# Current Awareness

### Column editor: Jane Grogan (Jane.Grogan@gchq.gsi.gov.uk)

This column contains summaries of articles (print and electronic) about information access and retrieval, electronic publishing, preservation and virtual libraries etc. including, with permission, abstracts identified with an * next to the author initials, drawn from Current Cites, the monthly publication distributed electronically by a team of Librarians and Library Staff and edited by Roy Tennant (http://sunsite.berkeley.edu/CurrentCites).

If you are interested in providing reviews for the Column, please contact Jane Grogan for further details.

### Digitisation Projects / Preservation

Australasian Digital Theses Program. **Australasian Digital Theses Program: Membership Survey 2006** Canberra, Australia: Council of Australian University Librarians, 2007. (http://www.caul.edu.au/surveys/adt2006.doc) – This report presents the results of a 2006 survey of Council of Australian University Librarians' and Council of New Zealand University Librarians' member libraries about their digital theses archiving activities. It contains a number of interesting findings, especially regarding submission rates. It found that when digital theses submission was voluntary, only 17% of theses were deposited; however, when it was mandatory, the rate rose to 95%. Twenty-two universities had a mandatory submission policy in place when the survey was conducted, with another five planning to do so in 2007, which means that 59% of respondents will have a mandate in 2007. More than 90% of respondents offer mediated deposit, with 63% offering mediated deposit only, 7% offering self-deposit only, and 30% offering both options. Three key reasons for the high level of mediated deposit support were conversion, copyright, and software issues. Half of the respondents have completely or partially digitized their print theses, and slightly over half have an institutional repository, with only four of IRs not being used for digital theses support – [*CB]

Carr, Leslie, Brody, Tim. **Size Isn't Everything: Sustainable Repositories as Evidenced by Sustainable Deposit Profiles** D-Lib Magazine 13(7/8) (July/August 2007) (http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july07/carr/07carr.html) – How can we measure the success of a digital repository? Simply looking at the number of deposited items is problematic for many reasons. A better method, the authors argue, is to measure "community engagement," which should be evident in deposit patterns. For example, a repository built through a few large batch deposits may have less community engagement than smaller repositories with daily deposits across a broad range of subject categories. This article attempts to develop a "metrics of community take-up" by analyzing the deposit profiles of repositories in the Registry of Open Access Repositories (ROAR), looking in particular at the number of items deposited per day over the course of a year, and the deposit patterns across subjects or communities in a given repository. According to this data, 12 of the 20 largest repositories (in size) would not make the list of the 20 most active. While the metrics presented here are quite general, they provide a useful way forward for institutions thinking about how to measure the use of their repositories. In addition, much of this data is tracked, kept up-to-date and made available in the 900+ repository profiles on the ROAR website, allowing institutions to see their own deposit patterns and compare with others – [*BR]

Chillingworth, Mark. **National Archives deal lifts threat of digital dark age** *Information World Review* 237, July/August 2007: 2 – Digital documents at the National Archives (TNA), created on older versions of Microsoft systems, are reported to be made accessible following a deal between the two concerns. TNA Chief Executive Natalie Ceeney described the deal as making digital data as 'resilient' as paper, allowing documents to be "viewed in the way they were produced" http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk – [RH]

Heid, Susan. **Culture Morph** Campus Technology 20(10) (June 2007): 42-48. (http://campustechnology.com/articles/48247/) – Much has been written in the past on library and IT collaboration (or the lack thereof), but with the increase in development of digital library projects, interest in this issue is resurging. However, unlike some articles in the past that were primarily obsessed with how different libraries and IT are from each other, this article focuses instead on how colleges have taken varying approaches to developing digital library services collaboratively between the two units. Using a variety of different approaches, and not just relying on an administrative combination of the two units into a single organization, these colleges have been able to move forward with projects that have increased the use of library resources, enhanced ease of access, and allowed them to focus on making improvements based on students' expectations – [*FC]

Piorun, M. E et al. **Challenges and Lessons Learned: Moving from Image Database to Institutional Repository** OCLC Systems & Services 23(2) (2007): 148-157 – The path to an Institutional Repository is not always a straight line, as this narrative from the Medical School Library at UMass makes clear. Along the way, at least in their case, were academic departments with conflicting objectives, budgets duly proposed and rejected, hardware and software issues. An epiphany of sorts came when they finally got the chance to choose their own software. "It was critical," they determined, "that the product be robust, require little special programming, and be implemented and maintained with current library staff." Finishing off this tale of joy and sorrow is a list of elements they felt either helped or hindered their success – [*LRK]

**Who Needs Google? Emory U. Libraries to Scan, Sell Book**s Library Journal Academic Newswire (7 June 2007) (http://www.libraryjournal.com/info/CA6450053.html#news2) – First the Million Book Project, then the Google Books Library Project, then the Open Content Alliance, and now the Emory University, Kirtas Technologies, and BookSurge partnership. Mass digitization has become the name of the game, and Emory's Woodruff Library has come up with a new spin: digitize books in conjunction with Kirtas, partially funding the effort by selling low-cost print-on-demand copies via BookSurge (see the Emory and BookSurge press releases for additional details). Hard on the heels of the Emory announcement, the University of Maine, the Toronto Public Library, and the Cincinnati Public Library announced that they would follow Emory's lead. If Emory's detailed 2008-2012 strategic plan is any guide, expect more bold moves in the future under the leadership of Vice Provost and Director of Libraries Richard E. Luce – [*CB]

## E-Publishing

Brown, Laura; Griffiths, Rebecca and Rascoff, Matthew, et. al. **University Publishing in a Digital Age** New York: Ithaka, 2007. (http://www.ithaka.org/strategic-services/university-publishing) – While the journal publishing activities of university presses are important, the key role that they have played in the scholarly publishing ecology has been book publishing. Scholarly books often have very limited sales, but they are critical to faculty in some disciplines, especially those in the humanities. These disciplines value books highly, and without publishing one or more scholarly books faculty in them cannot get tenure. Unfortunately, the long-term trend has been for universities to require that university presses be increasingly self-sustaining, and this, combined with the very corrosive effect of the serials crisis on academic libraries' monograph budgets, has resulted in presses seeking more profitable sources of income than obscure monographs. By publishing more popular books, they can subsidize the continued publication of scholarly monographs, but not at a level that scholars in book-heavy disciplines would desire, creating a scholarly monograph crisis. Of late, university presses have increasingly been put under the administrative control of academic libraries, new digital/print-on-demand university presses have begun to be established, and there has been increased interest in re-examining the role of traditional university presses. The 69-page Ithaka report is one of the most detailed investigations of how university publishing could evolve. It advocates a stronger role for universities in scholarly publishing; a strategic evaluation of what local scholarly publishing activities should be; a cohesive university-wide approach to publishing

activities; the development of scalable, collaborative, cross-institutional publishing infrastructure; the full utilization of online publishing capabilities; strategic capital investment; and vigorous leadership by university administrators, libraries, and presses. It's a provocative, important report that deserves to be widely read; however, while it advocates using a range of economic publishing models tailored to local needs, most discussion is focused on traditional fee-based approaches – [*CB]

Henry, Charles. Rice **University Press: Fons et origo** The Journal of Electronic Publishing 10(2) (Spring 2007) (http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.3336451.0010.205) – Cash-strapped university presses have been seemingly slow to explore new models of electronic publishing that could help revitalize and sustain their operations. One reason for this is the "cost of migration" – how to move to a digital publishing model while continuing to incur standard production and inventory costs. In this respect, the newly revived Rice University Press is viewing its original failure (it was shut down in 1996 for financial reasons) as a blessing in disguise, enabling it to redefine itself from scratch as "the first fully digital academic press in the United States." In this article, Charles Henry describes the rationale and business models behind the new Press, their decision to focus on art history and other areas that are particularly constrained by the print-based model, and their vision of the Press as a platform for new models of digital scholarship and a spur for changes in the academic culture of research (especially in the humanities). Currently the Rice University Press website lists just two publications, but it will be interesting to see how this initiative develops in the coming months and years – [*BR]

## Education

Abbott, Andrew. **The University Library Chicago** University of Chicago, May 2006. (http://home.uchicago.edu/~aabbott/Papers/libreport.pdf) – Agree with this report or not, it offers an invaluable outside-in perspective on current hot-button issues in academic librarianship. Respected scholar Andrew Abbott (author of *The System of Professions*) produced this "serious theoretical analysis of library research" for a task force appointed by the provost of the University of Chicago, where Abbott teaches. Abbott offers fresh and often trenchant observations, many backed quite refreshingly by real data, about issues such as use of the university library by undergraduates and faculty, off-site storage, research study rooms, and even the current vogue for building faculty-graduate research centers, which he refers to as "Potemkin Villages" that "exist more as targets for external funding than as physical realities." – [*KGS]

Del Bosque, Darcy, and Kimberly Chapman. **Your Place or Mine? Face-to-Face Reference Services Across Campus** New Library World 108(5/6) (2007): 247-262 – The future of reference is both more remote and more direct. More remote in that our users can communicate with us through e-mail, IM, etc.; more direct in that we can communicate with them face-to-face wherever they choose to congregate, whether inside the library or somewhere else on campus. The librarians in this article discuss an innovative program at the University of Texas San Antonio (UTSA) called "Direct-2-U Reference" which began in Fall 2005, and saw librarians setting up operations in five different locations on campus, including study areas and dorms. While the initial impact was modest, the librarians felt nonetheless that it built bridges to the outside academic community. It'd be interesting to see what traffic would be like on campuses with more centralized student areas – [*LRK]

Lynch, Beverly P., Catherine Murray-Rust, and Susan E. Parker, et. al. **Attitudes of Presidents and Provosts on the University Library** College & Research Libraries 68(3) (May 2007): 213-227 – In 2004, the authors replicated a 1992-93 study to investigate how the attitudes of university presidents and provosts towards their academic libraries have changed in the intervening years. Through an analysis of their interviews of presidents and provosts at six universities, the authors found that the symbolic role of libraries as the "heart of the university" no longer carried as much weight as the libraries' practical roles on campus. The article also contains evidence that campus visibility, outside funding, and technological innovation are new indicators by which university administrators judge the library's relevancy. This study confirms the sense that I believe many

librarians share, which is the growing need to better articulate to campus administrators the connections between the activities of the library with the university's academic mission – [*SG]

Villano, Matt. Collaborate **Campus Technology** (June 2007) (http://www.campustechnology.com/article.aspx?aid=48239) – How library information can be introduced into collaborative software for higher education is not the issue here, and the absence of that issue is the reason to read the article. The omission doesn't appear intended to send a pointed message, but as sources for wikis etc are described with the focus on bringing students and instructors together in virtual learning spaces, it's telling that documents and other information sources are usually described as simply coming from a Web search. It seems likely that in many cases campus IT planning will have a blank spot where the library should be. Read these imple-mentation tales, review the products and learn to talk the talk before demanding a seat at this table – [*JR]

Vondracek, Ruth. **Comfort and Convenience? Why Students Choose Alternatives to the Library** Portal: Libraries in the Academy 7(3)(July 2007): 277-293 – Library surveys often go over what users like and dislike about the library. This survey is unique in that it specifically asked non-users what they liked about their non-library locations when doing research or study. Non-users or infrequent users were asked where they studied most when on their own or in a group. They were also asked about the characteristics of their preferred locations (e.g. quiet, convenience). The thinking behind these questions was to see if characteristics could be identified that could then be applied to the library. Results included making it easier to reserve group-study rooms and making individual study areas more quiet – [*LRK]

## General

Ayre, Lori Bowen. **Library Delivery 2.0: Delivering Library Materials in the Age of Netflix** Library Philosophy and Practice (June 2007) (http://libr.unl.edu:2000/LPP/ayre.htm) – Ayre makes a case for learning from the Netflix model to deliver library items directly to patrons. Some principles Ayre cites for making our ILL work better include: make it easy, make it personal, and make it fast and convenient. There will of course be much work required to make this possible, but this brief, engaging piece at least makes the case that we should try. Anyone involved with interlibrary loan – or even simply in managing library services – sit up and take note – [*RT]

Blyberg, John. **Always Pushing Information** netConnect (15 July 2007) (http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA6453423.html) – Blyberg writes about, and expands upon, his "ILS customer bill of rights" that he first blogged about in November 2005. His list includes: 1) Open, read-only, direct access to the database, 2) A full-blown, W3C standards-based API (application programming interface) to all read-write functions, 3) The option to run the ILS on hardware of our choosing, on servers we administer, and 4) High security standards. I'm certain that at least some vendors would take exception to these points, either from the perspective that they already have them implemented (my guess is that most vendors believe they already have high security standards), or that they wouldn't be supportable (e.g., to run on any hardware of your choosing, which would greatly multiply their support headaches). Nonetheless, these are important points well worth discussing and advocating with your vendor – [*RT]

Chillingworth, Mark. **Defenders of the expert's realm** Information World Review 237, July/August 2007: 9 and 18 – An interview with Andrew Keen, former Web entrepreneur and author of the book *The Cult of the Amateur,* accompanied by a review of his publication. Keen takes a critical and dystopic view of the implications of Web 2.0 particularly in respect of their impact on creativity and knowledge. The role of the editor and the wisdom of the crowd are topics discussed in the article – [RH]

Embleton, Kimberley & Helfer, Doris Small. **The plague of plagiarism and academic dishonesty** *Searcher* 15 (6) (2007): 23-26 – It is argued that although students have always found ways to cheat the system, the Internet has made plagiarism and academic dishonesty far more straightfor-ward. A variety of online services selling off the shelf and custom written assignments are investigated. Many of the assignments sold online are found to be expensive and often badly

written, but can be difficult to detect with existing plagiarism detection software, particularly in the case of custom written papers or dissertations. To combat the rise in plagiarism, academics/information professionals are encouraged to provide better training to users about plagiarism. Another strategy proposed is that students be asked to submit outlines, rough drafts or literature searches etc to their tutors to demonstrate their progress/prove that they are submitting their own work – [MT]

McCune, Bonnie. **10 Tips for Getting Grants to Keep Your Library Afloat** Computers in Libraries 27(7) (July/August 2007): 10-14 – You spend many precious hours working on a grant proposal, only to find out that your project wasn't chosen. What went wrong? Funding insider Bonnie McCune, the library community programs consultant for the Colorado State Library, shares ten tips for getting your grant proposals accepted. Suggestions include tailoring your request for smaller foundations, making key contacts in funding organizations, planning for evaluation, and honing your message. Her best advice is not to get discouraged. When you take the time to learn from your past rejections, you improve your chances for success in the future – [*KC]

Schachter, Debbie. **Negotiating in areas where end-user services dominate** *Searcher* 15 (6) (2007): 46-49 – This article looks at the way librarians negotiate with suppliers, and the way in which new free/low-cost online resources are increasing their bargaining power. It is argued that free services like Scirus, while of considerable value to smaller institutions, have limited value (and limited demand) for large academic institutions. These still cannot afford to do without higher cost packages from their traditional suppliers. As the market evolves, the competition from free resources is seen to be influencing traditional services providers. Companies such as Bowkers now have to add extra value to their products, resulting in libraries receiving better value for money – [MT]

Smith, Laura. **Public Sector shirking online engagement** *Information World Review* 237, July/August 2007: 3 – A report commissioned by former cabinet office minister Hilary Armstrong has concluded that current public-sector policy and action are inadequate to meet the challenge of the Internet and Web 2.0 technologies. The social and financial benefits afforded by community websites for the state are seen to be stymied by risk aversion and lack of knowledge among government officials. Forming partnerships with online communities, rather than trying to replicate them, are among the recommendations of the report. http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk – [RH]

Swan, Alma. **What a Difference a Publisher Makes** OptimalScholarship (7 July 2007) (http://optimalscholarship.blogspot.com/2007/07/what-difference-publisher-makes.html) – In this posting to her new OptimalScholarship weblog, scholarly communication consultant Alma Swan examines the copy editing of journal articles. Does it add value, subtract value, or both? What are the typical differences between the author's final draft and the copy-edited paper? Are these differences significant? As digital repositories containing e-prints multiply, these issues are increasingly important. Swan discusses pertinent research studies that address these issues, and she discusses the VALREC project, which is developing a tool to alert readers to the differences between article versions – [*CB]

## Information Access

Lamb, Brian. **Dr. Mashup or, Why Educators Should Learn to Stop Worrying and Love the Remix** EDUCAUSE Review 42(4) (July/August 2007): 13-24. (http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/erm0740.pdf) – As Lamb explains, the term "mashup" is used to describe the "reuse, or remixing, of works of art, of content, and/or of data for the purposes that were not intended or even imagined by the original creators." HousingMaps (http://www.housingmaps.com), which brings together housing vacancies on craigslist with Google Maps, is an excellent example. Although mashups are fraught with difficult questions for educators and policy-makers, such as whether a mashup is a derivative or original work, Lamb encourages the higher education community to be more "open" to the possibilities. Specifically, Lamb would like to see educators using open and discoverable resources (e.g. not locked inside course-management systems), open and transparent licensing (e.g. Creative Commons), and open and remixable formats, to encourage the reuse of their content. A well-written piece that should cause

librarians to consider the appropriate types of content/data that we could be offering up to the mashup sandbox – [*SG]

Miguel, Ramos & Gauthier, Dawn. **Mash it up!** *Searcher* 15 (6) (2007): 17-22 – The article explores the emerging phenomenon of mash-ups. A mash-up is created when Web-based content from different information sources is blended together in a single application/website. The term is shown to originate from the world of hip-hop music where artists compose new tracks by mixing/splicing together songs from other artists. Some of the most popular/common mash-ups have been created by overlaying Google maps with another data source, such as local house prices data or restaurant information. It is argued that more information professionals should begin creating mash-ups to aid their users; one such site is http://www.authoratory.com, that analyzes http://www.pubmed.gov data to find further information about the authors of biomedical articles – [MT]

## Information Retrieval

Anderson, Nate. **Deep Packet Inspection Meets 'Net neutrality' CALEA** Ars Technica (25 July 2007) (http://arstechnica.com/articles/culture/deep-packet-inspection-meets-net-neutrality.ars) – Information travels the Net through 'packets'. Whether we're sending e-mail, watching video or talking to friends using VoIP, it all consists of packets. So, what if there were a technology that could identify each packet as to where it's going and what it consists of? This is precisely what 'Deep Packet Inspection' or 'DPI' does and Nate Anderson of Ars Technica does a splendid job explaining the implications. Short synopsis: Bad news for Net Neutrality (and privacy) – [*LRK]

Buckley, Owen, Tim. T**ough times ahead for market research aggregators** *Information World Review* 237, July/August 2007: 13 – Following the acquisition of Datamonitor by Informa, the competitive environment and choice in online market research is analysed in this article. The problems for those producing generic research for an increasingly sophisticated user base and the future of the traditional aggregator is discussed. Meanwhile the advent of newer-generation, open-format, web-based market information sources is looked at in the context of being able to easily find research data – [RH]

Haya, Glenn, Else Nygren, and Wilhelm Widmark. **Metalib and Google Scholar: a User Study** Online Information Review 31(3) (2007): 365-375 – Interesting interface shootout between Metalib and Google Scholar. The guinea pigs in this study were 32 "intermediate" undergrads from Uppsala University in Sweden. Neither option swept students off their feet, but the response to Google Scholar was "more positive". This had to do with the familiarity of the interface plus ease of use. Interestingly enough, success rates increased considerably for both tools if the students went through a short training session prior to beginning their search. The main lesson to draw from studies like this is the importance of testing "meta-search" products in order to gauge their effectiveness. Simply making them available isn't enough – [*LRK]

Tomaiuolo, Nicholas. **Citations and aberrations** *Searcher* 15 (7) (2007): 17-24 – The article contends that the primary function of a citation is to aid the retrieval of bibliographic materials. The author discusses a number of the different referencing guides/tools concludes that the variety of style guides available can be bewildering for authors (he lists the American Psychological Association format as his own personal preference). The article argues that the sheer volume of online information now available and the reliance of modern scholars on it has had a negative effect on the citation behaviour of authors. It is argued that whilst electronic reference management tools can be helpful to authors, ultimately it is the quality of the bibliographic information input into these system that is the key factor. Teaching users the principles of accurate citation is still an important task for information professionals, and the article stresses it is one we must not shirk. Academic libraries that provide poor or inaccurate advice are strongly taken to task and KnightCite (http://www.calvin.edu/library/knightcite) is held up as an example of current best practice in the field of automated bibliographic instruction – [MT]

Weinberger, David. **Everything is Miscellaneous** NY: Henry Holt and Company, 2007. (http://www.librarything.com/work/2275491) – This juicy read from David Weinberger (of the Cluetrain Manifesto and Small Pieces, Loosely Joined) challenges us by arguing that librarian-style predictive order is passé and digital deshabille is a virtue. The meat of this book, and its primary momentum and entertainment value, come from Weinberger's lengthy discussions of the "third order," which grounds itself in the digital world, where all the old rules are blown out of the water. Those of us managing "second order" databases – such as library catalog – are momentarily off the hook, but that doesn't make this any less of a must-read for all librarians. Weinberger's fluid, engaging style masks the refreshing rigor of this highly readable contribution to public intellectual-ism – [*KGS]

## Knowledge Management / Social Networking

Britannica Blog: **Web 2.0 Forum** (http://blogs.britannica.com/blog/main/category/web-20-forum/) – The contributions to this series of blog posts by various pundits (with the lead essay from Michael Gorman, former library dean of CSU Fresno) range from fabulous to fatuous (even contributors who agree in general with Gorman's contention that the world is going to hell in a digital handbas-ket question his rhetoric), but the collection as a whole is lit up by thoughtful posts by Matthew Battle, Danah Boyd, Roger Kimball, Clay Shirky, and Gregory McNamee. Gender bias mars the overall discussion (Britannica could only find one woman with a brain?) and there is far too much space given over to what one librarian bard has described in song as the "anti-digitalists," but if you can't find an idea to engage with or object to in this collection, you're not trying – [*KGS]

Reid, Mike & Gray, Christian. **Part 1. Past and present** *Searcher* 15 (7) (2007): 33-43 – This is the first in a series of three articles looking at the evolution of online social networking software. The article traces the roots of current social networks such as MySpace and Blogger right back to the work of Vannevar Bush in the 1940s. The Usenet newsgroups that were made possible by the work of Truscott and Ellis in 1979 are highlighted as the first online social networks. Myspace.com is shown to be the current market leader and information professionals are encouraged to seize the opportunity to use online social networks to help meet the information needs of their users – [MT]

Starr, Jennie. **LibraryThing.com: The Holy Grail of book recommendations engines** *Searcher* 15 (7) (2007): 25-32 – An article reviewing the http://www.librarything.com website. LibraryThing allows its users to create an online catalogue of their own book collections, post their own book reviews and share book recommendations with others. The article states that LibraryThing allows you to import catalogue records from Amazon, Library of Congress or 78 other world libraries (since publication it appears this has risen to 82 libraries) Alternatively you can upload booklists into LibraryThing or manually enter book data from scratch. Users have the option of maintaining a free personal library of 200 books or subscribing to the service which allows them to catalogue an unlimited number of books. There are a number of additional features that add further value to the site including book discussions boards and a suggester/unsuggester function that finds other users whose books tastes are similar or completely different to your own. Other book recommendations websites are listed within the article, but LibraryThing is argued to be the best book recommenda-tion site currently available – [MT]

Winder, Davey **Blogging for beginners: monitoring** *Information World Review* 237, July/August 2007: 14-16 – A three-page article continues a series looking at the art of blogging. In this overview the art of finding out who's reading your blog and what they are saying about it is covered. Using site analysis, trackbacks and specialist search engines such as Google Blog Search and Tech-norati are looked at in depth in order to achieve 'blog management nirvana' – [RH]

## Legal Issues

Houghton-Jan, Sarah. **Imagine No Restrictions: Digital Rights Management** *School Library Journal* (6) (1 June 2007) (http://www.schoollibraryjournal.com/article/CA6448189.html) – I've presented a lot in the last year about digital audio options for libraries, and these discussions have always included the controversy surrounding Digital Rights Management (DRM). School librarians

are particularly interested in adopting digital audio resources, so I was pleased to see an article in *School Library Journal* by Sarah Houghton-Jan that lays out the issues for all libraries. Houghton-Jan gives us three reasons to care about DRM: device compatibility, roadblocks to fair use and accessibility, and long-term archival and playback issues. She calls for librarians to talk to vendors about DRM, and to support the vendors that are offering DRM-free content. A sidebar to the article helps you explain DRM to your users when they come up with the tough questions (i.e. why can't I use my iPod?) – [*KC]

## Security

Vaas, Lisa. **Is It OK For Google To Own Us?** eWeek (July 9, 2007) (http://www.eweek.com/article2/0,1895,2155596,00.asp) – Google has been a lightning rod for many issues in libraryland, but this piece demonstrates that it's not just librarians that are concerned about what Google is up to. In this brief article, Vaas provides an overview of the issues in the current dispute between Google and Privacy International. The basic dispute stems from a recent report from Privacy International (available at http://www.privacyinternational.org/article.shtml?cmd[347]=x-347-553961), in which Privacy International labeled Google "hostile to privacy" for its lack of controls in protecting the personally identifiable information (PII) of its users. Although some of the findings in the Privacy International report have been disputed, both by Google and external parties, this article and the Privacy International report are reminders of the myriad ways seemingly innocuous information is being collected on a regular basis without any substantive regulations or guidelines on how that information can or should be used in the long term – [*FC]

## Web Design / Metadata

Coyle, Karen. **Rights in the PREMIS Data Model: A Report for the Library of Congress** Washington, DC: Library of Congress, December 2006. (http://www.loc.gov/standards/premis/Rights-in-the-PREMIS-Data-Model.pdf) – Although this report has been out for a while, it remains a less-discovered gem among the many recent reports related to metadata issues. While the primary focus of the report is to discuss the required enhancements to incorporate digital object rights information into the PREMIS data model, a particular value of this report is its comprehensive overview of the PREMIS metadata scheme. For those unfamiliar with PREMIS, this report is a good introduction to the metadata scheme and its role in establishing preservation information for digital objects – [*FC]

## Contributors to Current Cites *

Charles W. Bailey, Jr., Keri Cascio, Frank Cervone, Susan Gibbons, Leo Robert Klein, Jim Ronningen, Brian Rosenblum, Karen G. Schneider, Roy Tennant

## Contributors

Peter Chapman, Ann Dixon, Catherine Ebenezer, Linda Fawcett, Ina Fourie, Rob Hughes, Linda Kerr, Ida Kwan, Shirley Parker-Munn, Claire Pillar, Liz Reiner, Ann Smith, Matt Treadwell, Ian Walker, Jennifer Wilkinson.