Short Takes
ProQuest has acquired ebrary to merge the 250,000
e-books with journal articles, dissertations, reference
material and multimedia — making them all searchable
through a ProQuest platform. Both companies state the
benefits of moving ahead with the decision: ebrary “will
be positioned to drive new levels of e-book discovery
and usage, enhancing value for both publishers and
end-users” while ProQuest will continue its “mission to
support global research through information solutions.”
Read the press release here: http://www.proquest.com/

As we settle into 2011, visit the Top 10 Strategic
Technologies for 2011 that Gartner, Inc., a leading
research company, has predicted will dominate. Among
the predictions…from 2011 until 2013, video “will
become a commonplace content type and interaction
model for most users, and by 2013, more than 25
percent of the content that workers see in a day will be
dominated by pictures, video or audio.” Read the other
top technologies by visiting http://www.gartner.com/it/
page.jsp?id=1454221.

It now appears inevitable that the Borders Group, Inc.
book store chain will be filing for bankruptcy in the
coming days or weeks. In addition to stock shares at
less than one dollar a share on the New York Stock
Exchange, the company is delaying payment to vendors.
Read more about bankruptcy predictions at: http://www.
bloomberg.com/news/2011-02-01/borders-said-to-

Google has bought eBook Technologies, a relatively
small e-book and e-reader company for an undisclosed
amount. One may wonder why Google is interested
in eBook Technologies, but the company and its co-
inventors have “accumulated several different patents and
proprietary technologies over the years”…which must
have caught Google’s attention. http://content.usatoday.
com/communities/technologylive/post/2011/01/why-
google-acquired-ebook-technologies/1

There was a very interesting debate about the survival
of reference books and journals at the recent PSP
Annual Conference: http://www.pspcentral.org/
events2/PSP2011ConferenceProgram.cfm. And Kent
Anderson has an interesting follow-up and comments
about traditional peer review: http://scholarlykitchen.
spsnet.org/2011/02/09/crowdsourcing-reference-works-
and-peer-review-some-surprising-connections/?utm_
source=feedburner&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+ScholarlyKitchen+%28The+Scholarly
+Kitchen%29.

TCR Reports from ALA
Assessing Return on Investment
for E-Resources

Reported by . . . Patrick Carr, Head,
Electronic & Continuing Resources Acquisitions,
East Carolina University <carrp@ecu.edu>

When libraries consider cost-per-use (CPU) data for their
e-resource subscriptions, they do so in a bubble; in other
words, they keep the data internal and do not share it with
other libraries. What happens if a library is able to analyze
its CPU data in context with data from other libraries? What
would such an analysis reveal and how could librarians use
this information?

These were questions considered in “Assessing Return on
Investment for E-Resources: A Cross-Institutional Analysis
of Cost-Per-Use Data,” a presentation I gave at the midwinter
meeting of the ALCTS Continuing Resources Section College
& Research Libraries Interest Group. Building on initial
research conducted by Chuck Hamaker (UNC Charlotte), CPU
data was compared from four libraries within the University
of North Carolina system: East Carolina University, UNC
Charlotte, UNC Greensboro, and UNC Wilmington. The
data included CPU figures from site licenses for individual
journals, indexing and abstracting services, and journal
packages of large commercial publishers and university
presses.

While the study’s results were insufficient for making
sweeping conclusions about return-on-investment, it did
provide some general insights into the potential value of
such an analysis. Among the potential applications discussed
were pricing negotiations with vendors and collection
development decisions regarding subscription renewals and
cancellations.

So what is the next step in this project? If there is interest
among the library community, the next step would likely
entail a number of complex tasks such as coordinating
the accurate collection of additional libraries’ CPU data,
aggregating additional data, and making it available to
participants. The most ideal candidate to coordinate further
study would be a library consortium or relevant professional
organization. And, indeed, shortly after the presentation,
Chuck Hamaker and I participated in a conference call with
leaders of the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries’
(ASERL) collection development group. In the meeting, we
discussed the potential role that ASERL might play in moving
the project forward. One outcome of the call was formulating
tentative plans for an ASERL-sponsored webinar on the
topic of cross-institutional CPU analyses. That webinar will
hopefully occur sometime in the spring.
Mark Your Calendars


Must Reads

In his new book, The Googlization of Everything: And Why We Should Worry, Siva Vaidhyanathan talks about how Google has influenced and has been influenced by our lives. About the academic realm, he states:

Google Book Search has radically transformed both the vision and the daily practices of university libraries. Yet Google has simultaneously contributed to the steady commercialization of higher education and the erosion of standards of information quality. At a time when cost pressures on universities and their students have spiked and public support for universities has waned, Google has capitalized on this public failure.

http://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/authors/interviews/article/45941-the-googlization-of-books.html

By the Numbers

7.3 million…Apple announced that it sold 7.3 million iPads in the quarter that ended December 25. Amazon still holds the e-book market, though, with 40% of the e-book sales. To read more about Codex Group’s findings, visit http://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/industry-news/bookselling/article/45861-amazon-ups-edge.html.

$10…Americans are only willing to spend about $10 on online music and software a month. Read the entire report from the Pew Research Center here http://www.pewinternet.org/~/media//Files/Reports/2010/PIP-Paying-for-Online-Content_final.pdf.

89%…SOAP (Society for Open Access Publishing) Survey results indicated that 89% of respondents believed that journals publishing open access articles would benefit their field. Read the complete findings at http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1101/1101.5260.pdf.

810,000…The Kindle store has 810,000 books with the majority of them under $9.99. Read more about Amazon’s impressive numbers at http://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/industry-news/bookselling/article/45932-records-fall-at-amazon-as-kindles-e-books-rise.html.


Information Today’s Interview with Derk Haank, CEO, Springer Science & Business Media

To an industry facing a “crisis” or at least an unprecedented difficult era, Springer CEO Derk Haank offers a candid and realistic take on topics such as open access publishing, serials pricing, and the overall growth of the industry.

Among his poignant remarks:

• The number of papers published each year is growing by 6-7%...consequently prices must rise.

• The current market provides an incentive for librarians to accelerate their move from paper to electronic.

• The Big Deal is the best invention since sliced bread.

• We [Springer] felt we were well positioned to become the leading player in the OA area.

• We need to look at non-traditional markets...selling information to individuals...perhaps the iPad will help here.

The Charleston Report – January/February 2011

ALA Midwinter San Diego, CA January 7-11, 2011

Reported by . . . John Riley, BUSCA, Inc. <jdriley@comcast.net>

Official numbers from the Midwinter Meeting Registration for the last 3 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011 San Diego</th>
<th>2010 Boston</th>
<th>2009 Denver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendees</td>
<td>7,549</td>
<td>8,526</td>
<td>7,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitors</td>
<td>2,561</td>
<td>2,569</td>
<td>2,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,110</td>
<td>11,095</td>
<td>10,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Feet</td>
<td>82,960</td>
<td>81,200</td>
<td>87,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Companies</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were approximately 1,000 meetings at this year’s midwinter convention. Some of the hot topics were patron driven acquisitions, collaborative collection development, connecting with patrons through mobile devices, job inventories, discovery services, and the looming budget crises of 2012. The purchase of ebrary by ProQuest was the breaking news as the conference opened.

Patron driven acquisitions is still a major topic, but opportunities to continue exercising selection expertise are still important. Bibliographic and collection development skills are still needed to vet PDA lists. PDA has been useful for departments that don’t spend all of their allocation. With more adjunct faculty there is less input from professors. On average, only about 37% of faculties are now tenured. There are problems with ILL and PDA in a networked catalog environment, but one solution is to mark PDA acquisitions as non-circulating and update their status later. UCLA has instituted a print only PDA model by loading book records in their catalog.

Selection skills are necessary to winnow PDA offerings. Duke cut the ebrary holdings down to 23,000 books that they offered for patron acquisition. Foreign publications and rare books still require selection skills. The library’s local depository is also an area for selection expertise. In an ironic role reversal, selection is very important in reviewing de-selection. Libraries are comparing their holdings to Hathi Trust to see if there are archival copies in order to winnow their own collections.

The recent launch of Google e-books has not been exciting. Of the 3 million titles, many are either in the public domain or are older titles that have no demand. Sales are very low. I feel that this is a preview to problems that Google will have if they ever launch their larger Google Books Project. On top of these problems many prominent authors have withdrawn from the Google books database. What remains unique in the database are orphan books which probably have little demand. Figures from the legal case have hinted at a $5,500 cost for initial link to the Google books database if it ever becomes available.

There was a good amount of talk about the Espresso Book Machine, but sales for this device have not even reached 100 worldwide. Opinions about the machine tend to focus on its high cost and operating expense compared to simply using a well equipped print shop. With Xerox taking over the machine’s distribution there may be some improvement in the functioning of the machine and fewer breakdowns.

In other news, there was buzz about sharing collection development staff across institutions such as what Cornell and Columbia are doing. There was also lots of talk about single article purchase for journals. Libraries would prefer to keep access to the articles they purchase rather than pursue a “one sip” model. Libraries are striving to be more pro-active by embedding access through Blackboard and sending student feeds for new titles based on their majors. Amazon has initiated their second imprint, AmazonCrossing, for English language translation of foreign titles (see more at http://mashable.com/2010/05/19/amazoncrossing/).

Staying in touch with students through mobile devices was a popular subject. Librarians that offer this service say that students search databases and email articles to themselves for reading later. Sales of mobile devices will surpass PC’s by 2012. JSTOR, EBSCO, IEEE, ArtStor, Cambridge Journals and Pub Med are among databases offering mobile access.

The Harvard Law Library showed off their latest development for a novel way to view books in their repository. They have created a virtual bookshelf based on their catalog and the books are color coded based on their circulation numbers so users can easily see the most popular books.
After-thoughts on the Cornell Collection Usage Study


While the traditional academic research library has strived to build collections to meet any potential research need, Cornell has undertaken this study to explore actual collection use and question the investment in “just in case” collections. Highlights include data which show that 61% of the Olin Library’s English language books circulated since 1990. Fifty-five percent of the total collection has never circulated in two decades. This examination into the factors affecting collection use and future investment sets the stage for new assessment of collection development and acquisitions operations.

Joe Esposito’s recent posting, “Aftermarketing: What Publishers Must Now Do After the Sale” http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2011/02/01/aftermarketing-what-publishers-must-do-after-the-sale/?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Feed:+ScholarlyKitchen+(The+S... reviews the study and advises publishers to consider how this quantitative analysis will affect their future brand marketing after the sale. Esposito ponders if “good stats will increase the likelihood that a library will purchase the publisher’s next book…” Publishers, librarians, and aggregators will be keeping an eye on these developments.

Editorial note from Corrie Marsh: This study sparked my attention in remembering my 1980 master’s research in the circulation trends for approval purchases and the controversy among bibliographers it sparked in questioning our “just in case” collection management in a research library. My quantitative findings for a decade of data correlate perfectly with those of the Cornell study. I abandoned this line of study since, for several decades now, research libraries have been committed to building collections for “potential” use. The times are now driving new innovations for prioritizing collection development with a re-examination of actual circulation and user-oriented selection. I would like to introduce one additional thought. Another role of many libraries of all types is the commitment to resource sharing — the loan of our collections among one another. In a current two-month snapshot of borrowing, I found that more than 25% of borrowing requests were for recent acquisitions of highly cited books that may not yet be available in the borrowing research libraries. Does this merit further analysis or will our economic cutbacks also reduce our resource sharing abilities?