From the editor: Welcome to the inaugural issue of *Endnotes: The Journal of the New Members Round Table*. We are pleased to be presenting scholarly research by NMRT members in a separate publication for the first time. NMRT’s Scholarship, Research, and Writing Committee was created four years ago to give new librarians an opportunity to publish in a peer-reviewed environment. After three years in which this research formed the basis of a special, print issue of *Footnotes*, the committee has struck out on its own with a standalone online publication. In addition to the four research papers presented in this issue of *Endnotes*, the online format has allowed us to expand the publication to include reviews of books relevant to the new librarian. Through the reviews and papers, you will learn about approaches to the tenure process, greening library collections, models for gaining confidence as a subject specialist or liaison librarian, technology in special collections, writing for librarians, and more.

The mission of the Scholarship, Research, and Writing Committee (renamed the Endnotes Committee as of summer 2010) is dual: to publish scholarly research by and relevant to new librarians and to provide new librarians with an introduction to the world of scholarly publishing. I’d like to thank all the members of NMRT who submitted proposals and applied to review books, as well as the committee members who worked extra hard on this edition, researching and editing a solid set of papers after brainstorming how to reinvent the publication itself. Thanks especially to our assistant editor, Michael LaMagna, for many contributions and ideas. The committee is also grateful for the support of the NMRT board and the NMRT web committee.

Elizabeth Goldman, editor
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Abstract

This paper examines approaches to reference, collection development, and information literacy taken by a new subject specialist librarian at a large research university. It presents case studies for using various qualitative surveys and quantitative methods, including a collection development survey and information literacy post-assessments. Strategies are presented for tackling the challenges faced by a subject specialist librarian in an unfamiliar field. These efforts led to new services and liaison relationships with user constituencies. Specific services and approaches used are detailed including collection development decisions, information literacy program planning, and outreach programming. Finally, this paper proposes further research and recommends professional development resources.
Introduction

In contemporary academic libraries, the responsibilities of a public service librarian are as diverse as they are numerous. Duties range from the traditional buying of books to selection of electronic resources to outreach through new social networking media. Students, faculty, and research staff expect immediate access to information. Librarians new to the profession, new to an academic library, or new to a particular position face many challenges and may be unfamiliar with the university culture, the library’s users, and their colleagues. Finally, they may be unfamiliar with the academic disciplines served by their library and related resources.

Experience or a graduate degree in a related academic discipline can bring greater familiarity with specific information resources. This knowledge can be valuable to librarians working with users in these areas; however, libraries often serve more than one academic discipline. How does a professional librarian without a related subject degree tackle such challenges? This paper suggests looking to professional standards and literature to provide guidelines and following up each new project with documentation for future analysis.

Literature Review

Gary White (1999) conducted a study in which he analyzed academic library position announcements to characterize qualifications and responsibilities of subject specialist librarians. He reviewed business, social sciences, and science librarian job postings in American Libraries, College & Research Libraries News, and the Chronicle of Higher Education over a nine year period, looking at the number of positions, job titles, salaries, job responsibilities, required skills, and educational requirements. White found that the three most important job tasks were reference, information literacy, and collection development; faculty liaison activities also played an important role.

On a more general level, the NextGen Librarian's Survival Guide by Rachel Singer Gordon (2006) provides a number of topics of interest to new library professionals regardless of age. It focuses primarily on entry level jobs, making it most useful for those new to librarianship. Fundamentals of Collection Development & Management (Johnson, 2004) provides a baseline of skills in the many aspects of collection development and contains many useful examples of assessment, including a faculty questionnaire.

Stephen Pinfield (2001) discusses the changing nature of subject librarians in academic libraries where traditional roles extend into new areas. He notes much greater focus on the library user and the importance of proactively approaching user groups in formal and informal ways. The traditional job is still present but collection development becomes "advocacy of the collections" while teaching is transformed from simple bibliographic instruction into building "information" and "educational technology" skills. Though Pinfield acknowledges that a subject background is preferable for subject specialists, the reality is that "it is impossible for subject librarians to
have expertise in all of the subjects they are looking after” and that the ability to adapt and learn quickly is the most essential skill. *Building Bridges: Connecting Faculty, Students, and the College Library* (McAdoo, 2010) focuses on the importance of relationships between academic libraries and their constituencies. The book encourages librarians to pour energy into their jobs by expanding existing services and to "be proactive!"

Kara Whatley (2009) provides an overview of the new roles for subject or "liaison librarians" in the era of online information focusing on relationship building and "librarians as middleware." For each of the three traditional core roles affirmed by White and expanded by Pinfield Whatley gives examples of the striking changes that an online environment brings to the approaches and venues for effective activities. Librarians have become “embedded” in course-related instruction and partner with faculty to take part in designing courses and assignments. Finally, Whatley notes that collection development, while diminished in some ways by approval plan ordering, still requires strong relationships with users to create research collections for the future.

There is a large body of literature on assessment of library services in addition to many professional development programs. For a broad overview of assessment, *If You Want to Evaluate Your Library* (Lancaster, 1993) is useful. There are also articles that focus on the areas suggested by Pinfield and Whatley. For example, Lee, Hayden, and MacMillan (2004) assessed the delivery of reference services outside of the library to foster stronger relationships with academic departments. Another means of assessment, particularly useful for library serials subscription decisions, is citation analysis. Smith (1981) gives a balanced portrait of this method and advises how to use it as a factor in collection decisions. The *Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Institute for Information Literacy* (2010), which recently added a focus on assessment, is an excellent professional development resource for librarians who want to become effective teachers and instructors.

**Background**

After previous experiences at a small branch campus library, including liaison responsibility for all sciences, and then at a larger university as the sole engineering librarian, the author was hired as a subject specialist for mathematics and mathematical statistics at another large research university. A background in engineering and the sciences gave some preparation for such a position, but mathematics is unique. Although it might be said that "the library is their laboratory" (Tucker & Anderson, 2004, p. 8), mathematicians are very specialized, and it can take many years for a librarian to understand all aspects of the discipline. Anderson and Pausch (1993) wrote their seminal work *A Guide to Library Service in Mathematics: The Non-Trivial Mathematics Librarian* "to overcome any 'math anxiety' so that a new librarian could respond creatively and effectively to user needs.” Another difficulty for the author in the process of becoming a subject specialist was the closure of the math library, resulting in a new combined physical and mathematical sciences library. While the Math Library only moved across the street, the number of faculty and graduate students visiting declined noticeably during this time.
Approach

In order to take an informed approach to the responsibilities of a liaison librarian it was useful to consult professional standards and guidelines along with any local policies and best practices. Additionally, the experience of colleagues, though less formal, can provide important background information and organizational knowledge. Navigating the new position led to successes and failures. Regardless of the outcome, all experiences improved and helped tailor library services.

Reference

The nature of reference in libraries has changed and with it the Guidelines for Behavioral Performance of Reference and Information Service Providers, published by the Reference and User Services Association (RUSA) from its inception in 1996. Despite moving beyond the traditional reference desk to include email and chat reference, the Guidelines have kept a focus on "good communication skills" and stress the importance of a positive user experience in a reference transaction. The concept of embedded librarianship, where a librarian is present in the user's setting, stems from approachability practices such as the need to establish "a 'reference presence' wherever patrons look for it" and a number of guidelines related to "in person" and "follow up" service.

These indicators and other remote reference experiments on campus prompted the use of reference services embedded in the mathematics department (Meier, 2009). The initial time and location chosen for delivering these services preceded a weekly departmental tea, which in turn preceded a colloquium speaker series. The in conjunction with a colloquium speaker series. Because food and drinks are served, many members of the department stop in to chat and end up staying for the lecture. Librarian "office hours" started one and a half hours prior to the tea time in the same room, offering in-person assistance until the speaker began. Few faculty members and students showed up before the food arrived 30 minutes before the talk, so the time was shortened to one hour. A laptop and wireless network provided access to online library services, email, and information resources. Initially, the, department’s wireless network did not allow access to library circulation and acquisitions systems, but eventually this difficulty was resolved. Interactions between faculty and graduate students, during this time and in the library, increased with the physical presence. Additionally, many problems could be addressed on site, including gaining access to electronic journals, difficulties with interlibrary loan requests, and locating specific books in the library catalog.

Collection Development

When approaching collection development, combining a number of quantitative and qualitative methods is appropriate. A survey of library users is one of the first strategies suggested for academic library liaisons by the Guidelines for Liaison Work in Managing Collections and Services (ALA, 2001). In collaboration with other liaison librarians, a survey was developed and shared. Utilizing feedback from faculty members in the mathematics department, the group of
librarians removed or clarified questions, resulting in a final version (see Appendix). The survey was distributed by email, resulting in a response rate of 25% and yielding a diverse array of research topics and publishers of interest. Faculty indicated an interest in notification of new book arrivals through email, which became a new outreach service. Although students were not surveyed as part of this study, the questionnaire addressed graduate student research.

In order to make budget decisions during the annual renewal period for library serials, citation analysis was performed on faculty publications. The past three published journal articles of each faculty member in the mathematics department were identified and their cited references retrieved from a licensed citation database. Counting the frequency of journal titles among the citations yielded additional usage data that was combined with electronic journal access information to make selection decisions. It is much easier to determine the top journals than to find those with the lowest usage and citation counts, which made deciding to cancel subscriptions somewhat arbitrary. Faculty were interested to discover the most used journals in their department. Consequently, a "Top Ten" list of journals, produced to meet this need, is now an annual information service.

**Information Literacy**

The survey indicated that there was little interest in library instruction by the mathematics department. Semiannual discussions with administrators in the department confirmed this attitude was confirmed, resulting in very few library instruction sessions in practice. There was no information literacy program established within the department, but approaching individual faculty teaching "First Year Seminar" and "Writing Across the Curriculum" courses succeeded in a number of ways. For the first year experience course, a library tour, online tutorial, and online quiz were used as graded assignments in lieu of class time. Discussions avoided traditional bibliographic instruction and focused on evaluation of information, as in the *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* (ALA, 2000). This resulted in an entire class period devoted to the library in the upper level undergraduate writing course. The instructional materials for this course used selected objectives from the *Information Literacy Standards for Science and Engineering/Technology* (ALA, 2006) as educational outcomes.

Library course related instruction sessions and outreach, such as tours, were tracked along with class attendance and, when possible, library staff administered a qualitative survey of student expectations. Both courses showed a dramatic increase in participation from the mathematics department. For the capstone course, the majority of responding students indicated they had had a librarian speak to them, leading to increased confidence in information seeking skills.

In order to establish a more collegial relationship with faculty in the department, participation in regular seminars proved to be key. The library has worked with faculty to create a literary-themed event at a special departmental tea. Along with refreshments, the library brought posters of poetry and new library books, and faculty could check out popular science titles using a laptop. Following this success, the author was invited to give a lecture during a teaching
seminar on the library and the use of books to inspire students to pursue mathematics as a career. The experience increased interactions with teaching faculty and graduate students in the department and fostered a sense of inclusiveness.

Conclusions

While following institutional and professional traditions can be useful to a new librarian, there are benefits to seeking out current professional standards and appropriate assessments in order to move forward. Mistakes and failed attempts at new services can lead to future improvements and success, but only when a record of the experience is kept. Such a record can also be useful for promotion and tenure documentation. It was easier to note successes informally than to document them, but there is no way to share and build upon these feelings or transitory comments. Despite a lack of subject expertise in a particular area, success is possible with attention to guidelines and some initiative.

Recently, statistical tracking software was implemented at all reference services points, including remote reference. Data gathered in this way can be used to compare the viability and level of staffing for each reference service. As mentioned previously, collection development should not be based solely on one metric, such as citation analysis, or on one audience, such as faculty. Thorough evaluation should bring together usage statistics, interviews and user surveys, with strategic purchasing decisions and comparison to other libraries and universities. The qualitative survey of instruction sessions contains a great deal of data that was not aggregated or analyzed. It could provide a more holistic view of teaching successes and areas that require improvement.

Future Research

Each of the qualitative and quantitative approaches used merits improvement, further data collection, and longitudinal analysis. These assessments can be expanded, and there are many more outcomes to be measured. Additionally, this article has only focused on the efforts of a single librarian. In order to reach a conclusion about the professional development and education needs of subject specialist librarians, a study of expectations and experiences of new librarians in the field should be conducted.
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Appendix

Faculty Interest Survey

1. Name
2. Primary Department
3. Other Departments or Programs
4. Address (campus mail)
5. Office Address
6. Fax
7. Email Address
8. Please describe your current and future research and teaching areas of interest. Be as specific as possible regarding geographic coverage, historic periods, etc.
9. Please describe any additional topics that your students are researching.
10. Please list those organizations or publishers whose materials you find particularly useful to your research or teaching.
11. Which special types of materials are important to your research (in addition to books and journals)? Check all that apply.
   • Conference proceedings
   • Electronic resources
   • Maps
   • Microforms
   • Statistical data
• Technical reports
• Working papers
• Other, please specify

12. Does the existing Libraries collection adequately support your needs? Please describe any areas needing improvement.

13. Are you interested in having a subject librarian in your discipline offer library instruction to your students?

14. Would you like to be informed of current library acquisitions, events, and other information?

15. How do you prefer to be contacted?

• Email
• Campus Mail
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Abstract

This article examines the development of new instruction librarians through on-the-job training. Research includes a literature review, interviews with librarians, and a survey of library administrators. Perspectives from new librarians and administrators are gathered and compared through surveys and interviews, identifying a vast disconnect between these two groups. The authors provide suggestions for improving the quality and availability of training opportunities for new librarians in order to help them ease into their professional responsibilities and improve the quality of library instruction.
Introduction

Most academic librarians participate in some sort of instruction, be it showing an undergraduate how to use the library catalog at the reference desk, teaching students in an upper-level sociology class which databases are most appropriate, or training a new employee how to use the integrated library system. As new library school graduates scour job listings, they see requirements like “instruction experience,” and “teaching ability.” Once these brand new librarians arrive at their first jobs, they often find that they are expected to possess these skills already. They receive little training or guidance. The purpose of this paper is to explore how new librarians feel about on-the-job instruction training, what training they wish they were receiving, and how the situation might be improved. We define on-the-job training as both in-house and outside training. In order to meet these goals, we conducted interviews with new instruction librarians, as well as a survey of library administrators in order to gather multiple perspectives.

Literature Review

The literature discussing training for instruction librarians is abundant and ranges from the presence or absence of training in Library and Information Science (LIS) programs to professional development programs and topics in between. This discussion dates back over 30 years. While much has changed, such as the number of graduate schools offering classes on instruction, much remains the same. Petrowski and Wilson (1991) write about the need for in-house training and propose a solution to the lack of training for bibliographic instruction, including a checklist for developing a training program. More than ten years later in 2003, Hook, Bracke, Greenfield and Mills discuss the need for instruction training at the University of Arizona libraries and describe the specific modules developed to provide adequate training. This article demonstrates that there were not great improvements in training for instruction librarians during those ten years but that some libraries recognized this need and worked toward progress.

Wilkinson and Lewis (2006) discuss the need for comprehensive training in academic libraries and the important role that library administrators play in this effort, inspiring further investigation into the perspectives of library administrators. Walter (2006) frames the discussion of the development of librarians as teachers in the overall picture of instructional improvements in higher education. Looking at the literature, it is clear that the need for instruction training is not new. Although the problem has been much discussed, few solutions have been identified in the literature. Through interviews with new instruction librarians and a survey of library administrators, we have discovered fresh perspectives and solutions to this issue.

Instruction Librarian Interviews

Previous Research
In the fall of 2008, we administered a survey for new instruction librarians (graduates from 2003 to 2008) and collected more than 300 responses. This survey was distributed via the Information Literacy Instruction (ILI) and New Librarian (NEW-LIB) listservs. We focused on the availability of instruction training in graduate programs and also began investigating what kind of on-the-job training new instruction librarians received once in their first professional positions. As the literature would suggest, the respondents agreed that LIS programs were not adequately preparing librarians to teach. The respondents advocated raising awareness of the need for training and felt that quality courses in instruction should be offered regularly in graduate programs. Although the focus of this survey was training in graduate school, it included several questions about on-the-job training. The respondents expressed dissatisfaction with instruction training once in their first professional positions and identified specific improvements that could be made. New instruction librarians appreciated evaluation and feedback as a means to improve teaching and increase confidence. In addition to in-house training, asynchronous and inexpensive online training was a priority for new librarians. Results of this survey were illuminating and begged further investigation. We wanted to explore further the ways in which these librarians continued to develop once in professional positions.

Method

One year later, in the fall of 2009, we randomly selected 52 of the original respondents and asked them to participate in a follow-up interview regarding the issues that surfaced. After reviewing the original data, we developed 10 questions that expanded upon previous responses and addressed new topics as well (Appendix A). Over the course of a month, we conducted 25 interviews via email. The results were gathered in interview, not survey, format. Respondents answered open-ended questions and were not prompted with answer choices. Answers varied greatly, as these librarians interpreted questions in different ways.

All participants had been in the profession for less than five years. We were interested not only in expanding upon what we had learned from the first survey but also in discovering if these librarians had experienced any changes in their instruction training situations since the last time we were in contact.

Satisfaction with Training

In the initial interviews in 2008, this group of librarians expressed dissatisfaction with the availability and quality of on-the-job training. Not much had changed in the intervening period. Of those interviewed, 60% said there had been no changes in training over the past year, and 24% felt they had received “very little” training. These librarians felt that seeking training is their responsibility, although a few received institutional financial support for doing so. One in five described some changes in instruction training over the last year. These changes were often related to larger changes; for example, the hiring of new librarians or the addition of a for-credit information literacy course to the curriculum. One respondent described spending a semester team-teaching with an inexperienced new hire and reported a positive experience for both librarians.
Not surprisingly, almost half the librarians reported that their satisfaction level with on-the-job training had not changed over the past year, although 20% were somewhat more satisfied. These more satisfied librarians tended to be those who reported changes in training. Many of the respondents also indicated that they wanted more training than they currently received. Fourteen out of the 25 interviewees felt instruction training is very important. However, a significant minority said training had become less important to them as they gained experience in the classroom. The following are selected responses to the questions regarding satisfaction with training:

- “Even though I still want to work on my instruction skills and find new and better ways to do instruction, the informal feedback from instructors has increased my confidence so that needing formal feedback on my instruction skills is still highly valued but not as urgently needed as when I first started.”

- “It's essential to keep learning, growing, and trying new things in order to keep from stagnating.”

Training Activities

The previous survey showed that instruction librarians consider feedback to be extremely valuable as they work to improve teaching skills. The respondents received feedback from faculty, students, and colleagues, but 30% said they got very little formal feedback. Some gave students ‘one-minute’ papers at the end of class to garner a sense of the impact of their instruction work, but they also questioned the effectiveness of this technique. Others wished that colleagues were more open to participating in observation and giving feedback.

Regarding additional professional development and instruction training activities, 40% attended a conference in the last year, most often the American Library Association (ALA) and Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) conferences. Other than that, respondents also trained by reading library instruction-related listservs and blogs. We should note that this data was affected by the distribution of the original survey on the Information Literacy Instruction (ILI) and New Librarian (NEWLIB) listservs. Webinars and in-person seminars were also popular with a third of the respondent group. Several librarians had attended Immersion, ACRL’s intensive information literacy institute, with mixed results. In addition, librarians took advantage of the centers for teaching and learning that can be found on most campuses. By attending lectures and workshops along with faculty members from different departments, they developed teaching and classroom management skills.
The following are selected responses to the questions regarding training activities:

- “The only instruction training that I've had this year is following listservs and viewing some of the links and sources recommended. Not surprisingly professional development was cut to save money.”

- “I'm still going to conferences like ALA Annual and Midwinter...When I go to conferences, though, I do seek out sessions on instruction more than any other topic.”

- “I conducted an informal 'summer salon' for discussing instruction last summer, which I think was helpful.”

**Confidence**

Despite the marked lack of on-the-job training, these librarians reported high levels of confidence: 20% stated that they were ‘confident’ or ‘very confident’ and 44% were ‘somewhat confident.’ Eleven out of the 25 claimed increased levels of confidence over the past year, often citing positive feedback from faculty, colleagues, and students as the reason.

When asked with which aspect of instruction they were the most confident, the answers varied with little repetition. However, 20% felt most confident in developing lesson plans and teaching materials. Another 20% felt most comfortable with the content they taught. Two answers received three mentions apiece: creating assignments and activities and engaging students. This concept of engaging students, though, was also the most common answer to the next question: “With which aspect are you the least confident?” Twenty-four percent of the respondents found developing and maintaining student interest and involvement to be difficult. Public
speaking also appeared both places, with two librarians feeling most confident and three
feeling least confident in this aspect.

Figure 2. Confidence of New Instruction Librarians

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top five aspects of instruction with which the respondents were MOST confident:</th>
<th>Top five aspects of instruction with which the respondents were LEAST confident:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lesson content</td>
<td>1. Keeping student interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing lesson plans and teaching materials</td>
<td>2. Classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Creating assignments and activities</td>
<td>3. Public speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Engaging students</td>
<td>4. Assessing instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Public speaking</td>
<td>5. Unfamiliar subject matter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are selected responses to the questions regarding confidence with instruction:

- “My presentation skills are by far what help me 'survive and thrive' as I draw upon my skills as a former teacher and storyteller to create realistic research scenarios with typical problems researchers encounter.”

- “If most [students] are hostile or bored, I usually blame myself for not being able to make the instruction session interesting or relevant.”

- “I am most confident with my ability to set relevant learning goals for a session and to create and lead activities which teach students the skills required to meet these goals.”

Advice from the Instruction Librarians

The respondents tended to be particularly eloquent when it came to giving advice. Nine of the 25 recommend observation and peer evaluation, and several of these mentioned watching faculty from outside the library teach if possible. Five librarians asserted the importance of practice, and several encouraged team-teaching as a way to begin this process. In addition, 20% suggested that new librarians find a mentor for support and feedback. Almost three years ago, this research was inspired by a perceived lack of availability of instruction courses in MLS programs. Even now, 32% of the respondents urged graduate students to take instruction coursework. Some enthusiastically described a course they had taken; some lamented the fact that these classes were not available to them. They all agreed, however, that such courses are valuable. The following quotes are selected from the instruction librarians’ advice:
• “I am really glad I did take a course in instructional strategies while completing my MLIS [Master of Library and Information Science]. I think a course like that should be mandatory for all library students since most librarians have some sort of instructional duties.”

• “I think a trusting mentoring relationship between and instruction librarian with at least two years’ experience and a new instruction librarian would be an ideal way to allow for structured training, both formal and informal, in a way that is non-threatening and supportive.”

Survey of Library Administrators

Method

In order to gain a different perspective on on-the-job training for new instruction librarians, we gathered information from library administrators. As supervisors, these administrators are often the ones who decide which training is available to new librarians. We requested participation via several listservs, asking administrators to complete an 11-question survey (Appendix B). Through this survey 112 administrators shared what they see as the greatest needs for new instruction librarians, the types of training they provide or advocate, and anticipated developments and challenges in library instruction. Because we surveyed the administrators with many of the same questions we asked new librarians in the initial survey, the data from these two surveys are interesting to compare. While some perspectives of new librarians and administrators matched closely, others revealed a vast disconnect in perspectives between these two groups.

Availability of Training

In the first part of the survey, administrators answered specific questions describing training at their institutions. Eighty-six percent of respondents answered “yes” to the question “Do you (or your library) provide in-house training for new instruction librarians?” The next question revealed that the most common in-house training provided was “observing other librarians provide library instruction,” which 94% of respondents consider a training activity. “Receiving feedback from colleagues/other faculty” received the second highest response at 67%. Some common responses from administrators in the “other” category for this question consisted of team-teaching, informal discussion, and providing outlines and standardized curriculum for new librarians. In the 2008 survey of new librarians, 57% said that they have not received instruction training on-the-job, a much larger percentage than the 14% reported by library administrators.

Barriers to Training

Administrators reported time and budget as being the greatest barriers for providing adequate training for new instruction librarians, and one respondent commented that these two barriers are often one and the same. If there were no time or budget restraints, administrators reported
that they would provide more training. In fact, 28% of the instruction librarians interviewed reported that professional development funds had been cut at their institutions.

The top choice for ideal training activities was “attending workshops or conferences,” which 91% of administrators would support. Among the remaining choices were in-house workshops, receiving feedback from colleagues/other faculty, observing other librarians provide library instruction, reading library instruction literature, and online courses and webinars. None were supported by less than 70 percent of administrators. Many of these activities match those reported by the librarians in the survey and interviews. In the “other” category administrators mentioned the need for librarians to attend educational and instructional design training separate from library training and advocated specific workshops such as ACRL’s Immersion.

Training Activities

When describing on-the-job training, 92% of library administrators favored “attending workshops or conferences.” In addition, “online courses or webinars” and “reading library instruction literature” were supported by more than 80%. Other kinds of training mentioned were listservs and blogs, teaching training on campus, and mentoring programs.

Figure 3. What have you found to be the most successful training activities for new instruction librarians?
Administrators found that “observing other librarians provide library instruction” and “receiving feedback from colleagues/other faculty” were the two most successful training activities. Practice, team-teaching and co-teaching were also mentioned as effective training activities. In the previous survey new librarians were asked which training activities had been most helpful in preparing them for library instruction, and they ranked the choices in the same order, with similar percentages. It is worth noting that the highest-ranked activity, “Observing other librarians provide library instruction,” is relatively inexpensive and requires little staff.

**Perspectives on New Librarians**

We also asked administrators several questions about new librarians they hire. When asked, “Among new librarians that you hire, what do you find is the biggest area needing improvement?” 47% of administrators responded with “preparing a lesson.” “Speaking in front of a group” and “familiarity with concepts and lesson content” were ranked at 34% and 37% respectively. Many administrators also mentioned classroom time management, understanding students and determining student needs, and training in pedagogy. In the initial 2008 survey, new instruction librarians identified “speaking in front of a group” as the area where they were least confident, and “familiarity with concepts and lesson content” as the area where they were most confident.

**Perspectives on Graduate Programs**

Eighty-six percent of library administrators reported that they did not think graduate programs adequately prepared new librarians to teach. This response is not unexpected, as the previous survey revealed that new librarians felt the same way. Administrators provided more insight into this question, saying librarians didn’t lack an understanding of library concepts but rather teaching and learning concepts. Many mentioned the need for education in pedagogy and teaching fundamentals, and several indicated that LIS faculty lack experience since most are not practicing in the field. Other administrators argued that this question cannot be answered about all programs because some are making significant progress. Some pointed out that employers and administrators should not expect new instruction librarians to be seasoned teachers because this is a skill that is developed over time, even for those who do receive adequate training.

**Anticipating Challenges**

Looking forward to the future of instruction librarians, administrators were asked what they anticipate as being the greatest challenge for the next generation of librarians. Responses varied greatly, ranging from maintaining institutional support to staying abreast of new technology.

While viewpoints varied, overall administrators recognized the need for training new instruction librarians, and they were supportive of a variety of training activities. Owing to a perceived lack of training in graduate school, most were active in training for new librarians,
whether by in-house or outside means. The following quotes are selected directly from administrators’ response to the question of why training matters:

- “Keeping libraries relevant as teaching and learning institutions”
- “Learning how to teach in the online environment”
- “Inadequate education and preparation”
- “The greatest challenge is how to truly integrate information literacy throughout the curriculum”

Sharing different perspectives developed through years of experience, these administrators provided insight to the discussion of on-the-job training for new instruction librarians.

**Conclusion**

Considering the data from the instruction librarian interviews and administrator surveys together, we can see where these two groups are in agreement and where they differ. It is clear that these two groups perceive the training situation in very different ways. As previously noted, 86% of administrators indicated that they do provide in-house instruction training for new librarians, but almost a quarter of the interviewed librarians said that they receive no training. We suspect this disconnect is related to how these groups define training. The new librarians see peer observation as important but too informal, and the administrators see this as a vital part of instruction training. New librarians and administrators support many of the same professional development activities; both groups are highly in favor of attending workshops or conferences and receiving feedback. Sometimes librarians and administrators agreed on less pleasant topics: the instruction librarians lamented decreased professional development funds, while the administrators identified budget concerns as the greatest barrier to providing training.

These new instruction librarians are indeed making an effort to improve teaching skills, but the research suggests they would appreciate a more structured environment in which to develop as teachers. While the literature and research both demonstrate a growing commitment to instruction training, they agree that there is much room for improvement. Improved communication between librarians and administrators regarding training and expectations would likely help close this gap. In addition, no- or low-cost development opportunities should be sought out and publicized. Although the focus of this study was not to evaluate how LIS programs prepare instruction librarians, both groups mentioned the lack of a foundation provided in graduate school. Library school programs need to address this issue and ensure that the appropriate courses are offered regularly.

Future research should look more closely at these training activities and determine how effective and efficient they truly are. Librarians and administrators agree that observation and
feedback are crucial. Are they, in fact, worthwhile training activities? How and why do they help librarians develop teaching skills? When time and money are so limited, should we not make sure that the training and professional development activities in which librarians do participate make the most of both?
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Appendix A

Instruction Librarian Research Questions

1. In our previous survey we discovered that new instruction librarians highly value feedback on their teaching - do you agree or disagree and why? Explain the feedback that you receive and/or give.

2. Over the last year, have you noticed any changes in the way that instruction training on the job is provided at your institution? Please explain.

3. In our last survey, you described the additional training activities that you pursued on your own, e.g. following listservs, attending workshops. Describe the additional training activities in which you have participated this year. Are these typical for you, or have you made changes?

4. Has your satisfaction with on-the-job instruction training changed within the past year?

5. How important is on-the-job instruction training to you? Has this changed over the last year?

6. How confident do you feel in your instruction abilities? How has this changed in the past year and to what do you attribute these changes?

7. With which aspect do you feel most confident?

8. With which do you feel least confident?

9. Do you have any recommendations for ways that on the job training for new instruction librarians could be improved? Advice for these new librarians?

10. Is there anything else you would like to share about your instruction training experiences?
Appendix B

Library Administrator Survey Questions

1. Do you (or your library) provide in-house training for new instruction librarians?
   a. Yes
   b. No

2. If yes, what kind of in-house training does your library or department provide for new instruction librarians?
   a. observing other librarians provide library instruction
   b. receiving feedback from colleagues/other faculty
   c. in-house workshops
   d. other

3. What kind of training do you provide, advocate, or support besides in-house?
   a. attending workshops or conferences
   b. online courses or webinars
   c. reading library instruction literature
   d. other

4. Among new instruction librarians that you hire, what do you find is the biggest area needing improvement?
   a. speaking in front of a group
   b. preparing a lesson
   c. familiarity with concepts and lesson content
   d. other

5. If you had no time/budget constraints, what training would you provide or support for new instruction librarians?
   a. attending workshops or conferences
   b. online courses or webinars
   c. reading library instruction literature
   a. observing other librarians provide library instruction
   b. receiving feedback from colleagues/other faculty
   c. in-house workshops
   e. other

6. What do you see as the greatest barriers for providing adequate training for new instruction librarians?
   a. time
   b. budget
   c. institutional support
   d. willingness of new librarians to participate
e. other

7. What have you found to be the most successful training activities for new instruction librarians?
   a. observing other librarians provide library instruction
   b. receiving feedback from colleagues/other faculty
   c. attending library instruction workshops
   d. online courses or webinars
   e. other

8. Do you think that graduate programs adequately prepare new librarians to teach?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   Why or why not?

9. What do you anticipate as being the greatest challenge for the next generation of instruction librarians?

10. Is there anything else that you would like to say on this topic?
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Abstract  

Many writers in the library literature have addressed sustainability of the collection with regard to increased prices, user need, and format stability. To this list of concerns librarians should add the environmental impact of the different resources libraries choose. This article considers three facets of collection development: selection of materials whose content informs and assesses green practices; de-selection processes that emphasize reusing and recycling materials; and selection of a material format, specifically print or electronic, that honors the green dictum to reduce the carbon footprint an institution makes. The problem of reducing a library’s carbon footprint is perhaps the most complex and most contentious when it comes to the format of the collection. It is on the issue of print versus electronic resources that the present discussion of environmental sustainability will devote most of its focus.
Introduction

Libraries have long been icons of sustainability. Vested with the duty of maintaining knowledge and information from one generation to the next, libraries have sought to support the rich variety of human experience and understanding as part of their mission. Given their substantial history as institutions, libraries have also come to embrace library economy as a necessary tenet of operation. These traditions within the library make it ideally suited to embrace a newer, increasingly urgent call for sustainability: environmentally “green” collections. Both people and the environment benefit when “a book that is loaned ten times cuts not only cost but paper use per reader by a factor of ten” (Meadows, 2009). The library’s practice of loaning out a single item multiple times makes it an institution that “reuses” materials extensively, but what of the other two foundational practices of the Green Movement? How effectively do libraries recycle and reduce? Three facets of collection development are considered here: selection of materials whose content informs and assesses green practices; de-selection processes that make the most of the green mandate to reuse and recycle materials; and selection of a material format, specifically print or electronic, that honors the green dictum to reduce the carbon footprint an institution makes. The problem of reducing a library’s carbon footprint is perhaps the most complex and most contentious when it comes to the format of the collection. In evaluating the environmental impacts of monographs and of electronic resources, it becomes clear that books are ultimately more earth friendly. ¹

Background

In her article “The Green Library Movement: An Overview and Beyond,” Monika Antonelli (2008) provides a detailed look at the library’s formal involvement in green activities. The movement began in the early 1990s, with libraries showing substantial involvement around 2003. The journal in which Antonelli’s article appears is the Electronic Green Journal, which was preceded by The Green Library Journal: Environmental Topics in 1992. Around the same time, the American Library Association formed its Task Force on the Environment (TFOE), which still actively addresses issues of greening the library (p. 1-2; Stoss, 2009). Many within the library profession have become vocal advocates of reusing books, recycling paper (Jankowska, 2008), investing in green library architecture (Kuzyk, 2008), and providing green programming (Kuzyk, 2008; Colston, 2009; Urbanska, 2009, p. 54). In addition to the large-scale efforts to create sustainable libraries, individual librarians have creatively adapted local practices to produce greener results. Two libraries within a few miles of each other in Ames, Iowa, have set up a bike system for all of their interlibrary loan exchanges (Oder, 2008). Some librarians in Oregon have encouraged all staff to bike to work (Wann, 2007), and librarians in Noe Valley, San

¹ This paper was originally written under the direction of Dr. Jeff Weddle, University of Alabama SLIS program, for a Collection Development course in spring of 2009. My appreciation goes to him and to the members of my cohort for guidance and support throughout the program.
Francisco, public library have converted on-site green space into a community garden, tended by patrons and staff (Miller 2008). At the Clark County public library in Kentucky, the director, a gardener, has been saving heirloom seeds for her library (Antonelli, 2008, p.7), and to facilitate gardening and other do-it-yourself projects, the Berkeley Public Library has maintained a tool-lending library since 1979 (Antonelli, 2008, p.7-8).

Given all of these creative greening efforts, it is only natural to take a closer look at collection development practices that are influenced by or can be more closely adapted to green practice.

**Green Collection Development**

**Green Selection**

A look at the library literature suggests that there are several levels at which selection of green collection materials takes place. The first is when librarians educate themselves about green practices, green collection resources, and green programming materials. In New York, the Metropolitan New York Library Council created a Green Librarianship Special Interest Group (SIG), to further these educational goals (Antonelli, 2008, p. 5). In 2007, the University of Wisconsin-Madison graduate program in library science offered “Eco-Librarians: Changing Our Communities One Step at a Time,” and in December 2008, the Southeastern Library Network (SOLINET) was slated to offer “The Greener Library” as an online class (Antonelli, 2008, p. 5).

A second level of collection building occurs when librarians gather green information for their patrons. Crucial to the campus effort is building a green emphasis across the curriculum. Sometimes there is overt web presence concerning green issues and resources (Briscoe, 1994), and often, there are specific instructions for incorporating green topics, activities, and materials into syllabi (Brase et al., 2009; Link, 2000). The ALA (2009) also suggests ways to support community needs for green information. They urge libraries to build up their green collections in several ways:

- Provide open forums for green book clubs and facilities for environmental video viewings or lecture presentations
- Create opportunities for children to get excited about ecology, such as poster competitions or poetry sound-offs
- Select collection materials on organic gardening and composting or green computing and energy conservation
- Set library computer links and bookmarks to environmental issues sites
- Forge outreach relationships with local groups interested in environmental concerns and inquire about their information needs
- Work with local schools to support green curriculum and projects, such as murals or models of eco-systems

Link (2000) offers basic suggestions for campus librarians to use green resources in several of their roles on campus. The advice includes using green topics and resources as the basis for information literacy instruction sessions and publishing reviews of new green resources in the
campus newsletter or newspaper. Crumpton (2009) echoes these suggestions, noting librarians’ role in disseminating green information (p.36).

Finally, there are a number of review articles focusing on green resources to add to the library’s collection. For example, Eagan (2008) offers a “starter set” of titles for a sustainability collection (p. 40-43), as do Sotak and Zeidman-Karpinski (2007) in “Green Reading: Resources for the Sustainability-Minded.” Applin (2009) has created a substantial bibliography for academic libraries wishing to build their green resources, including reference works, serials, books, DVDs, and websites.

Weeding the Garden

Traditionally, de-selection in libraries has involved removing outdated or worn monographs and, on occasion, serials from the collection. Often, these were thrown away; however, as the emphasis on recycling strengthened, several more options appeared. Book sales and giveaways became standard, serving as supplemental income for the library or as a source of good will in the library’s relationship with the community (Penniman and McColl, 2008). The advent of the Internet, however, has increased recycling and reusing weeded materials. Penniman and McColl (2008) provide no fewer than sixteen online options for earning extra money for the library, for trading books with other interested parties, and for getting older books to readers who would otherwise go without. Multimedia communication and digitization have made for richer collections, but they have also contributed to the production of many hard-to-dispose-of items, like CDs, DVDs, cassettes, audiobooks, and VHS tapes, all with plastic cases. Some librarians are able to find reliable services like NextStep recycling, which takes many formats to recycle (Cole, 2007). Unfortunately, it is more difficult to recycle these sorts of multi-media waste products than it is to recycle or reuse monographs. Information about e-recycling is more disheartening; reputable recyclers who take items connected with electronics are hard to find (Elgin and Grow, 2008).

Green Collection Format: Print and Electronic

Rather than assessing the collection, the great majority of green library articles focus on the actual building that houses the library, with quite a number of articles on Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification (the de facto U.S. standard for green construction). As early as 2003, Brown describes examples in “The New Green Standard,” a paper followed by a flurry of articles covering green construction and retrofitting (Mikkelsen 2007; Fox 2007; Kuzyk 2008; Miller 2008; Miller and Fialkoff 2008; Gisolfi, 2009; Bushnell, 2009; Urbanska, 2009). No one should underestimate the value of building such libraries and of publicizing the green efforts of the library. These structures can serve as welcoming community assets as well as brick-and-mortar models of how green principles can be made concrete.

Within these green buildings, however, decisions about resource format need to be made. Finding information in the library literature that conducts a head-to-head comparison of the environmental impact of print versus electronic resources is difficult. Numerous studies have
been published which contrast the two formats listing the benefits each type brings with the
cost. Connaway and Lawrence (2003), McElfresh (2006), Zhang and Haslam (2005), and Borrelli,
Galbraith, and Brady (2009) all attempt to clarify the issues of pricing, rights, accessibility,
archiving, and processing of each type. One of the most comprehensive and useful analyses of
the cost-benefit ratio of print versus electronic resources focuses on Drexel University’s
conversion from primarily print resources to an almost entirely electronic collection (King,
Boyce, Montgomery, and Tenopir, 2003). Comparing the two format types is complex, with
evaluations of “service input and output, performance, usage, effectiveness, outcomes, impact,
and cost and benefit comparisons” (King, Boyce, Montgomery, and Tenopir, 2003, p. 376).

These studies balance almost all of the regular concerns of collection development. Given the
precedent in libraries, however, of considering the environmental impacts of collection
information content, of de-selection, and of the library buildings themselves, it is appropriate to
add to any cost-benefit analysis a consideration of the carbon footprint and the toxin footprint
of resource formats.

Though the author could find no quantitative studies in the library literature comparing the
environmental impacts of each of these resource formats head-to-head, librarians have not
failed to worry about the issue. Becken (2009) is concerned about increasing dependence on
fossil fuels in libraries, as growing digital collections require more use of electronics yearly (p.
55). Jankowska (2008) argues that:

> Today the tradition of sustainability has been overshadowed as digitization,
collection development, and providing adequate technologies have become core library
missions. Academic libraries must keep up with user demands and needs, but that does
not mean that we should turn our backs on the very concepts that libraries were
founded on. This is not even a matter of maintaining the past; it is an issue of
developing and planning for a future that is realistic, achievable, and most importantly—
sustainable.

She finds fault with ACRL’s “Environmental Scan 2007” for not directly addressing issues of
sustainability with regard to resource type. She voices concern that not enough is being done
to recycle weeded materials:

>F>urthermore, each library throws away or rarely recycles weeded and unneeded
printed books, government documents, magazines, newspapers, bound periodicals, junk
mail, office computer paper, and general waste. As the number of digital projects and
functions escalate, libraries are faced with increasing energy costs, as well as need to
recycle unwanted equipment, outdated computers, CDs, computer discs, and used
computer paper. (Jankowska, 2008)

She is also concerned about patrons’ expectations of an ever-increasing collection and the
environmental and budgetary impact of these larger collections (Jankowska, 2008). She ends
with a series of questions specifically about library collections’ environmental impact

---

2 Jankowska and Marcum have since extended this analysis in “Sustainability Challenge for Academic Libraries,” a
pre-print that appeared in ACRL Insider in summer, 2009. The pre-print addresses many of the issues I discuss in
this paper, though my emphasis is on all types of libraries and I seek to quantify the CO2 impact of formats in the
collection.
specifically, contending that unless these needs are addressed in library planning and operation, libraries will eventually only be able to provide “limited access to information to a limited number of people” (Jankowska, 2008).

Print Resources: Environmental Impacts

The environmental impact of the publishing industry in the United States is substantial: “[T]he manufacture of paper consumes over 15 percent of all the energy used by all types of manufacturing activity in the U.S.” (Peters, 2009, p. 3). As with any complex manufactured product, the impact is multifaceted. Trees are cut and processed, paper production involves several steps, and then books are created, marketed, and shipped. All of these steps require energy consumption. The largest portion of the publishing industry’s carbon footprint, however, is in the cutting down of trees which would otherwise serve as CO2 storage, at 62.7% for “forest and forest harvest” (see Table 1) (Milliot, 2008). Each monograph is calculated to create 8.85 lbs. of CO2 equivalent in emissions over the course of its production (see Table 2) (Milliot, 2008). The carbon footprint and carbon emissions of the publishing industry break down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Source of Carbon Emissions in the U.S. Book Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Segments of the Industry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest and Forest Harvest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Production, Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Releases (methane)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution and Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Storage in Books and Energy Recovery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Environmental Trends and Climate Impacts: Findings from the U.S. Book Industry (qtd. in Milliot, 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: The U.S. Publishing Industry’s Carbon Footprint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.086 billion: Number of books sold, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15 billion: Number of books produced, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 million metric tons: Amount of paper consumed for books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%: Average book return rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%: Amount of recycled paper in books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.85 lbs. CO2 equivalent: Carbon footprint per book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4 million metric tons: Total carbon footprint of book publishing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Environmental Trends and Climate Impacts: Findings from the U.S. Book Industry (qtd. in Milliot, 2008)

In detailed discussions of the current status of forests and planted acreage in North America, Ynostroza (2008) and Miller (2009) acknowledge the difficulty of calculating the CO2 footprint of the paper industry, but they each point to continuing innovations for reducing that footprint. Upton (2008), president of Malloy, Inc., a printing company, defends print publishing, noting forests harvested for printing in the U.S. and Canada (the two largest publishers of
monographs) are being replanted at more than a replacement rate (p.3). He also points out that printed material is more easily recycled than other resources (p. 5-6).

A consideration of the environmental impact of print is important because most libraries still contain a significant number of monographs; however, the trend is toward using e-resources in serials rather than print (Franklin, 2004).

**Electronic Resources: Environmental Impacts**

The carbon footprint of e-resources as determined by their electricity use is substantial and growing. Current news reports have focused on the amount of energy consumed in Internet searches; one estimate “puts the CO2 emissions of a Google search at between 1 [gram] and 10g, depending on whether you have to start your PC or not. Simply running a PC generates between 40g and 80g per hour” (Leake and Woods, 2009). Our increasing dependence on computers comes at a cost: “EPA estimates that the nation’s servers and data centers consumed about 61 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity in 2006 for a total electricity cost of about $4.5 billion” (Marsan, 2007, p. 26). A typical computer running the entire length of an 8-hour business day creates 618 pounds of CO2 every year while in use. Laptops are better, creating 77 pounds of CO2 every year at the same usage levels (Lexington Global Warming Action Coalition Carbon Footprint Calculator, 2007). When the EPA compared usage rates over the years, it found that the energy consumed by servers and data centers doubled over five years’ time, and it projected that these large jumps in usage would continue, unless active measures were taken to reduce consumption (Green Information Technology (IT) Strategic Plan, 2009). Within the business sector, some estimates are that “server computer performance has been increasing by a factor of three every two years, but energy efficiency is only doubling in the same period” (Herring, 2009, p. 33).

While libraries obviously do not accommodate the massive amount of search traffic that Google and other commercial search engines get, and therefore have much smaller footprints, Alpi (2000) noted that 100% of libraries surveyed offer electronic journals, and Miller and Fialkoff (2008) estimate that “about one-third of energy use in libraries is in ‘plug load’ from computers and other tools” (p. 14). As context, Marsan (2007) notes that the amount of electricity consumed by servers and data centers each year is “more than the electricity consumed by all the nation’s color televisions and similar to the amount of electricity consumed by 5.8 million U.S. households” (p. 26). An example that is a bit closer to home for librarians is Nicholas Carr’s estimation that “maintaining a character (known as an avatar) in the Second Life virtual reality game requires 1,752 kilowatt hours of electricity per year. That is almost as much [as is] used by the average Brazilian” (Leake and Woods, 2009).

The environmental impact of e-resources does not stop with electricity use, however. E-resources are associated with increased paper use, as library patrons and staff print out articles for in-house use or as a result of electronic reserves: One survey on library e-resource behaviors found 69% of respondents reported increased printing (Alpi, 2000). Nardozza and Stern (2006) observe: “Ironically, the most promising paperless educational tools, including courseware and
the internet, have triggered a dramatic increase in hard-copy output” (p.2). Increased printing is a trend across campus (Brase et al. 2009, p. 11; Li and Lee, 2009, p.1) and librarians have witnessed it as well (Springman 2008; Luther Campus, 2010).

Other facets of computer use and disposal are also important in determining environmental impacts of e-resources. Recycling and reusing computer cartridges, such as those for toner, currently saves “38,000 tons of plastic and metal” from ending up in landfills (Alpi, 2000), but much of this waste is not recycled in libraries. An EPA study done in 2005 estimated that only about 15 to 20% of about two million tons of discarded electronics actually gets recycled (CoSN.org, 2009). By 2008, that e-waste estimate had increased to 3 million tons in the United States (Canada produced about 140,000 tons) (Delaney, 2008). While e-waste includes cell phones and other electronics, a substantial proportion of each pound of waste is made up of computer components. In addition to plastic, e-waste contains lead, mercury, and cadmium, all toxic and all capable of leaking into the soil and water supply (CoSN.org, 2009). Consumer Reports notes that the typical CRT computer contains four to eight pounds of lead (“Electronics Reuse and Recycling Center,” 2008).

These sorts of statistics may seem hopelessly huge, but industry has begun to respond to customer demands for greener practices.

A Greener Agenda: Industry Efforts

Several major publishing institutions have set goals to harvest fewer trees. Random House was one of the earliest to set a goal of using 30% recycled paper as part of its publishing; it hopes to accomplish this by 2010, cutting 500,000 fewer trees annually (Deahl, 2006). Simon and Schuster aims for 25% recycled paper use by 2012 and has instituted an in-house policy of distributing e-copies of galleys instead of paper copies (Deahl, 2007). Scholastic Books has also targeted the goal of using 30% recycled paper, which has been Forest Stewardship Council-certified, by 2012. By the time the company reaches its goal, it calculates that it will reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by 24 million pounds (Milliot, 2008).

On the electronic front, some progress is being made as well. Google has developed a gadget for Google Desktop that instructs a computer to adjust Windows users’ power settings to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s recommendations, in addition to allowing users to track how much energy they are using (Greenwood, 2008, p. 52). Verdiem Corporation has come out with a similar product called SURVEYOR, which cuts energy consumption by 30%. Of special note for librarians, Wiley-Blackwell is working to become carbon neutral by investing in projects around the world that work on reforestation and on using methane from landfills to make electricity. EBSCO Industries hopes to be energy efficient in its mill building by using solar panels, and it is also investing in global reforestation projects (Greenwood, 2008). While these companies are not the only ones who need to be concerned about their environmental footprints, perhaps these key players will contribute to peer-pressure for greener practice.
Greener Collection Development

Creative librarians can have an enormous influence on how patrons see their information-gathering. Librarians can bring their love of detail, their dedication to library economy, and their knowledge of global issues to bear on their consideration of the environmental impacts of the resource types they choose for their collections.

For those librarians who feel that their patrons will not tolerate any diminution of electronic resources, there are a number of practical ideas that will dramatically decrease energy usage by computers in the library. Among them are:

- Choosing only Energy Star compliant computer components (Neale, 2008)
- Consolidating servers in large institutions
- Using virtualization so that multiple patrons can share a single machine’s computing power
- Managing equipment replacement cycles mindfully and having older computers repaired (Brase et al., 2009)
- Finding reputable recyclers of e-waste (despite a ban on trading hazardous waste, Elgin and Grow (2008) found at least 43 companies who were purported to be recycling but who were in fact shipping toxic e-waste to Asia)
- Recycling toner cartridges and choosing “green” inks
- Reducing overall paper use and, when paper is necessary, using recycled, chlorine-free, FSC certified paper (Milliot, 2008)

Another collection development decision that may seem counter-intuitive is to return to more use of monographs in the collection as a whole. Several studies have noted that for particular types of research needs, many people prefer print to electronic resources (Siebenberg, Galbraith, & Brady, 2004; Gregory, 2006, p. 268; Walters, 2008, p. 579; Borrelli, Galbraith, & Brady, 2009; Snyder, 2010). A number of authors in the library literature work on the assumption that delivering information digitally is necessarily greener than using monographs in the collection (Crumpton, 2009, p. 36; Urbanska, 2009 p. 54; Herring, 2009, p. 32), and calculations to create a head-to-head comparison of the two types of resources are quite complex (Miller, 2009, p. 33). However, a book creating 8.85 pounds of CO2 equivalent impact versus a computer used over the course of a week to search and find the equivalent amount of information for 11.88 pounds of CO2 would indicate that the book has a smaller impact environmentally (calculations of CO2 equivalent are based on amounts used by each type of resource, detailed above). This estimate does not include the environmental impact of the computer’s ultimate disposal as e-waste. This comparison also does not begin to calculate the CO2 savings that result when the same book is used multiple times to access the information. The e-resource would use additional energy and would compel more printouts each time separate users wanted the same information.

Rebsamen (2008) adds further evidence that books are more environmentally sound by pointing out that publishers are heeding consumer demands for greener practices. Book waste, he contends, is “very close to 100 percent” recyclable (p. 8). In a detailed treatment of book
binding’s environmental impact, he argues that “covering materials and adhesives are, in most cases, and as stated in regards to the environment, a very friendly product” (p. 8). Librarians can use these additional pieces of information to make the best decisions for their patrons.

Conclusion

The library’s position as an environmentally sound institution preceded the current green movement. Its emphasis on multiple users of single items and its wish to preserve items over time both make for sound sustainability practices. These traditions are fundamentally connected to the “reuse” and “recycle” components of the green movement. The library has also been adept at being flexible with regard to library functions and patrons’ needs as new technologies have come to the fore. It is with this flexibility that librarians will adapt to changes in environmental concerns moving into the twenty-first century. Of continued necessity will be comprehensive understanding of community information needs, continued critical evaluation of emerging technologies, and continued creativity. If Jankowska (2008) is correct that “the tradition of sustainability has been overshadowed” and that librarians will face “increasing energy costs, as well as [the] need to recycle unwanted equipment,” then having a higher ratio of print to electronic resources in the collection would be more environmentally sound. It is likely, however, that e-resources will remain a significant portion of most libraries’ collections. Reclaiming the tradition of sustainability will thus involve mindfully and consistently adopting energy-saving and resource-recycling policies and behaviors. Librarians already have the skills and talents to create a balance between conflicting needs and, as they clarify this collection development process for their library users, in formal information literacy classes as well as at the reference and circulation desks, communities and campuses will recognize that being information-literate will also involve being environmentally-literate.
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Abstract

This article presents a model of collaboration to manage the research responsibilities in the librarian tenure process, a model that has been successfully used by the authors since November 2008. It includes a wiki, weekly meetings, and a timeline to plan, organize, and implement project goals. The routinization of the research process reduces anxiety, clarifies goals, and makes it possible to collaborate on multiple projects simultaneously.
Introduction

Librarians in tenure-track faculty positions have responsibilities beyond basic librarianship. At East Carolina University, for example, tenure-track librarians are expected to publish in scholarly journals, present at conferences, and demonstrate service to the profession on a local, state, and national level. Many librarians find the publishing process and professional presentations stressful.

The authors are tenure-track librarians at Joyner Library at East Carolina University (ECU). At Joyner Library, tenure-track positions require 70-80% teaching, 10-15% service, and 10-15% research. For librarians at ECU, teaching is synonymous with job responsibilities, which also include daily work activities such as cataloging, reference work, instruction, and administrative duties. Service to the profession can be completed on many levels, including service to the library, campus, state associations, and national associations. Research options include poster sessions, conference presentations, and publishing in professional and peer-reviewed library science journals. Publishing multiple times in peer-reviewed journals is essential to meeting the tenure requirements.

East Carolina University’s tenure process takes seven years to complete. The process consists of annual personnel evaluations, reappointment decisions at the end of the second and fourth years, and an application for tenure early in the sixth year. Each reappointment decision requires written evidence submitted to the tenure committee to illustrate contributions to teaching, service to the profession, and scholarship. Cumulative documentation is compiled in a personnel action dossier, which is submitted to a committee of all tenured faculty members, who vote on the materials for reappointment evaluations and the tenure decision. The final dossier is due at the beginning of the sixth year in order to allow time for the final tenure vote and a job search if the application is unsuccessful. The tenure decision requires votes from the library’s tenure committee, the dean of libraries, and university administration. ECU’s tenure process is documented in Appendix D of the Faculty Code (ECU Faculty Senate 2007). Other libraries have similar tenure and promotion requirements.

For academic librarians with tenure-track faculty status, tenure requirements must be fulfilled over and above the normal duties of librarianship. The models for obtaining tenure vary, but the most common elements for evaluation are librarianship (sometimes called teaching), service, and publication. Faculty for whom scholarly publication is required often find that it can assume an enormous presence in their work life. Librarians tend to have longer work weeks than teaching faculty and are less likely to begin their careers with a strong research agenda and research experience. According to Mitchell and Swieszkowski, (1985) despite the stress tenure requirements may cause, most tenure-track librarians’ tenure applications are successful (p. 253). Although most librarians have 12 month contracts, rather than the 9 month contracts of teaching faculty, they find time for both librarianship and scholarship.
Literature Review

There are a significant number of publications on tenure for academic librarians dating back to W.E. Henry’s 1911 article, “The academic standing of college library assistants and their relation to the Carnegie Foundation.” The contemporary discourse on tenure for academic librarians tends either to survey the current situation, to discuss problems with the system, or to offer advice for success.

Park and Riggs’ (1991) extensive survey on librarians with faculty status found that at 85 percent of their institutions, these librarians are evaluated on research and scholarship. Nevertheless, lack of publication was not a common reason for tenure denial (p. 285). Welch and Mozenter (2006) observed that less than 50 percent of academic librarians are eligible for tenure and that only tenure can ensure “(1) full participation in university governance, enhancing the library’s role in academe; (2) academic freedom; and full opportunity for professional growth” (p. 174). The impact of publication on tenure is debated. Mitchell and Swieszkowski (1985) found that lack of publication was the most frequent reason for tenure denial (p. 235). However, Mitchell and Reichel (1999) discussed the problems of research and publication for academic librarians and came to the same conclusion as Park and Riggs: The lack of publication record was not a common cause for tenure denial among librarians (p. 237). Both studies noted high rates of tenure success for academic librarians.

The most common form of support for the tenure process in library literature is the formal mentoring program in which tenured faculty members provide support and advice for tenure-track librarians. An example of which is Louisiana State University (LSU) Libraries’ formal mentoring program. The program began in fall 1998 to help tenure-track librarians meet the requirements of tenure and promotion (Kuyper-Rushing, p. 440). The mentoring committee created an extensive plan for both mentors and mentees. All tenure-track librarians were required to participate but could not be mentored by a supervisor or someone in their department (p. 442). The program began with an expert-led workshop on developing the skills needed for a successful mentoring relationship, including interpersonal skills, developing a mentoring contract, the art of mentoring, evaluation techniques, and the role of self-leadership in the process (p. 442-3).

Miller and Benefiel (1998) advocate the support group as a strategy for success and a way to cope with challenges to the formal mentoring model. The major challenges potential mentees face include finding someone willing to serve as a mentor and whether or not the mentor has enough time to contribute to the relationship (p. 261). The challenges of formal mentoring and the benefits of working with peers led librarians in the Sterling C. Evans Library at Texas A&M University to create the Tenure Support Group. The group met monthly for “brown-bag” lunches, open to all librarians, which included informal discussions and invited presentations (p. 262). Some of the positive effects of participating in the group included the opportunity to share common experiences and anxieties, meeting colleagues, learning about colleagues’ research, getting feedback on projects, how to participate in professional development, finding
colleagues interested in collaboration, providing a welcoming group for new faculty members, and attending high-quality presentations (p. 264).

Level and Mash’s (2004) peer mentoring program at Colorado State University Libraries (CSUL) furthers the evolution of peer support in the tenure process. They define peer mentoring as “an approach to pair an inexperienced person with a knowledgeable individual or group of the same status” (p. 304). Level and Mash (2004) observe the importance of developing relationships with peers in “overcoming the feelings of loneliness and isolation that new campus employees often face” (p. 305.) However, the major drawback of peer mentoring is the limited experience of the collaborators. Kathleen M. Quinlan (1999) postulates that “even junior members of an organization have experience, information, skills, knowledge, and perspectives which will be helpful to peers” (p. 35).

The CSUL peer mentoring group closed the gap between the formal mentoring program and the responsibilities faced by a growing number of new tenure-track librarians (p. 307). Initially, the “juniors” met once a month during regular work hours but later transitioned to quarterly meetings. Agendas included formal presentations by tenured and tenure-track librarians as well as informal discussion sessions (p. 307). Members of the peer mentoring program at CSUL experienced many of the same benefits discussed by Miller and Benefiel such as creating research ideas, providing an arena for open discussions, and improving communication amongst all faculty (p. 308).

A Model for Collaborative Research

This collaborative research model provides a way to manage the research responsibilities of the tenure process between peer collaborators which can work for small or large groups in one or more libraries. The four steps include planning for collaboration, setting a meeting schedule, organizing with a wiki, and completing a project. This model was developed as a result of the authors’ research experience in which one author was new to the tenure process and the other was new to the profession. It has been used successfully by the authors since November 2008. In that time, the authors have given two regional conference presentations, completed and submitted two papers to peer-reviewed journals, and been accepted for a poster session at a national ALA conference.

Prior to developing this technique, the authors considered research the most intimidating part of the tenure process. Selecting a topic and initiating a project were particularly daunting. The authors emulated two colleagues’ method of meeting weekly to work on a research paper. A research project idea emerged and project development started in earnest after a few brainstorming meetings.
Plan for Collaboration

Research partners should develop a collaboration agreement to clearly outline expectations for the partnership. There are several things to consider when creating a collaboration agreement. First, determine who will be participating in the collaboration and how long the commitment will last. One option is to work on a single project and then reevaluate the arrangement later. Next, decide how and where you will meet, for instance at your local coffee shop weekly or via Skype once a month. The authors found it useful to meet away from their offices in order avoid distractions. Be aware that the agreement might change over time but establishing it at the outset gives the participants a clear starting point.

Set a Meeting Schedule

Choose a meeting schedule that works for all members. Robert Boice (2000) and Paul J. Silvia (2007), in their books of advice to new professors, credit methodical work as the number one indicator for publishing success. Consider scheduling meetings a semester in advance to avoid future conflicts. Regular meetings encourage productivity and steady progress toward research goals. It helps to compartmentalize research to working meetings, thereby reducing anxiety about the research process at other times. The authors agreed on two-hour meetings every Friday morning, and additional meetings were only rarely needed. If sessions are frequently rescheduled, the meeting time should be renegotiated by the collaborators.

Sometimes it is necessary to do homework outside of the meeting. In order to reduce questions about how much homework to complete, predetermined a quantifiable amount of work to be accomplished outside of the meeting, (e.g., read for two hours, write a certain number of pages, etc.). This technique reduces guilt about how much to accomplish outside a meeting and it will help collaborators determine when they have completed their homework. Occasionally, a meeting will start slowly or take a while to get into a productive rhythm. If this happens, continue working on the project, and eventually a sluggish start will transform into an effective working session. If a session is still ineffective, a walk may help to clear the mind. Some of the meetings for which the authors felt the least enthusiasm later proved to be the most productive.

Weekly meetings are helpful to alleviate stress, keep the work load evenly distributed, and keep projects on track. Compartmentalizing projects during the meetings allowed the authors to focus on work outside of the meetings and avoid unneeded concern over research projects. The workload was explicitly and evenly divided because work was completed only during meetings or as occasional homework assignments. The method required the authors to be accountable to one another and to the collaboration agreement.
Organize with a Wiki

The next step is to organize the project. There are multiple ways to do this. The authors’ project management solution came in the form of a wiki. Wikis are web-based, have the capacity to upload and store documents, and most important, their content is separate from other work documents. As reference librarians, the authors worked at computers in the office, at the reference desk, or at home; therefore, it was important not to be tied to a specific location. The wiki’s uploading feature provided a place to store project information, and the documents could then be accessed from anywhere with an internet connection. It was important to keep the research planning documents separate from other work in order to compartmentalize projects into research meetings.

The wiki acted as a repository for ideas, current projects, deadlines, and calls for research. It provided a record of what was done, project agreements, and plans for the future. The wiki’s homepage included the main schedule, links to ideas, and links to each project. The schedule included final due dates for each project, due dates of calls for proposals, and long term plans. New research ideas were always recorded in the wiki. Whenever a research project was informally discussed, the ideas were recorded no matter how insignificant they seemed at the time. Any further discussions on a previous idea were also added. Many of the informal conversations eventually evolved into research projects. Each project was linked from the homepage and had multiple subpages with a to-do list, schedule, ideas, and final products.

As a result of this exhaustive record, projects could be put on hold and returned to later without confusion. It was surprising to rediscover ideas that were recorded during a research meeting and subsequently forgotten. Without the wiki, this information could have been lost. This record provided a tool for managing multiple projects simultaneously and reduced questions about the feasibility of a new project. It made it easy to tell if there was time for a new commitment.

Complete a Project

The final step is to complete the research project. The most effective way to finish projects is by creating and adhering to deadlines. The authors conceptualized deadlines as either macro or micro. Macro deadlines are the major deadlines of a project. For example, the completion of an entire section of a research paper. In order to complete a major deadline, numerous micro deadlines must be met, such as writing individual paragraphs, citing a quotation, and proof reading. This method helped to subdivide the deadlines for a project and kept track of every detail. The satisfaction of completing deadlines, no matter how small, helped encourage the completion of a project. At each meeting, the authors reviewed the prioritized list of micro deadlines produced from the previous week. The micro deadline determined what projects would be discussed at the current meeting.
It should be noted that deadlines are a balancing act. Ideally, there should be progress toward completing a micro deadline each meeting. At the same time, collaborators should be flexible. Always try to meet a project goal, but be aware when something needs more time to develop, at which point you should extend the deadline. Keeping an updated schedule allowed the authors to plan projects and to know clearly if a project was on schedule. A major portion of the authors’ success is because of their adherence to the planned schedule. Even on days when inspiration waned, sticking to the schedule meant that something was always accomplished.

Conclusion

This collaboration method provides numerous benefits. A peer partnership is a boon to research productivity because the collaborators are accountable to each other and to the collaboration agreement. Regular meetings encourage output and methodical progress toward tenure goals. A wiki is an effective project management tool. It is a repository for ideas, current projects, deadlines, and calls for research. It keeps a record of what was done, project agreements, and plans for the future. An updated schedule provides a blueprint for planning projects and sticking to the schedule lays the groundwork for success. The routinization of the research and writing process results in less stress and greater productivity.
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Reviewed by Anthony Prince, Jr., Library Information Specialist II (cataloger), University of Missouri-Kansas City

It would be difficult to find a book that tackles more topics in library management in fewer pages than Jack E. Fritts, Jr.’s handy volume. Fritts, who provides the introduction to this rather brief book, succeeds in creating a collection of essays that outline the challenges that often arise in library management and demonstrate effective ways to meet those challenges. Each chapter, contributed by a different author, follows the same basic formula: presenting a scenario that highlights a number of problems relating to library management followed by a discussion of concrete solutions to the problems.

The chapters are concise, manageable, and practical. By design, it is not a book about management theory or a textbook. It offers practical scenarios, from navigating campus politics in the chapter, “Keeping Your Library on the Right (Correct) Side of Campus Politics,” to the chapter, “Developing Power and Influence as a Library Manager.” The ideas in this book are not substantially new or groundbreaking, but the presentation and concise exposition make it an appreciated guidebook. If looking for a broader look at library management, consider the older but still relevant, The Library Manager’s Deskbook: 102 Expert Solutions to 101 Common Dilemmas (Carson, Carson, & Philips, 1995).

In Mistakes, each chapter is a short essay outlining a scenario, which means the book lacks in-depth examination of theories behind the situations presented. For that, readers may consult the standard text in the field, Library and Information Center Management (Stueart & Moran, 2007). Leadership Basics for Librarians and Information Professionals (Evans & Ward, 2007) is also good for its more detailed investigations into leadership.

Do not be fooled by the word “academic” in the title; this book is just as applicable to situations in public libraries, and the editor makes this point in the book’s introduction. While it is true that each scenario is built around the model of the academic library, there are few times that these same problems would not arise in a public library. For example, the chapters, “Communication: A Two Way Street,” “Staffing for Success,” and “Knowing Your Library User,” all deal with problems that are inherent to any library or any organization. Keep in mind, however, that a school or special library may find it more difficult to apply the lessons of this book.

Depending on how new the readers may be to the library profession, they may not yet be in a position of leadership. This manual may help those librarians better understand their own supervisors and library administrators. Recognizing the potential follies of leadership is a primary purpose of this book, and understanding the mistakes of our own supervisors and administrators can help us better deal with the possible fallout. This work is recommended for library administrators, particularly those new to a leadership position, or those hoping to move into one in the near future. Although highly informative, it will prove less practical to librarians not in a leadership role.
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Special Collections 2.0: New Technologies for Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Archival Collections
by Beth M. Whittaker and Lynne M. Thomas. Santa Barbara: Libraries Unlimited, 2009. 150pp, $45,
ISBN 9781591587200

Reviewed by Melanie Griffin, Assistant Librarian, Special & Digital Collections, University of South Florida

In this deceptively slim volume, Beth Whittaker (head of Special Collections Cataloging, Ohio State University) and Lynne Thomas (head of Rare Books and Special Collections, Northern Illinois University) map the terrain of Web 2.0 applications in rare book, manuscript, and archival repositories. A much-discussed subject in the library world in general over the past few years (e.g., Casey & Savastunik, 2009; Courtney, 2007; Kroski, 2008), Whittaker and Thomas argue that special collections repositories are notoriously late adopters of technology (p. 120), making this topic uncharted territory in these more specialized environments.

After the publication of this volume, such claims are no longer valid. Writing for an audience of professionals working in special collections repositories, Whittaker and Thomas exhaustively catalog, analyze, and illuminate a plethora of Web 2.0 technologies ranging from Facebook to Goodreads and everything in between. Based on personal investigation and research as well as a survey with more than 300 respondents, the volume both introduces Web 2.0 tools and evaluates their effectiveness in the special collections setting. The authors use thematically arranged chapters to identify resources for social networking, blogging, creating wikis, using media sharing sites, and social cataloging. The Web 2.0 terrain is vast, and the coverage here is, at times, overly exhaustive rather than focused on best bets. The “Social Book and Music Networking” section, for example, includes a discussion of Last.fm that concludes: “[W]hile there may not be much direct application to libraries, this service may be of personal interest to music librarians and music lovers” (p. 19). This thoroughness, however, results in a ready reference source for even the most obscure Web 2.0 technologies available in 2009.

At times, the book’s comprehensive investigation strikes an uneasy balance between the assumed technological reticence on the part of special collections professionals and the ubiquity of Web 2.0 technologies in twenty-first century life. The authors presuppose no prior knowledge of any of the tools discussed, resulting in incredibly thorough introductions to applications such as Facebook and Twitter that should be familiar to the reasonably regular reader of national news reports (the New York Times alone, for example, published well over 150 stories on Facebook from 2008 to 2009). Once beyond these explanations of basic functionality, however, the authors move to much more fruitful and insightful discussions of specific ways to harness these tools in a special collections environment. The sections on identifying institutional uses for blogs are particularly effective, with suggestions ranging from announcing events to hosting ruminations on the philosophy of processing. The authors’ discussion of social cataloging’s possible pitfalls in special collections is also illuminating.

The inclusion of specific ideas for the use of Web 2.0 applications and links to existing special collections blogs, wikis, and social cataloging projects prove the book’s greatest assets. While the tools discussed are typically well-known, their application in a special collections environment is not always intuitive. The examples provided are concrete and actionable, yet they still provide room for institutional sculpting and creativity. They are, moreover, readily applicable to a wide variety of repositories and not simply those housed in university libraries.

The book’s final chapter addresses “the elephant in the room” (p. 99): the challenges associated with preserving digital information in a Web 2.0 environment. This chapter and the appendix on digital preservation that follows focus on the practical, providing lists of resources for addressing known
problems, such as the necessity of archiving blog content as well as comments. More provocative, however, are the authors’ introductory statements on the subject: this book itself is a “recognition that we cultural caretakers are ultimately responsible for documenting the shifting nature of our culture during this moment” (p. xix) from print to digital. By becoming involved in and conversant with Web 2.0 technologies, Whittaker and Thomas argue that archivists and special collections librarians can become more capable curators of the digital age (p. 100).

Digital preservation is not, however, the only elephant in this book’s room. There is considerable irony in the authors’ choice of medium – a printed monograph – for a discussion of Web 2.0 technologies. While full of helpful tips and tricks, the book was dated before the ink was dry, and it continues to age with alarming rapidity. When the book went to press, for example, the authors were correct in noting that “Facebook profiles are not publicly searchable through Google or other search engines” (p. 8); this statement is no longer true. The afterword explicitly acknowledges the tension between medium and subject, noting, “[We] are acutely aware of the irony of presenting our work in a published book format...we know that much of what we have written will be immediately out of date” (p. 119). While duly noted, the justifications for choosing to accept the limitations of print are neither discussed nor acknowledged. It is, of course, impossible to infer the reasons behind the authors’ choice of medium, although suspicious readers might wonder if they relate to the printed monograph’s supremacy in academic circles and its aura of authority when compared to the ephemeral and constantly changing world of the web about which the authors write with such fluency. Readers can only hope that these incongruities, once acknowledged, will lead to changes that enable a more flexible and timely platform for works such as this one.
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Reviewed by Megan Hodge, circulation supervisor, McGraw-Page Library, Randolph-Macon College, and library school student, University of North Texas

This anthology of nearly one hundred short essays strives to provide a quick-and-dirty guide for librarians desiring to see their names in print. Other books aiming to guide librarians through the publication process have appeared in recent years (Crawford, 2003; Gordon, 2004); these focus exclusively on publishing in the field of library science. Writing and Publishing instead attempts to cover the breadth of publishing options—from fiction and poetry to restaurant reviews—available to writers who are also librarians.

Striving to add something new and innovative to the literature is an admirable goal; wanting to be all things to all librarians, though, results in not enough content for anyone. The tacit goal of the book seems to be aiding librarians who wish to write, whether professionally or beyond the job; however, it could benefit from a more focused approach. Several of the essays do not tie the subject matter to librarianship at all, some essays overlap in subject matter, and others are illogically organized within chapters. For example, the essay “Learn How to Review Books” appears after two other pieces on book reviewing. A brief introduction to each essay would be helpful to tie all the pieces together. In addition, the preface states that the contributing authors were instructed to submit 1,900-2,100 word essays. While this works for some pieces, others lacked sufficient space to impart useful information.

Despite the structural flaws, there is much useful information to be found in this anthology for new librarians. Essay topics include publishing for tenure, finding one’s niche, how to write articles, and how to edit a book for the first time, as well as several articles on the process of submission to revision. Other pieces discuss how to build a portfolio of published works, time management skills for writers, and how to get started if one has not yet published. While some of the articles on non-professional writing seem out of place, others make an excellent case for tying fiction- and poetry-writing to librarianship and describing how the research, commitment, and imagination required is beneficial. Some authors discuss author-editor, author-agent, and author-publisher relations and the proper etiquette for correspondence in the world of publishing.

Overall, Smallwood has put together a collection of essays of definite value to the new librarian. For the $65 price tag, librarians seeking advice for professional advancement may decide to spend their money on a book more focused on professional writing and simply use one of the many how-to-get-published manuals available at their local library. Librarians with an itch to write but without a clear idea of what to write, however, are strongly encouraged to peruse Writing and Publishing.
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Reviewed by Rebecca K. Miller, Science Librarian, Virginia Tech

The library profession has been concerned with public relations and marketing for more than 100 years. Many librarians trace this concept to the 1896 ALA Conference when Lutie Stearns of the Milwaukee Public Library presented a talk on advertising a library and its services (Iyengar, 1996, p. 147). A search of WorldCat in April 2010 reveals 152 unique items, dating back to the 1960s. While the concept of marketing in libraries is hardly new or rare within library literature, **Bite-Sized Marketing: Realistic Solutions for the Overworked Librarian** takes a novel approach to it by providing ideas for “simplifying and streamlining” the process in a way that is both understandable and meaningful (xi).

Authors Nancy Dowd, Mary Evangeliste, and Jonathan Silberman bring a distinctive set of experiences to this volume. Each of the three authors have developed and implemented successful marketing campaigns for various libraries and library services, winning national awards in marketing from ALA and ACRL. Collaborating to publish 11 chapters that discuss different approaches to promoting library services, the authors lay out a simple plan of action in each chapter, providing readers with specific ideas and what they will need to enact each strategy or area of marketing. Examples of checklists, questionnaires, and strategies are also included. Chapter topics include word of mouth marketing, using stories, outreach, new media tools, and branding. The volume ends with a chapter on best practices in library marketing, neatly tying the previous 10 chapters together.

**Bite-Sized Marketing** is not geared toward any specific type of library or library environment; for the most part, the concepts and ideas discussed within this resource are general enough to be applicable and appropriate within any library setting. The majority of the examples throughout the 11 chapters come from the public environment. Many “teen” related examples are provided, as well as a few examples of applications to the academic or special library setting. Chapter 3, “How to Market Electronic Resources,” is an exception, speaking mainly to academic librarians.

Dowd, Evangeliste, and Silberman focus on using new and emerging technologies in each of the chapters. The authors’ precise definitions, clear examples, and quick tips surrounding the use of new technologies work to mitigate any anxiety or intimidation that could be associated with their ideas. When talking about using the social networking photo site Flickr, for example, the authors provide a brief explanation of the site, how it works, possible legal issues, and concrete ideas for getting started. This model applies to all technology tools discussed throughout the book.

In successfully simplifying strategies for creating marketing plans in libraries, Dowd, Evangeliste, and Silberman have oversimplified one important issue: the distinction between marketing and advocacy. This distinction is particularly important because **Bite-Sized Marketing** was published during Dr. Camila Alire’s ALA Presidential Initiative to promote advocacy and increase the library profession’s awareness of its need to support a distinctive course of action that will secure libraries’ required funding. In Chapter 6, “Advocacy,” the authors never provide a functional definition for the term; furthermore, the authors seem to use the term “advocacy” interchangeably with the term “marketing” in several other chapters. In their introduction to the book, the authors mention that marketing is simply “a concerted effort to articulate your value,” a flexible definition that can also extend to include advocacy, but that omits the specifics that make each topic deserving of special attention (p. xi). The marketing/advocacy
distinction needs to be made in order to underscore the unique responsibilities and strategies that accompany advocacy in libraries.

This book represents a valuable resource for library staff members working with emerging technologies, involved with marketing library services, or participating in advocacy campaigns. Additionally, the tools and strategies described in *Bite-Sized Marketing* are also applicable to those working with professional organizations outside the library; anyone who has planned a conference, networking event, or similar function will find the advice offered here valuable. Because Dowd, Evangeliste, and Silberman make the case that all library staff members need to be agents of marketing, this book is also recommended for anyone interested in gaining or reconfirming their perspective on library marketing. With its clear organization, easy to read style, and concrete ideas, this book would make an especially good selection for a professional reading group or an entire library staff’s discussion.
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