ABUNDANCE, ATTENTION, AND ACCESS:
OF PORTALS AND CATALOGS

by Sarah E. Thomas, University Librarian, Cornell University Library

The world’s information resources are abundant, but time is a scarce commodity. The ideal discovery tool, therefore, is one which consults omnivorously, but which returns a selection of relevant results in rapid sequence. Searchers find what they need promptly without having to wade through a vast assortment of tangentially related, inaccurate, or otherwise deficient data. It costs little to build and operate, and it yields a high degree of user satisfaction because it delivers reliable information in a timely manner with relative ease. Such a tool is still imaginary, although it could become a reality in the near future if librarians organize themselves appropriately and commit the resources to design it.

One precursor of this discovery tool is the library catalog. Over the past century, the catalog has achieved a reputation as a dependable starting point for people seeking particular kinds of information: published information appearing chiefly in books or journals that has undergone a formal review and editing process. Libraries have further filtered these publications through their selection practices, in which collection policies guide the acquisition of texts to meet the needs of a particular community. The titles chosen by bibliographers represent quality because they have been at least twice vetted, once by professional editors and once by library subject specialists. Once acquired, the volumes receive added value through their integration with other related materials held by the institution. Through the cataloging of these chosen items, they gain in significance as trained experts distill their essence into a standard bibliographic description. Subject headings and classification contribute further to the access of these materials. Widespread adoption of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, Library of Congress Subject Headings, Library of Congress or Dewey Decimal Classification, and the MARC format has enabled the creation of virtual union catalogs with a number of superior attributes. The catalog yields highly codified citations to quality publications in a predictable and dependable fashion. Names are usually authoritative and consistent. These features instill a strong degree of user confidence in the results of their searches. Libraries enhance this trust by ensuring that the materials cited are readily available for consultation, since titles cataloged are either locally held or obtainable through resource-sharing agreements. Furthermore, the library’s commitment to preserve the documents in its custody guarantees enduring access.

Over the past few years, library management systems have matured and now present catalog users with sophisticated online public access capabilities that include web access, improved keyword searching, relevance ranking, ability to limit searches by date or other fields, and reference linking.

The catalog’s trustworthiness comes at a price. It depends heavily on human intelligence to apply principles of organization to bibliographic works, and the complex rules needed to exact consistency have proven expensive to apply. Original cataloging can cost $50 to $100 per title. (Of course, so can the answer to a single reference question.) Although libraries have reengineered their processes to take greater advantage of cataloging copy and automated assistance in the creation of bibliographic records, the world’s output of publications has outstripped the resources available to control them using traditional cataloging procedures. Compounding the situation, there has been a rise in interest in other formats, such as films, recordings,
photographs, manuscripts, maps, and, now, digital objects. At the same time that the aperture of scholarship has been widening, libraries have been diverting resources devoted to cataloging to other functions, as ARL statistics reveal: the percentage of the total professional workforce in ARL libraries employed as catalogers has dropped by 25% from 1990 through 1998.\(^3\)

The declining role of the catalog was highlighted in a New York Times article headlined “Choosing Quick Hits Over the Card (sic) Catalog.” While conceding that “libraries are organized and easily navigated,” the author reports “students prefer diving into the chaotic whirl of the Web to find information.” More and more students and faculty turn to the Internet as their first point of contact for information. Even deans at top-ranked universities have confessed that they get satisfactory results from “Ask Jeeves,” or that they question the need for physical libraries since they find all the references they require for their writing available online. Over the past five years, there has been a strong trend in many quarters of the university to prefer electronic resources because of the ease and speed of access. More recently, the concept of portal has emerged as a unifying device for the wide variety of data made available on the web. The portal serves as a starting point for searching, and it usually offers an array of associated services such as news, related products, and reference tools, often clustered around a theme or discipline.

Portals differ from the catalog in a number of significant ways. They provide access to a wide range of materials, much of which would fall in the “unpublished” category. Harvesting of data occurs through the use of algorithmic programs, and there is little human cataloging effort. The largest catalog departments process 250,000 volumes annually, while Google’s search engine indexes millions of web pages weekly and claims to hold links to more than a billion URLs. To cope with the effect of large response sets, portals have moved to include relevance ranking. Still it is common to experience duplicates, false drops, and dead ends in many searches conducted with the discovery tools popular on the web. In addition, the free service they provide in locating information is often subsidized through advertising, which sometimes even affects placement in search results. Proprietary information, such as licensed databases to which libraries often subscribe, is inaccessible through most commonly used portals.

Despite these deficiencies, portals offer many compelling features. They yield up-to-the-moment information, and they deliver a vast quantity and rich variety of resources, including full-text, images, and sound. The web’s ability to support linking enables the searcher to move with ease from document to document, and to capture material for his own use and facile manipulation. Customization and even personalization of searching and retrieval are other popular characteristics of search engines and portals. Looney and Lyman observe that “portals gather a wide variety of information resources into a single ‘one-stop’ web page, helping the user to avoid being overwhelmed by ‘infoglut’ or feeling lost on the Web.”\(^4\)

The enthusiasm with which people embrace the web, and the skepticism which many of these same digerati express about traditional libraries, has been sobering for some librarians. Information professionals note the flaws in search engines and in digital “library” content, which is often unstable, of dubious quality and authenticity, and incomplete. Their cautionary observations go unheeded among the hype and the reality of the flexibility of the web and the wealth of resources it encompasses. It is unlikely that the catalog—in its present incarnation—can ever be the tool that provides the principal mode of access to information for students and scholars.

An alternative to both the dot-com portals and the catalog is the scholars portal. A concept developed by a number of library leaders in 1999, the scholars portal, described at length by Jerry Campbell, would promise high-quality content of the type consistent with the support of research and scholarship, and it would incorporate the suite of services, such as reference, familiar to library users.\(^5\) It would build on the collaborative strength of libraries to create a destination for scholars that would convey the traditional values of careful selection, expert organization, skilled retrieval and delivery, interpretation, and endurance that have characterized libraries over the past century.

The scholars portal has not yet come to fruition, but the energy and debate surrounding the proposal are healthy signs of the realization that libraries must transform themselves and create new services in the near future. One area that is ripe for review is the proportion of time dedicated to the cataloging of books and journals. In the past decade and more, catalogers have become increasingly productive, using copy cataloging and...

...libraries will have to reallocate funds presently devoted to describing books and journals to materials that are proportionately underrepresented in today’s catalogs, such as films, music, photographs, and digital objects.
automated workstations to lower the cost of cataloging. Library administrators have seized resources previously devoted to cataloging and reallocated them to other, higher priority areas, such as technology development. There is a chronic imbalance between the amount of work to be done and the resources available to do it, however, and in addition to backlogs of printed publications such as books and journals, the level of bibliographic control over sound recordings, photographs, films, and archival materials such as manuscripts remains poor. To this growing population of resources, which is increasingly considered important research territory, we now add endlessly proliferating electronic files. User expectations are expanding for timeliness, for in-depth access at the word or image level, for rapid retrieval, and for linkages. Expert management of all this content is essential because, as David Levy astutely observed, “There is a growing awareness of attention as a highly limited resource, stemming in part from the realization that an abundance of information, good though it is in many ways, is also a tax on our attention.”

To serve their clients well, libraries must blend the features of the catalog with the virtues of the portal. This will require the use of a sophisticated search engine to deliver the quantity of resources, the hyperlinks, the customization and personalization, and the instantaneous access that provides the user with convenience, flexibility, and immediacy. Libraries can add value by promoting filtering and ranking which would prefer resources produced by universities, governments, and other sources that meet a set of established criteria, such as having a strong likelihood of authenticity, accuracy, or endorsement by others of standing. Added to the content retrieved by the search engine should be material contributed by libraries through a reengineered cataloging process. This reformed activity should favor timely access to a wide variety of formats. To achieve this, libraries will have to reallocate funds presently devoted to describing books and journals to materials that are proportionately underrepresented in today’s catalogs, such as films, music, photographs, and digital objects. This cannot be accomplished by fine-tuning, but will rather require significant compromise and change.

Although certain titles may still receive full bibliographic description and analysis such as is conducted today using the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules and the Library of Congress Subject Headings, the need to increase greatly the number of resources of interest to scholars that can be located through the library’s access tool will result in the application of a different standard to many materials. For digital documents, it should be possible to derive key metadata using automation informed by and combined with human intelligence. The emphasis should be placed on identification of many new resources of value to the scholar and researcher, rather than on the cataloging of only a few, relatively speaking, new items.

By working collaboratively, libraries will ensure that they avoid redundancy, and they can aggregate their efforts to create a large-scale portal (“portal”?) that offers access to a large quantity of high-quality resources of current interest. One of the salient distinctions of this portal will be that it will bridge the analog and digital worlds in a far more comprehensive way than most Internet search engines do, calling attention to the 96% of the world’s published knowledge that does not exist electronically. In addition, it will draw on two defining characteristics of a library: the ability to provide access to the materials cited or displayed and to offer this access across time through the commitment to preserve and safeguard its collections. A critical aspect of the library portal is that for an individual library to serve its users successfully, it must connect and ally itself with other libraries and developers of commercial search engines in a highly integrated fashion.

Libraries should seek to partner with developers of portals and search engines to share expertise in a constructive way, drawing on the best each has to contribute to the goal of effective access to information. Traditional libraries have much to learn from the commercial portals about attracting and satisfying users. At the same time, libraries can call attention to the value they have offered and continue to offer for today’s and tomorrow’s scholars. The result will be a superior service for the world of higher education and beyond.

1 This article is inspired by the author’s paper, “The Catalog as Portal to the Internet” (Contributed to the Library of Congress’s upcoming “Bicentennial Conference on Bibliographic Control for the New Millennium,” 15–17 November 2000). The full text of the paper is available at <http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/bibcontrol/ thomas.html>.
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Martha Kyrillidou, Senior Program Officer

LibQUAL+: One Instrument in the New Measures Toolbox
by Colleen Cook, Executive Associate Dean of University Libraries, Fred Heath, Dean and Director of University Libraries, and Bruce Thompson, Professor of Educational Psychology, Texas A&M University

On 20–21 October, a symposium, “The New Culture of Assessment in Academic Libraries: Measuring Service Quality,” will present a global perspective on the assessment of service quality in research libraries. This article features an update on LibQUAL+, one of the instruments in the ARL New Measures toolbox and one of the service quality measurement tools that will be discussed at the symposium. (For more information on the symposium, see <http://www.arl.org/libqual/events/oct2000msg/>.)

The web-delivered survey instrument was piloted with 12 ARL libraries in the spring of 2000. (A continually updated bibliography of LibQUAL+ studies can be accessed via the web address <http://acs.tamu.edu/~bbit6147/servqbib.htm>.) Based upon Gap Theory of Service Quality, a random sample of library patrons from each institution replied to 41 questions measuring various aspects of their library’s service quality from three perspectives (perceived, desired, and minimum) using one to nine scales. Parasuraman, Berry, and Zeithaml assay the gaps that emerge among perceived, desired, and minimum expectations to identify and address service quality issues. LibQUAL+ is still an emerging instrument that originated from Parasuraman, Berry, and Zeithaml’s SERVQUAL tool, the industry standard for measuring service quality in the private sector. The origins of LibQUAL+ and an early report on its findings were discussed in previous issues of the Bimonthly Report.

SERVQUAL was selected as the departure point for future development in assessing library service quality because it had earned a reputation for the statistical integrity of its results over its 12-year history and there had already been significant experience with the tool in academic research libraries. From the start, there were theoretical issues demanding attention. The previous work at the University of Maryland and Texas A&M had failed to recover consistently the five defining dimensions of service quality that the SERVQUAL developers found in the public sector (tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance, empathy). In three Texas A&M iterations only three dimensions were recovered, defined by researchers there as tangibles, reliability, and affect of service. The question remains, what other factors, if any, should be incorporated into the assessment of service quality in a research library setting?

While SERVQUAL functioned a priori as the theoretical construct of service quality from which inquiry proceeded, it was necessary for the survey to be re-grounded. Based on grounded theory, the methodological design established an inquiry paradigm to isolate additional factors that should be considered in establishing the working definition of service quality in the research library context. The expertise of external qualitative evaluator Yvonna Lincoln guided the next steps, and great care was taken to ensure a close fit between the theory selected to guide inquiry and the inquiry paradigm itself. Whereas other researchers in the area of service quality have focused their qualitative inquiries upon the providers of service, the LibQUAL+ investigators were guided by the dictum of Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Berry, that “only customers judge quality; all other judgments are essentially irrelevant.”

Over the course of the winter of 1999–2000, 60 interviews were conducted with faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates at nine of the participating pilot institutions. Open-ended interviews lasting from an hour to an hour and a half explored from the perspective of library users the variables defining the delivery of quality library service in their experience.

The data from the interviews were collected, transcribed, and interpreted with the aid of the content-analysis software Atlas TI. Based upon initial analysis, two additional areas meriting investigation came to light in the first phase of the pilot project. Corroborating other findings, there seemed to be a clear relationship between the provision of physical collections and user perceptions of library service quality. Likewise, there was pervasive discussion of the matter of library as place, a concept transcending the definition of tangibles as found in the SERVQUAL studies. While triggered primarily in those instances of over-crowded or substandard facilities, many of those interviewed spoke passionately of libraries as sanctuaries or havens, as contemplative environments essential for their creativity. Based on the language of the respondents, a series of questions was developed and added to the SERVQUAL core in order to test the efficacy of these two factors.

The resulting instrument combined the 22 questions of the standard SERVQUAL with 19 questions designed to measure the additional factors uncovered in the interviews. While it may have been possible to have extended the pilot instrument to follow other qualitative leads, the researchers were guided in part by recent studies that suggest the optimal completion time of a web survey is 13 minutes. Careful pre-tests of the web version proved out; across all respondents to the survey
as it was administered in spring 2000, the average time to completion was 11 minutes and 18 seconds. As explained in ARL 211, the study considered the issue of proportionality of the several populations from which the samples would be drawn, and determined that it would be desirable to seek roughly equal response sets of faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates. That outcome was achieved, as was a response set equally proportioned by gender, well distributed by age groupings, with strong representation across various disciplines. The sample frame also had the desired effect of reaching library users. Compared with another recent survey that drew its sample from circulation data of readers checking out at least one book in the past year, over 98 percent of the LibQUAL+ respondents reported using the library at least quarterly.

Analysis of the data began in June, after the survey had run to completion on all 12 campuses. As will be shown below, careful qualitative inquiry paid dividends. For the initial analysis, the responses from 4,407 participants from 11 institutions were analyzed using a hierarchical model of factor analysis. In the first stage of the analysis, the 41 items on the survey were found to cluster into five first-order factors, or dimensions (see accompanying graph):

- Affect of Service
- Reliability
- Library as Place
- Provision of Physical Collections
- Access to Information
The first two dimensions derive from the original SERVQUAL instrument; the other three emerged from the qualitative interviews and the resulting responses from more than 4,000 respondents. While there is much work ahead to evaluate and validate the results of the first pilot phase, LibQUAL+ seems to have broken free from its SERVQUAL origins, and promises to more precisely measure the issues that the research library constituency deems important.

The next stage of the analysis identified a single, overarching, second-order factor that is noteworthy because it suggests that users may simultaneously think about quality at multiple levels. This single, second-order dimension (as yet unnamed) seems to dominate user thinking and expresses the concept of library service quality; it is saturated by all 41 items used in the survey. Yet, considerable information regarding users’ perceptions that is present in the five first-order factors is not present in this single overarching dimension. Both levels of the factor analysis contribute to our understanding of users’ perceptions of library service quality. Even if all 41 items feed the overarching, second-order factor that defines library service quality in the eyes of users, is there anything we can learn from respondents across North America as to what is most important to them? Interestingly, among items that in the aggregate are considered almost equally important among users (Desired Mean Score 8.13–8.25 on a scale of 1–9), four correlate most closely to the Affect of Service issue, and one to Reliability. These items are:

- Readiness to respond to users’ questions (Affect, question 18)
- Willingness to help users (Affect, question 19)
- Employees who have knowledge to answer users’ questions (Affect, question 20)
- Performing services right the first time (Affect, question 28)
- Maintaining error-free user and catalog records (Reliability, question 16)

In the working out of perceived gaps, however, it is the areas of materials where the constituents are most likely to find libraries in need of improvement. As the accompanying graphic demonstrates, the two areas where the pilot libraries were found to be most deficient, falling outside the zone of tolerance were in the two collections areas:

- Full text delivered electronically to the individual computer (Access, question 25)
- Complete runs of journal titles (Collections, question 37)

In summary, we have found that users do perceive library service at a global level; there appears to be a single, second-order factor associated with the delivery of quality library services in a research university environment. However, our hierarchical factor analysis also demonstrates that research library users simultaneously think about library quality at multiple levels, and that all of the elements used in the LibQUAL+ survey suffice the second-order factor. As several first-order factors contribute important and unique information to the notion of service quality, and as different users may place varying degrees of importance on first-order factors, the utility of the hierarchical LibQUAL+ model is demonstrated.

There is much work ahead. As Hendrick and Hendrick note, in the behavioral sciences “theory building and construct measurement are joint bootstrap operations.” A three-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) ensures that the development path for LibQUAL+ will continue, and that the mature version of it will be available for administration by ARL. In the interim, as well as beyond, there is the iterative work of responsible science: tentatively formulating a theory based on careful qualitative work, developing a measure of that theory, evaluating the measure, revising the theory, and then proceeding cyclically back through this process time and again. Most immediately, after further evaluation and revision of the LibQUAL+ tool this fall and winter, a new iteration of the survey will be conducted with additional participants in spring 2001. LibQUAL+ seems to hold promise in assessing service quality in the research library environment; thoughtful application in the appropriate library contexts is recommended.

---


Andaleeb and Simmonds.


8 Average time was operationally derived from all respondents completing at least 30 of the 41 questions.


11 For this analysis, York University data captured on a different rating scale was excluded. Included were data from: University of Arizona; University of California, Santa Barbara; University of Connecticut; University of Houston; University of Kansas; Michigan State University; University of Minnesota; University of Pennsylvania; University of Pittsburgh; Virginia Tech; University of Washington.

12 The analysis was completed by employing an approach recommended by John Schmid and John M. Leiman, "The Development of Hierarchical Factor Solutions," Psychometrika 22 (1957): 53–61. This solution "orthogonalizes" the two levels of analysis to each other by removing from the first-order factors any information that is also available at the second-order level.

13 Colleen Cook, Fred Heath, and Bruce Thompson, "Users’ Hierarchical Perspectives on Library Service Quality: A ‘LibQUAL+’ Study" (Unpublished manuscript, August 2000).
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MEASURING LIBRARY SERVICE QUALITY

An ARL OLMS Online Lyceum Collaborative Learning Event
13 November–15 December 2000

This interactive online course will cover the theory and impact of measuring library service quality as well as methods to assess and improve service. For more information, see <http://www.arl.org/training/quality.html>.

- development of tools and protocols for evaluating library service quality;
- development of effective web-based delivery mechanisms;
- identification of best practices; and
- establishment of a service quality assessment program.

The project builds on the ARL New Measures project, LibQUAL+, initiated in spring 2000. Twelve ARL institutions participated in a pilot project using a standardized instrument measuring service quality, LibQUAL+, a modified version of SERVQUAL. (See accompanying article for a report on the LibQUAL+ project.)

The FIPSE funds for this three-year project, which begins October 2000, will cover 49.5% ($498,368) of the estimated costs of the project; Texas A&M and ARL contribute the remaining 50.5% ($508,761) of the total project costs.

Any postsecondary institution interested in participating in the project should contact Martha Kyrrlidou, ARL Senior Program Officer for Statistics and Measurement, <martha@arl.org>. A website for the project is available at <http://www.arl.org/libqual/>.
DEFINING NLM'S COMMITMENT TO THE PERMANENCE OF ELECTRONIC INFORMATION
by Margaret M. Byrnes, Head, Preservation and Collection Management Section, and Chair of the Working Group on Permanence of Electronic Information, National Library of Medicine

As the volume of electronic information produced by the National Library of Medicine (NLM) continues to grow, the importance of communicating NLM's level of commitment to maintaining the availability of its online resources has become more widely recognized. Of particular concern is the ability to inform users whether an electronic resource cited today will be available in the future, retrievable from the same address, and unchanged in content. Equally important is the ability to indicate to other organizations those resources for which NLM has assumed archiving responsibility. To address these needs, the Working Group on Permanence of NLM's Electronic Information (WGP) began meeting in July 1999. The Group, which is comprised of NLM staff from throughout the organization and John A. Kunze, consultant, UCSF Medical Informatics, is focusing on electronic resources that NLM makes available to the public. Despite this limited scope, the WGP is aware that its work could provide a model for other publishers of electronic information and contribute to the development of preservation metadata standards.

Phase I
Categories of Permanence
During Phase I of its work, the Working Group identified three core categories of permanence for electronic resources: identifier validity, resource availability, and content invariance. Identifier validity is defined as the extent to which a user can be assured that a given name, number, or other identifier will not be changed or assigned to another resource. Resource availability is the extent to which a given resource will remain accessible. Content invariance is the extent to which the content of a given resource and the links it contains will remain unchanged. The rating system initially developed by the WGP is as follows:

Identifier Validity (IV)
1. Undefined or Transient
   (Either no rating has been undertaken or the identifier could be changed or reassigned.)
2. Guaranteed
   (The identifier will not be changed or reassigned to another resource. Example: a MEDLINE record.)

Resource Availability (RA)
1. No Guarantee
   (The resource may become unavailable at any time. Example: announcements.)
2. Permanently Available
   (Accessibility is guaranteed. This rating implies a commitment to archive the resource. Example: NLM annual reports.)

Content Invariance (CI)
1. Unrated
   (No rating has been undertaken or no guarantee has been made.)
2. Dynamic
   (The content may be replaced, corrected, and revised. Internal and external links could change. Example: NLM's home page.)
   a) Open
   b) Closed
3. Stable
   (The content is subject only to correction and minor additions. Internal and external links will be updated. Example: online exhibits.)
   a) Open
   b) Closed
4. Invariant
   (The content is static. Example: an image from the Visible Human Project.)

The optional subelements "Open" and "Closed" may be assigned to "Dynamic" and "Stable" resources to indicate whether the resource will grow in regular increments or is no longer growing.

Sample rating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEDLINE</td>
<td>IV: 2</td>
<td>Identifier Validity: Guaranteed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Aggregate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA: 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resource Availability: Permanently Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI: 3a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Content Invariance: Stable/Open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase II

Rating Categories of Resources
During Phase II of its deliberations, a task force of the WGP categorized NLM’s electronic publications by resource type and tested the proposed system by assigning ratings to the resource categories as well as to a selection of individual resources. (Sample resource categories include bibliographies, newsletters, database records, press releases, and training manuals.) This exercise showed that in many cases it would be possible to assign ratings to resource categories and eliminate the need to assign ratings to individual resources. Default ratings would be assigned to resource categories but the creators of individual resources could override them as needed.

A Condensed Rating System
The same task force addressed the question of whether the concepts included in the original rating system could be expressed in a simplified manner. It was believed that using natural language rather than alphanumeric code would make it easier for resource creators to assign ratings and users of NLM resources to understand them. In addition, it was hoped that revised wording would make it more immediately obvious that a given resource had been assigned a permanent rating. The task force developed the following condensed rating system:

- Permanent: Unchanging Content
  (Example: scanned image of a piece of correspondence in the Profiles in Science collection.)

- Permanent: Stable Content
  (Example: a MEDLINE record.)

- Permanent: Dynamic Content
  (Example: NLM’s home page.)

- Permanence Not Guaranteed
  (Example: conference agendas.)

A rating of “Permanent” means that the resource will remain available and the identifier will not be changed or reassigned. Aggregate resources (e.g., databases or digital library collections) that are rated “Permanent” may be assigned the following subratings:

- Subject to Growth
  (Additional objects may be added to this resource.)

- Closed
  (Objects are no longer being added to this resource.)

For resources rated “Permanence Not Guaranteed,” the following optional subratings may be used to indicate which elements are subject to change:

- identifier undefined or transient
- resource availability not guaranteed

The Working Group’s Recommendations
Included in the WGP’s Phase II report was the recommendation that permanence ratings be included in the metadata NLM assigns to its electronic resources. In this way, whenever a resource is assigned a rating of “Permanent,” its metadata could be downloaded to the Library’s catalog and upgraded to a MARC-formatted bibliographic record. The condensed permanence rating would be displayed in the MARC 583 field and distributed to the bibliographic utilities as part of the record. Because users may access a resource through the web rather than through NLM’s catalog, the condensed rating would also be available in the web version.

The WGP recommended that provisional permanence ratings be assigned by the creators of the resources. Because of the institutional commitment involved, all ratings of “ Permanent” for major resources such as databases would be subject to review by higher level NLM staff.

The Phase II report was submitted to NLM’s Associate Director for Library Operations at the end of June and currently is undergoing internal review. If its recommendations are approved, follow-up activities would include the development of:

1) consistent policies for management of all servers that store NLM resources that have been rated “Permanent”;
2) written guidelines for assigning permanence ratings;
3) NLM-wide specifications for the format and location of permanence ratings and unique identifiers;
4) a set of applications that would link to electronic resources from their unique identifiers and assist in recording and maintaining permanence ratings; and
5) a prototype system.

The WGP expects that additional changes will be made to the proposed rating system as it undergoes review and implementation. Comments are welcome and should be directed to the author at <Margaret_Byrnes@nlm.nih.gov>.
A VIEW FROM THE SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION TRENCHES: “TEMPE PRINCIPLES” STIR FACULTY DISCUSSION
by David S. Ferriero, Vice Provost for Library Affairs and University Librarian, Duke University

Duke University’s Library Council was established by the faculty of the university in 1928 to exercise “general supervision over matters of policy” in the main campus library and its branches. Membership is comprised of faculty, undergraduate and graduate students, and library staff. Over the life of the Council, agendas have dealt with circulation policy, the Dewey Decimal Classification system, materials budgets, technology, space needs, etc. During the past four years, issues dealing with “scholarly communication” have been on the agenda with increased frequency in one guise or another, e.g., the serials budget, ownership of vs. access to information, the promise of electronic full-text, the university’s developing intellectual property policy, etc. Each discussion involved a significant amount of preparation and creativity on the part of the staff, including the presentation of spending projections and data on the problem of price inflation in scholarly publishing. Each meeting was a new opportunity to engage especially the faculty in the issues surrounding the future of scholarly communication.

Minimal success was enjoyed until we shared the “Principles for Emerging Systems of Scholarly Publishing” developed at the March 2000 Tempe, Arizona, conference sponsored by ARL, the Association of American Universities, and the Merrill Advanced Studies Center of the University of Kansas. Lively discussion ensued at two Library Council meetings resulting in a sense of understanding and ownership of the issues for the first time. The “Tempe Principles” more effectively engaged the faculty than did earlier discussions of scholarly communication issues because the Principles focus on an ideal state rather than starting from the current, problematic state. As a result, the level of discussion was raised. Furthermore, the Principles seem to personalize the issues in a way that encourages faculty to see themselves as creators and users of intellectual property and, therefore, as part of the positive change that can be effected within the system of scholarly communication.

Points of particularly spirited discussion prompted by the Tempe Principles include:
• Differences between the sciences and non-sciences—whose problem is it?
• Do junior faculty really have a choice in “judiciously assigning copyright?” Most do not want to jeopardize the publication of their work—which is necessary to earn tenure—in a dispute over retention of rights.

• The tenure case and new forms of dissemination—reflections on the quality of the information that now resides in electronic format convinces most Council members that peer review is absolutely necessary.
• Assignment of rights—I can’t do what?
• The practicality of managing copyright to assure faculty access. For example, the Principles suggest a variety of models for assigning reuse permissions. How would a potential “reuser” even begin to locate a copyright holder in some of these models? Is there a role for the Association of American University Presses in streamlining the permissions process?

Despite the issues raised, the Library Council unanimously adopted the Tempe Principles and assumed responsibility for educating their colleagues, using the principles as the discussion document. Tentative plans for the fall include a feature article in the Faculty Forum, Duke faculty’s newsletter, co-authored by a faculty member and the University Librarian, to stimulate interest in the topic. This will be followed by Library Council-hosted discussions for members of the community. In addition, the Provost and the University Librarian will be addressing the Academic Council, Duke’s faculty senate, using the principles as the springboard for discussion.

While we have not reached a state of having “created change,” here at Duke we have at last captured the attention and imagination of our faculty leadership. Thanks for the Principles!

The Tempe Principles are available online at <http://www.arl.org/scomm/tempe.html>.

—Copyright © 2000 David S. Ferriero

NEW ON THE
Create Change
WEBSITE

The CREATE CHANGE website is rapidly growing. New features include:

In the Resources section
<http://www.createchange.org/resources.html>
• Tables and Graphs
• Conferences and Symposia
• Success Stories

In the Issues section
<http://www.createchange.org/librarians/issues/quick.html>
• Managing Your Copyrights

Visit the CREATE CHANGE website often to view new content, including a forthcoming section on Editors Agreements.
<http://www.createchange.org/>
TRANSITIONS

Columbia: Elaine Sloan announced her intention to retire as Vice President for Information Services and University Librarian effective 1 July 2001.

Florida State: Charles Miller retired as Director of Libraries effective 31 August 2000. Bill Summers, retired Professor and Dean of the School of Information Studies, is serving as Acting Director of Libraries.

Georgia Tech: Richard Meyer, currently Director of the Library at Trinity University, was named Dean and Director of Libraries effective 16 October.

Guelph: Michael Ridley, Chief Librarian, is on administrative leave through 31 December to conduct research on digital libraries and work with the Ontario Library Association. Helen Salmon, Manager, Social Science and Arts Information Services, is Acting Chief Librarian during this period.

York: Ellen Hoffmann announced her intention to retire as University Librarian effective spring 2001 when she will begin an extended sabbatical leave.

OTHER TRANSITIONS

Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS): Elizabeth Sywetz, IMLS’ first Deputy Director for Library Services, resigned on 24 August 2000.

ARL STAFF CHANGES

Dawn Haglund joined the staff on 25 August as OLMS Training Program Assistant. Ms. Haglund brings extensive database management and event planning experience to the OLMS; she holds a B.A. in Business Administration with a concentration in Human Resources and Marketing. Ms. Haglund can be reached at <dhaglund@arl.org>.

Melanie Hawks, former ARL OLMS Adjunct Faculty Member and Staff Development Officer for the University of Utah Library, joined the OLMS staff on 5 September as Program Officer for Training. Ms. Hawks has strong facilitation skills and the ability to design both in-person and web-delivered content that is dynamic and practical. She may be contacted at <melanie@arl.org>.

Kaylyn Hipp, Editorial Specialist and Assistant Editor of the ARL Bimonthly Report, assumed a new role at ARL as Web Developer & Analyst, working primarily on the LibQUAL+ project. She brings five years of web-development experience and three years of data-analysis experience to the project. She may be reached at <kaylyn@arl.org>.

Bradley Houston, ARL Communications & Marketing Coordinator, announced her resignation effective 29 September to lead development efforts for the Society of General Internal Medicine.

DeEtta Jones, former Director of ARL Diversity Initiatives, was named ARL OLMS Director of Organizational Learning Services. In this newly created position, Ms. Jones assumes overall leadership of the ARL Office of Leadership and Management Services.

UCITA: A GUIDE TO UNDERSTANDING AND ACTION

A Satellite Teleconference
13 December 2000

The Uniform Computer Information Transactions Act (UCITA) is a proposed state law that would create a unified and potentially problematic approach to the licensing of software and information. Two states— Maryland and Virginia—have passed UCITA, and it will be under consideration in many other states in the near future. UCITA’s broad scope and focus on software and information raise issues of great significance to the research library community, in particular licensing, copyright, and fair use.

This teleconference will provide a valuable “primer” on UCITA, strategies for dealing with the legislation in your state, and an opportunity to ask the panelists questions. It is presented by ARL and four other library associations: AALL, ALA, MLA, and SLA.

Panelists:

James Neal, Dean of University Libraries, Johns Hopkins University

Rodney Petersen, Director, Policy and Planning, Office of Information Technology at the University of Maryland

Sally Wiant, Director of the Law Library and Professor of Law, Washington and Lee University

Cathy Wojewodzki, Librarian, Reference Department, University of Delaware Library and former member of the Delaware legislature

All four panelists have been actively involved in the UCITA debate in their home states.

Registration details are on the ARL website at <http://www.arl.org/ucita.html>.
### ARL Calendar 2000–2001

#### 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 16–</td>
<td>Training Skills Online: Facilitating Effective Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 24</td>
<td>Online Lyceum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 17–19</td>
<td>ARL Board and Membership Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 20–21</td>
<td>Measuring Service Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 23–26</td>
<td>Library Management Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute II: The Management Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30–31</td>
<td>To Preserve &amp; Protect: The Strategic Stewardship of Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library of Congress and ARL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1–3</td>
<td>Project Management Institute: Getting Things Done or Getting the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes You Want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13–15</td>
<td>Library Management Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute I: The Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evanston, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13–</td>
<td>Measuring Library Service Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>Online Lyceum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16–17</td>
<td>Advanced Workshop on Licensing Electronic Information Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 4–5</td>
<td>From Data to Action: An ARL Workshop on Strategies to Redesign ILL/DD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 7–8</td>
<td>CNI Task Force Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 13</td>
<td>UCITA: A Guide to Understanding and Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teleconference via satellite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00–4:00 p.m. EST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 8–9</td>
<td>ARL Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 23–25</td>
<td>ARL Board and Membership Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Note new dates!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 23–24</td>
<td>ARL Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16–19</td>
<td>ARL Board and Membership Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>