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/en-US/aboutus/pressroom/11/20110106.shtml*.

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-prepare-bankruptcy-filing-as-early-as-next-week.html*.

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.sspnet.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

March 14-15, 2011 JISC Annual Conference in Liverpool, England will focus on "Financial Challenges – Digital Opportunities." For more information, see *http://www.jisc. ac.uk/events.aspx*.

March 21-23, 2011 Computers in Libraries 26th Annual Conference sponsored by Information Today, Inc. in Washington, D.C. The 2011 theme is "Strategic Focus & Value for Library Communities." Program and exhibitor details are at *http://www.infotoday.com/cil2011/*.

March 30-April 2, 2011, ACRL at the PA Convention Center, Philadelphia, PA, "Declaration of Interdependence," Program details are at *http://www.acrl.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/events/ national/2011/program/index.cfm*.

May 11-13, 2011 The Fiesole Collection Development Retreat in St. Petersburg, Russia will feature the theme "Collections Across Frontiers: Technology and Globalization." *http://digital. casalini.it/retreat/retreat_2011.html*

June 2-5, 2011 North American Serials Interest Group Annual Conference in St. Louis, Missouri. The theme for the 26th Annual Conference is "Gateway to Collaboration." Visit *http:// www.nasig.org/conference_registration.cfm* for conference description and schedule.

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-its-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*.

200%... According to OverDrive, e-book checkouts went up 200% in 2010 from 2009 for its "Virtual Branches." Visit *http://www.overdrive.com/News/getarticle.aspx?ne wsArticleID=20110106* for more of its e-book statistics.

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.

Read the entire interview at *http://www.infotoday.com/it/ jan11/Interview-with-Derk-Haank.shtml*.

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

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

Reporting from California's sunny, second largest city, the consensus was that the conference attendance was especially low because it was too close to the holidays, too far away from the rest of the US, and that travel budgets were too tight. However the ALA Executive Board White Paper on ALA Midwinter supports continuing the conference for the future. *http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/governance/officers/eb_documents/2010_2011ebdocuments/ebd12_17_%20mw_future.pdf*

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

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

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 settlement. 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

By now, most of you have seen the Cornell University Libraries' "Report of the Collection Development Executive Committee Task Force on Print Collection Usage" *http://staffweb.library.cornell.edu/system/files/CollectionUsageTF_ReportFinal11-22-10.pdf.*

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+Scholarly+Kitchen)* 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?