2009

Reviews of Articles and Chapters

Ivan Gaetz

Collaborative Librarianship, igaetz@regis.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/collaborativelibrarianship>

Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gaetz, Ivan (2009) "Reviews of Articles and Chapters," *Collaborative Librarianship*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 2 , Article 8.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29087/2009.1.2.08>

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/collaborativelibrarianship/vol1/iss2/8>

This Review is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Collaborative Librarianship by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu, dig-commons@du.edu.

Reviews of Articles and Chapters

Ivan Gaetz (igaetz@regis.edu)
General Editor, *Collaborative Librarianship*

Antelman, Kristin and Mona Coutts, "Embracing Ambiguity ... or Not: What the Triangle Research Libraries Network Learned about Collaboration" *College & Research Libraries News*, Vol. 70, no. 4 (April 2009): 230-233.

<http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/publications/crlnews/2009/apr/ambiguity.cfm>

The Triangle Research Libraries Network (TRLN) consisting of Duke University, North Carolina Central University, and the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill represents one of the longest (since the 1930s) and very successful library collaborations in the United States—this despite the absence of a union catalog. A plan to create this missing important piece of the collaboration mosaic was started in 2006 and led to the launch of the union catalog, "Search TRLN," in 2008. In the process, a few things were learned about collaboration.

First, relationships matter. This begins with knowing and trusting the partners involved and developing relationships at all levels of the library organization. Second, build on a simple and clear objective. Third, use the sense of urgency to propel collaboration forward. Fourth, balance a focus on both "us" and "me." Fifth, agree to share the risks. Sixth, be willing to sacrifice some autonomy. Seventh, share the work load according to roles and skills of the partners. Eighth, know how to set goals but exercise flexibility in developing work strategies. In most, if not all, of these lessons learned, it became clear that an essential quality of all the partners was to be comfortable with ambiguity while also knowing

when too much ambiguity really is too much.

Brown, Ladd, "E-Journal Workflow, Staffing, and Collaboration in Technical Services: a Taste for Coffee, a Tolerance for Ambiguity, and a Happy Ending" in *E-Journals Access and Management*. Wayne Jones, Ed. New York: Routledge, 2009, pp. 289-302.

Brown presents a detailed description of issues related to the current dominant form of digital resources, the electronic journal. This type of electronic material tends to be the most complex and widely used resource of academic libraries, and perhaps of other types of libraries as well. The article builds towards its pivotal insight on the need for collaboration in effectively managing e-journals. "When library departments get too 'departmental,' they tend to develop monocle-ism. The sort of trans-departmental, inter- and intrateam interaction presented by an ideal EJ [electronic journal] Team is the epitome of what library collaboration should be all about. It is also an indicator of what our future library staffs may one day resemble." (p. 300)

To be sure, Brown explains, the EJ Team has a challenging job. From the technical services point of view, there are special features of e-journals that require different and new types of workflow. A 'circular' workflow model is better than the common linear flow. Unlike print materials, e-journals may enter the system at any stage of the acquisition and processing workflow and so a flexible back and forth approach must be engaged. Librarians responsible for licensing agreements also need to be able to tap into the management process at var-

ious stages, depending if the e-journal comes from a single purchase, from a package deal, as part of a print subscription, or as part of a consortium purchase (to indicate some of the possibilities). The biggest challenge to e-journals, Brown suggests, is the maintenance. Again, successfully handling the maintenance task depends on collaboration. Internally, librarians and staff members from acquisitions, from technical services, from electronic services, from reference services (that serves end users), and from other library units, often collaborate on the purchase, access, coverage, platform, authorization, and other issues. Externally, the EJ Team needs to pay attention to developments within the publishing industry and to seize opportunities to enter into consortium deals that may need adjustments on the local level. In short, librarians involved in e-journal management need to be comfortable with considerable ambiguity.

As an EJ Team is formed, formally or informally, and as it takes on the daunting but important task of e-journal management, one overarching quality of its membership becomes clear. Brown states, "[A] great attitude is the single-most positive characteristic that people can bring to the e-journal workflow." (p. 298). It is when library staff are willing to meet the challenge of e-journal management through flexibility and collaboration that happy endings are entirely possible.

Coles, Andrea A. and William Dougherty, "Hang Together or Hang Separately: Improved Information Services through Communication and Culture" *College & Research Libraries News*, Vol. 70, no. 2 (February 2009): 110-113.
<http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/publications/crlnews/2009/feb/hangtogether.cfm>

Although this article specifically addresses improving collaboration be-

tween an academic library and an information technology (IT) department, Coles and Dougherty also offer insights and advice on how communication and developing a common culture can enhance collaboration in all types of libraries and in extra-library relationships.

First, effective communication rests on a solid foundation: engaging as much as possible face-to-face interactions, encouraging dialogues rather than monologues, seizing opportunities to work together on projects, and being creative in using social networking strategies.

Secondly, creating a common culture helps to bridge the gap between entities needing or hoping to collaborate. Both assumptions and professional standards define library and IT cultures. Activities that help these two cultures collaborate include: establishing common goals and values, engaging librarians in instruction for use of new information technologies, respecting and appreciating the strengths of both library and IT personnel, and following through on projects and other joint commitments.

The importance that respect and understanding play in collaboration is the overriding thrust of Coles' and Dougherty's article. "As a natural outcome of ameliorating the cycles and dynamics of relationships, our collegial attitudes will flourish and a better trust can be established. Forbearing and enduring with one another when mistakes happen and keeping the larger vision and common goal in mind, as Benjamin Franklin implored in 1776, 'we must all hang together, or most assuredly we shall all hang separately.'"

Connell, Ruth R. "Eight May Be Too Many: Getting a Toe-Hold on Cooperative Collection Building" *Collection Manager*, Vol. 33, nos. 1/2 (2008): 17-28.

The author begins with a helpful overview of past efforts in collaborative col-

lection building in America and of similar efforts within OhioLINK, of which Grasselli Library at John Carroll University is a part. This particular library experienced a significant budget crunch in 2004 which spurred its librarians to consider, in addition to interlibrary loan and other benefits of the centralized OhioLINK catalog, ways to reduce duplication and thus improve the library's buying power and enhance collection holdings.

In reference to duplication data available through the consortia catalog, Grasselli librarians established copy limits for various subject areas, but allowed for some exceptions when justified. Teaching faculty, who generally made most selection decisions, were consulted during the program development phase and it was explained they would be given an opportunity to override the limit of eight copies state-wide. Through a process of marketing the "8+ program" to faculty, over the first year it was in place faculty approval of the program increased from 36% to 80%. For the collection itself, from 2006 to 2007, approximately \$6,000 was saved by lowering the duplication. These funds were then used for other materials in the subject areas with the duplication reductions. Other benefits to the program included greater care in faculty requests for purchases and fewer requests for purchase of materials already owned by the library as selectors became accustomed to checking OhioLINK.

Future developments of the project will likely include improving the notification process of duplication data sent to faculty and tapping into OhioLINK's "Not Bought" Program. The authors note that because of the program there now exists a much greater confidence among librarians for further cooperative ventures.

Duke, Lynda M., Jean B. MacDonald, and Carrie S. Trimble, "Collaboration between

Marketing Students and the Library: an Experiential Learning Project to Promote Reference Services" *College & Research Libraries*, Vol. 70, no. 2 (March 2009): 109-121.

The authors describe the method and results of an experiment to market reference services at Illinois Wesleyan University (IWU), a private liberal arts school with about 2,100 students. Collaboration on the project stemmed from an idea shared by the library liaison to the Business Administration Department and a marketing professor.

The problem addressed at IWU is one commonly experienced in academic libraries – declining numbers of reference transactions. The project involved marketing design students creating a mechanism to measure student awareness of the reference services. The survey, among other things, found that students did not believe they needed help from reference librarians from the Ames Library, though many students held these librarians in high regard. As a truly collaborative project, the survey design was developed by the marketing students themselves, and in turn the professor obtained some "real world" learning exercise for the students. As further evidence of that depth of the collaboration effected real change, the results were received and appreciated by the librarians and many of the students' recommendations were adopted. These included adding signage that was more meaningful than "information" or "reference," creating an Instant Messaging (IM) reference service, promoting use of email reference, offering walk-in workshops to students on specific topics of interest, and then developing subsequently a direct marketing campaign to students about library services related to student assignments.

The direct marketing campaign proved to be an opportunity for another library-professor collaboration where students from a marketing communications

course (as distinct from marketing design) were asked to create the campaign. Dividing into three teams – The Office Team, The Ames Team, and The Not Cheating Team, the class developed direct marketing strategies targeting “millennial students” that showed the concrete benefits they could gain from Ames Library reference services and by interacting directly with the reference librarians.

Besides resulting in changes in the reference desk configuration and in slowing the downward spiral of use of reference service, this collaborative project brought a renewed sense of the importance of meaningful and helpful interactions between librarians and students. As well, it emphasized the fact that simply having quality resources, skilled librarians and extensive services were not enough. They also needed to be marketed effectively to the appropriate users. The collaboration, it should be noted, proved to be a successful education practicum for the students involved.

Mitchell, Catherine A. and Laura Cerruti, “Local, Sustainable, and Organic Publishing: a Library-Press Collaboration at the University of California” *Against the Grain*, Vol. 20, no. 6 (December 2008-January 2009): 22, 24, 26, 28. http://www.against-the-grain.com/TOCFiles/v20-6_Mitchell_Cerruti.pdf

The problem of gaps in the life cycle of scholarly communication emerged as an impetus for exploring a deepening partnership between the California Digital Library (CDL) and the University of California Press (UCP). These gaps (publishing that occurred outside traditional means such as through institutional repositories, a lack of scholar-to-scholar communication, a lack of integration of print and xml texts) revealed a clear and pressing need for the University to take on more responsibility for managing the academic publishing

environment. Leaders of the CDL and UCP researched the problem and gained new insight for conceptualizing the “university as publisher” that has led to a new level of collaboration between the press and the digital library.

The objective of the collaboration essentially was to respond to the publishing needs of faculty across the University of California system. The first step was to engage a thorough analysis and planning process that led to a collaborative model that took neither the CDL nor the UCP far from its core competencies and strategic plan. The joint mission emerged: “to support the research, teaching, and public service goals of the University of California by publishing high-quality, certified UC-sources scholarship in emerging digital research publication genres.” As the mission began to direct resource distribution, funding allocations and project evaluation, differences between the two entities surfaced. This led to a reexamination of the compatibilities of the core services of both the CDL and the UCP that opened up a way for a more natural and organic form of collaboration.

In concrete terms, these efforts resulted in the creation of the “UC Publishing Services” that combines the open access digital publishing services provided by the CDL through eScholarship (its institutional repository) with the distribution and marketing services offered by UCP. This service now responds well to a variety of publishing complexities related to content, format and dissemination. The specific services include print and electronic publishing, reprint and postprint dissemination, conference publication management, various business models, scholarly marketing and discovery, sales and distribution, peer review management, access and preservation, and statistical reporting. In addition to responding better to the publishing needs of scholars at the University of California, the collaboration,

as Mitchell and Cerruti illustrate convincingly, flourished in an environment that identifies, appreciates and constantly returns to, the shared competencies and values of both organizations.

Pifher, Karen, "The Collaborative Journey from Print to Electronic" in *E-Journals Access and Management*. Wayne Jones, Ed. (New York: Routledge, 2009), pp. 163-170

This short chapter explores the increasingly important shift in collection development towards less print and more electronic resources. At the Bridgewater College Library in Virginia, collection development decisions in the past involved assessing a large amount of detail on budgeting and subject allocations for print and AV materials. Based on

these data, residual budget funds were then allotted for electronic resources. New reports providing different information on fund allocations now promote the acquisition of more electronic materials. The trend towards electronic purchases has also encouraged a more collaborative decision-making process for acquiring electronic resources. This new approach that involves a more detailed comparison of print and electronic formats now allows for more extensive and judicious cancellations of print materials. (Forms used in obtaining faculty input on these decisions are reproduced in the chapter.) Despite the advances by JSTOR, LOCKSS and Portico, the biggest issue yet to be resolved with electronic resources is archiving and related access.