members were shocked to find their works being offered for sale without their consent.

The dissertations, as it turns out, were licensed from UMI, the de facto publishing body for all American graduate students (except those who attend the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which publishes its students' theses itself). UMI routinely obtains re-sale consent rights. Of note, UMI pays a 10% royalty to American authors of theses, but until recently, it paid those royalties only if it sold at least seven copies of a thesis in a calendar year. It now pays royalties on all sales of theses, but only after the royalties exceed \$10.

Canadians, however, "publish" their theses by submitting them to their national library which in turn contracts with UMI. Most academics in Canada were unaware of this arrangement and reportedly slammed Contentville with calls and email messages of protest. Canadian graduate students sign a form prepared by the National Library of Canada. The form does not mention UMI explicitly, but does note that the library has the right to hire other parties to manage its collection of dissertations and thesis.

In the end, both UMI and Contentville provided statements to the scholars concerning their agreements and also created an easy method for users to remove their works from the Website. Some, however, are leaving their online, hoping that someone will actually read their masterworks!

(Excerpted from *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. For the full article, see <http://chronicle.com/free/v47/i03/03a03701.htm>)

e-Books: Reports from the Field

e-Books: no single topic could be hotter right now, for libraries, publishers, and even the general public and press. But what is really happening? *TCR* looks at some recent reports.

- **Users at Sun Microsystems** want to use e-books as reference tools. They want to search across a book, examine the contents to get the answers they need, and then send the book back. If they want the book on an ongoing basis, they would prefer a physical copy. (Based on findings from internal focus groups conducted at Sun prior to introducing netLibrary. Reported in *Searcher*, October 2000.)

- **The University of Virginia Library's** Electronic Text Center reports that more than 600,000 Microsoft Reader formatted e-book downloads occurred in the six weeks between August 8 and September 20, 2000. The e-books came from a database of 1,200 publicly accessible, English language books. The Center reports its largest user communities as high-school students and teachers from all over the world, followed by the general public. (Reported at <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/>)

- "With the exception of **Stephen King**, nothing is selling." This quote from the CEO of online publisher **Xlibris Corp.** appeared in the *Wall Street Journal's* recent report on the industry. The title of the article tells the tale: "E-books have a big future, but it's unlikely to come anytime soon." According to the report, mainstream novels are not selling as well as, for example, computer manuals used by business travelers. The *Journal* quotes a survey by Book Expo America and *Publishers Weekly* stating that 63% of book buyers are aware of the existence of e-books, but 70% said they were "not at all likely" to buy one in the next six months. *Wall Street Journal Marketplace*, October 2, 2000.

- **On the other hand, PW** sees the data in a more positive light and believes that the buzz about e-books has raised awareness of the medium significantly. While two-thirds of the online book buyers polled knew what an e-book is, 32% of those said they were likely to buy an e-book in the next year. 11% said they had already read or purchased an e-book, and 78% percent of those who had tried e-books enjoyed the experience.

The general consensus seems to focus on two barriers to success for e-books at present: the relatively expensive reading devices which are still required and pricing which is confusing to users. Obviously, the University of Virginia's experience says that, if e-books are free, users will find them. Meanwhile, watch for a full copy of the **PW** report at www.publishersweekly.com.

Libraries on the Move

El Paso, Texas, voters approved a \$26 million bond issue for improvements to the Public Library system. Funds will be used for building renovation and technology. Adding Internet access, which is not currently provided, is the top priority for the library. *American Libraries*, August 2000.

The Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) will distribute more than \$2.7 million dollars to 12 libraries for projects that will digitize library resources and make them available on the Web. Winners include Cornell University; the Georgia Department of Archives and History; Indiana University; Louisiana State University; the Nebraska State Historical Society; the New York Public Library; Northern Illinois University; Tufts University Archives and Special Collections; the University of Arizona; the University of Georgia; the University of North Carolina, and the University of the Virgin Islands, St. Croix. For more information visit www.ims.org. *Academic News Wire*, September 26, 2000.

The Detroit Public Library has received a \$5 million grant for renovations to its downtown branch which has been closed since March 1998. The funds, primarily from the Skillman Foundation (named for donors Rose and Robert Skillman) will be used to renovate the facility, enabling it to open next year. Plans call for the site to include a cyber-café, a business center, and space to house the National Automotive History Collection. *Library Journal*, September 1, 2000.

Seven Big Negotiation Mistakes

1. Inadequate preparation.
2. Forgetting to get something in return when giving something away.
3. Using bullying behavior and techniques.
4. Allowing interruptions, including phone calls.
5. Showing a temper.
6. Talking too much and forgetting to listen.
7. Failing to ask enough questions.

Best advice: start by asking questions, then listen carefully to the answers. Look for the win-win solution. From Joan Mather, editor, *Meeting & Conference Executives Alert Monthly*.

The Charleston Report, Business Insights into the Library Market is published six times a year by The Charleston Co., 618 South Monroe Way, Denver, CO 80209. Subscription price per year is \$155 (U.S.) and \$170 (outside the U.S.). FAX: 303-282-9743.

The Charleston Report is written for publishers, vendors, product developers, merchandisers, and wholesalers who are interested in expanding their library market. Readers will gain insights in effective marketing to libraries, early alerts to library trends, access to library leaders' future plans, library budget projections, library strategic plans, technology directions, and publications needs.

For comments and contributions, contact Rebecca T. Lenzini, rlenzini@charlestonco.com, Editorial Offices, 618 South Monroe Way, Denver, CO 80209. 303-282-9706, FAX 303-282-9743, (c) Copyright, The Charleston Co., 2000. All rights reserved. ISSN 1091-1863.

Editor: Rebecca T. Lenzini

Editorial Board: Katina Strauch, Linda F. Crismond

Chief Financial Officer: Rebecca T. Lenzini

Publisher: The Charleston Co.

Graphic Design: Toni Nix • Masthead Design: Jack Thames

By the Numbers

25% . . . of Gnutella users serve about 98% of all files, according to a recent study conducted by Xerox. Moreover, 1% (314 computers) of the users studied provided 40% of all files made available during the study period. *New York Times*, August 21, 2000.

\$3.36 . . . is the 1999 average per capita expenditure for materials in U.S. public libraries, a 5% increase over 1998's average of \$3.21. *American Libraries*, October 2000.

95% . . . of public libraries in the U.S. now have formal policies to regulate Internet usage, according to a survey by the Library Research Center of the University of Illinois, conducted for the American Library Association. *ALA News*, June 2000.

Less than 1/2 of 1 % . . . of Web surfers click on banner ads, down from nearly 5% four years ago. *U.S. News & World Report*, August 21, 2000.

\$300 million . . . to \$3.8 billion in tax revenue is expected to be lost by state and local governments this year thanks to Internet purchasing, according to the GAO. Biggest estimated loser states are Texas and California. *Wall Street Journal*, July 25, 2000.

52 . . . ARL libraries reported fewer ILL loans in 1998-99 than in 1997-98, the first decrease in ILL statistics since 1986 when time-based collection of data began. *ARL Bimonthly Report*, August 2000.

How About It?

"In regard to stats, a great place on the Net to get any stat is www.internetstats.com. You ask a question and a real person will email back sites on the Net that have the statistics."—Ken Leebow, <http://www.300Incredible.com>

SFX: New Technology for Linking

No, it's not a Hollywood technique. SFX ("Special Effects"), a buzzword now flying in the library and publishing world, is really an algorithmic mechanism for mapping content from one database to other databases. Herbert Van de Sompel from Ghent University, Belgium, created the program as a context-sensitive reference linking tool, which is now owned and marketed by Ex Libris.

SFX allows for linking between diverse data content, such as full-text, A&I and citation databases, e-print environments, and additional Web-based sources. The key term is "Open URL" aware, which allows information providers to make connections across different types of content sources. In technical lingo, according to Ex Libris, an Open URL is a "generic public syntax to allow for metadata transportation and interoperability between information resources and service components."

With SFX, libraries can define the links among content resources. The result is fully integrated resources within the particular library service. SFX is being beta tested at Los Alamos National Laboratory, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), Harvard University Library, Vanderbilt University, and California Institute of Technology, among others. For more information and an SFX overview, logon to www.sfxit.com.

“Should Libraries Bother Collecting Journals At All?”

This question was posed by David Kohl, Dean and University Librarian at the University of Cincinnati, to those attending the Oxford 2000 Collection Development Retreat held in July at the University of Oxford and sponsored by *The Charleston Report* and *Against the Grain*.

Kohl was reporting on conclusions he has reached as a part of his active participation in OhioLINK's Electronic Journals Collection (EJC) project. Among his observations for libraries and publishers:

- increased access is more important than better selection;
- traditional purchase is not the only way for libraries to increase access;
- driving down per use costs is the key to increased access and profitability;
- replacing cancellation with re-pricing could serve low use journals;
- consortia are an important new opportunity for both librarians and publishers.

Cincinnati University is an active participant in OhioLINK's EJC which has acquired consortial rights to over 4,000 journal titles from 18 publishers, including Academic Press, Elsevier, Kluwer, Springer-Verlag, Wiley, Johns Hopkins University, MCB, the American Physical Society, the Royal Society of Chemistry, the Institute of Physics, and the American Chemical Society.

EJC has been a “win/win” for libraries and publishers alike, according to Kohl. OhioLINK libraries pay the publishers the sum of current printed subscriptions plus an additional negotiated amount in exchange for system-wide, increased access to the journals included in the packages. For the publishers involved, revenue is stabilized and even increased, journal cancellations are curtailed, and more users have access to their materials.

OhioLINK spends \$16 million on consortial licenses. Kohl noted that the University of Cincinnati now allocates roughly 25% of its collections budget to consortial purchases, and he sees room for more. The University, says Kohl, is not “selecting” but rather is acquiring by the lot.

Is this approach working? Usage statistics are impressive. EJC weekly downloads of articles have gone from 2-3,000 in spring/summer 1998 to 30,100 in the winter of 1999. Total downloads for the first twelve months were 280,000; for the second twelve months: 740,000.

More importantly, 58% of articles downloaded were from titles not previously held by the libraries. In fact, EJC has seen more use from titles never selected than from those which were actively selected. This data leads Kohl to recommend that libraries move away from acquiring title by title, to selecting collections based on general profiles, stretching the library's money as far as possible, acquiring as many collections as possible, and then letting the patron become the ultimate selector.

Kohl and others believe the library's ultimate job is now to expand access to as much reasonable material as possible, using the following in a cost-effective mix:

- Institutional purchases
- Commercial document delivery
- Consortial purchases
- Consortial coordinated collection development
- Interlibrary loan

EJC ultimately succeeds for both the publisher and the library because it lowers cost per use. It serves the library's budgetary constraints while allowing the publisher's material to reach a wider audience. Instead of cancellations in the future, Kohl hopes we will learn to re-price, moving from a “yes/no” decision model to a sliding scale where low use journals may cost less.

For more information on this presentation and others from Oxford 2000, logon to the conference proceedings at www.digital.casalini.it.

Short Takes

Houston Mifflin expects to earn at least \$1 million from digital dictionary licensing this year, more than 10% of earnings from its trade and reference division. Merriam-Webster, which offers its dictionary for free on its Web site (www.m-w.com), is getting about 20 million page views each month, at a rate of roughly 50,000 accesses per hour during the middle of the day. The site also features word games for children and a free word-of-the-day email. *New York Times*, August 21, 2000.

The Library of Congress should create more partnerships with private enterprises, according to a study commissioned in 1998 and conducted by the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences. The report also recommended upgrades to the library's technology practices and infrastructure, and suggested it continue to play a leadership role in digital projects and in digital copyright. The full report is available at www.nationalacademies.org. *Library Hotline*, August 7, 2000.

Drexel University reports that it moved from 100 e-journals and 1,850 printed journals in 1998 to 5,000 e-journals and 953 printed journals in 2000. Of note, technical service functions associated with acquiring the e-journals, including acquisitions, cataloging, and catalog maintenance, required the addition of staff; however, fewer staff were needed for other traditional functions such as issue check-in, claiming, binding, and shelving. *ARL Bimonthly Report*, June 2000.

Did You Know?

Teens spend less than half the time online that adults do, in both number and length of sessions, according to a study by market research firm Jupiter Communications and Internet statistics firm Media Metrix, released to attendees of the Digital Kids Forum held recently in San Francisco.

Teens spend an average of 303 minutes online per month, compared with the adult average of 728 minutes per month, according to Media Metrix research for June 2000. The gap isn't likely to change soon, said Stacey Herron, a Jupiter analyst. “As teens start to use the Internet at school more, perhaps they'll spend a bit more time online, but the lifestyle of a teen lends itself to other activities.” Posted on the Web at CNN by George A. Chidi Jr., September 14, 2000.

Charleston Conference Preview

The Twentieth Charleston Conference is due to begin on Thursday, November 2, 2000, at 8:00 AM at the Lightsey Conference Center on the College of Charleston campus in beautiful Charleston, S.C. The program is jam-packed with timely and fascinating topics.

- Keynote speaker, Nancy Eaton, Dean of Libraries at Pennsylvania State University, will address the conference theme, “Is Bigger Better” followed by Cindy Cunningham of Amazon.com whose topic is “Should Libraries Be More Like Amazon.”
- A debate between Tony Ferguson (Columbia University) and David Goodman (Princeton University) will focus on “Buying Through Title-by-Title Selection versus Buying Content by the Batch” for Friday afternoon participants.

Other topics include:

- “New Pacts Among Authors, Publishers, and Readers in the Digital World,” (Clifford Lynch, CNI)
- “Small Universities/Large Colleges in the Shifting and Demanding Library Economic Environment (Albert Joy and Peter Spitzform, U. of Vermont)
- “Hypertext is Only the Beginning” (Anna Belle Leiserson, Vanderbilt, Judy Luther, Informed Strategies, Pam Rose, U. of Buffalo, and William Terry, NetPubs International)
- “What’s Yours is Mine, What’s Mine is Yours: Intellectual Property Rights” (Bill Hannay, Schiff Hardin & Waite, Bonnie MacEwan, Penn State, Peter McDonald, Syracuse)
- “‘For love of Money’ Budget Allocation” (John Payne, Furman University, Joyce Durant, Francis Marion University, Kent Mulliner, Ohio University, Stuart Halliday, U. of Sunderland, UK)
- “State of Reference Publishing,” (Jim Rettig, U. of Richmond, John Lawrence, College of William & Mary, Beth Juhl, U. of Arkansas, Barbara Beach, The Gale Group)

... and many, many others. For further details, visit the Charleston Conference Website at www.cofc.edu/library/conference or call Katina Strauch or Mike Litchfield at 843-953-8020, libconf@cofc.edu, strauchk@cofc.edu. See you there!

Don't Miss This!

Evaluating, Selecting, and Acquiring Electronic Resources: Part III

Usage and Other Statistics for Electronic Collections

*College of Charleston, November 1, 2000
8:30 a.m.- 12:30 p.m.*

Frustrated attempting to measure the usage of your electronic collections? Or trying to meet library demands for more and more statistics? Join us for this informative half-day workshop, offered as a pre-conference to the 20th Annual Charleston Conference in Charleston, S.C. Organized by Judy Luther of Informed Strategies and Denise Davis of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS), this forum will provide an overview of current developments and the challenges facing publishers, aggregators, and librarians as we explore how to assess usage of electronic collections and understand their value to users.

There's still time to register! Send email to rlenzini@charlestonco.com or call 303-282-9706.

TCR Marketing TIP: A Great Web Site is Not Enough

The following may go without saying, but is worth repeating. Smart companies not only have effective Web sites, but also participate actively on the Internet and establish credibility there. Many firms appoint a company representative or group of individuals to represent them in an informed and collegial manner, and to participate actively in discussion groups and listservs. The right individuals for this job often are librarians who know the issues and players in the market and understand the higher level discussions which often occur on the Net. See *TCR's* January/February 2000 issue for a summary of the best listservs in which to participate and monitor. (Note: *TCR* back issues are available. Contact us at 303-282-9706 to request copies.)

BookFinder Scores Highest

The Charleston Advisor's summer issue (v.2, no.2, July 2000) featured a comparison review of Alibris, BookFinder and 21 North Main, all sources for locating used, overstocked, out-of-print, and rare books. The review's author is Kent Mulliner, Collection Development Coordinator for the Ohio University Libraries, who has personally used all three services and rates them highly (with Alibris at 4 stars out of 5, BookFinder at 4 1/2, and 21 North Main at 3 7/8).

Mulliner's conclusion: there is no clear winner. Each has strengths and shortcomings. For hard-to-find titles, Mulliner suggests using all three. He sees BookFinder as strongest for prices and selection, 21 North Main for ease of account management, and Alibris for wide selection and ease of ordering. On the down side, he experienced problems with each site: printing and selection with 21 North Main, purchasing hassles and unavailability of items with BookFinder, and account “nightmares” with Alibris.

To read the full review, logon to www.charlestonco.com and request a sample issue, or a temporary password. Or, call 303-282-9706 to request a copy.

TCR Quotes

“It is easier to predict what technology could do than what it will do, because of social and other influences.” Herman Pabbruwe, Oxford 2000 Collection Development Retreat.

“The publisher with the most links wins.” Karen Hunter, Elsevier. Popular quote, frequently repeated.

Coming in Future Issues

- Reports on Electronic Collections and Statistics
- Copyright Updates from the NWU and CCC
- Highlights from the Charleston Conference