

reasonably accurate measurements, and some luck. We also learned that collection content can influence the time and cost of moving library materials. For instance, it took much longer than planned to shift the government documents collection because the materials tend to be smaller, more slippery, easier to damage, and harder to keep in order. The most efficient approach to moving such materials would be to use one crew to move the volumes and another to shelf-read after the materials are on the new shelves.

We also know now that we were extraordinarily fortunate in the quality of the personnel working the night stacks crew. While we did experience some minor attendance problems among these employees, generally they exceeded our expectations in productivity, initiative, and ability to follow instructions. Undoubtedly the key to their good performance was the night supervisor, who had several years' experience as a stacks employee in the same library. There must be a good interface between the night crew and the day people who are also involved. It's essential for the person ultimately responsible (and who works days) to have an understanding of how much work should be accomplished each night and to check daily to see if adequate progress has been made; leave clear, written directions; require feedback from the night supervisor and take proper measures to react to it; and arrange periodic meetings with the night supervisor.

What would we do differently the next time we face such a large-scale remodel project? The one area that still looms as a source of potential disaster is predicting shelf space and layout for very large collections. After all of our calculations, our serial floor is fuller than we predicted. This may be due to ASU Libraries' healthy acquisitions budget which has allowed subscriptions to expand at a higher rate than anticipated 3-4 years ago. Our monograph stacks also appear to be fuller than anticipated. Interestingly, a concurrent Technical Services retroconversion project is turning up a number of books for which the library has no shelf record. This confirms Circulation personnel's suspicions that some books wander back into the library long after they have been withdrawn as a result of non-return from users. Whether there is a sufficient number to significantly throw off shelving calculations remains to be seen. Other libraries should consider taking a random inventory of high use areas of the collection to test reported collection statistics and sample for possible problems.

The arrival of microcomputers on the library management scene brings a much more efficient means for maintaining up-to-date collection statistics and making long-range estimates of shelving needs. It also becomes much more realistic to utilize call number specific standards for the number of volumes per linear foot. The size of the collection and the amount of available space greatly influence the relevance of collection analysis. ■■

Letters

Copyrighted tables of contents?

To the Editor:

In their article, "Keeping faculty current" (*C&RL News*, September 1985, pp.392-94), authors Hassig and Lewis tell of their successful use of photocopied tables of contents to create customized current awareness packages. They do not address, however, any possible copyright law implications of this practice. Section 108(g) of the revised Copyright Law states: "The rights of reproduction and distribution under this section...do not extend to cases where the library or archives, or its employee...(2) engages in the *systematic reproduction or distribution* of single or multiple copies..." (emphasis added).

The system described by the authors, whereby faculty members sign up for regular receipt of photocopied contents pages, sight unseen, appears to be systematic reproduction. Did the authors consider this?—*Mark E. Funk, Head, Collection Development, University of Nebraska Medical Center Library.*

The authors respond:

The copyright law has many ambiguities; establishing precisely what is legitimate is difficult at best. However, we feel that the Lehman Library service should not be a problem in the eyes of journal publishers. While it is true that we provide photocopies of the contents pages to faculty on a regular basis, we have not run across contents pages equipped with the copyright clearance note nor do we believe that distribution of these pages is likely to affect sales of the journals. It is even possible that the distribution of the contents pages to faculty may both promote journal usage, foster sales, and enhance a journal's prestige.

Also, the differential in pricing between individual subscriptions and institutional subscriptions indicates that publishers expect multiple usage of their publications. Perhaps most importantly, we do not believe that the contents page service may be equated with document delivery where copyright would clearly have to be considered. We are not distributing the actual journal articles; we are simply advertising their existence and availability in the library.

The contents page service has been in operation for many years—at Columbia and at other institutions—and the revised system described in our article has actually decreased the amount of routine photocopying. It is of course possible that we are misinterpreting the law. If we were to receive protests from journal publishers, we would naturally remove their titles from the service.—*Debra Hassig & David W. Lewis, Lehman Library, Columbia University.* ■■