

"Smart Searching: An Easily Customizable Subject-Specific Online Information Literacy Tutorial," does not make it clear that a template was created for science librarians to modify for various sciences; likewise, it is not clear that the tutorial in chapter fifteen, "From Classroom to Computer: Collaboration, Integration, and Success," was created in conjunction with education faculty who teach "Children's Literature in the Classroom." Daugherty and Russo do provide brief overviews of the essays in their introduction, allowing the reader to garner some information about the different programs by scanning the introduction.

This problem of the absence of abstracts is compounded by the lack of indexing in this collection. The reader cannot easily locate the points mentioned in the previous paragraph and is also unaware of gems that may be "hidden" in an essay such as the type of software utilized, what was learned about teaching APA citation style (chapter three, "The Development of a Library Research Methods Course for Online Graduate Students in Education") or a novel method of advertising library resources (chapter thirteen, "Smart Searching: An Easily Customizable Subject-Specific Online Information Literacy Tutorial").

These criticisms aside, this collection is an invaluable resource to any librarian either considering the creation of a new information literacy program or redesigning one already in place. Given the high interest in information literacy programs in the profession that has been expressed in many venues, a compilation such as this one is long overdue. This book is highly recommended.—*Lisa Vassady, Radford University.*

Richard M. Dougherty. *Streamlining Library Services: What We Do, How Much Time It Takes, What It Costs, and How We Can Do It Better.* Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press, 2008. 272p. alk. paper, \$45 (ISBN 9780810851986). LC2007-40288.

"Accountability" is a theme that runs through much of the literature of higher education today. In the administrative realm, the call for accountability may be reflected in more transparent budgeting practices or more stringent oversight of financial transactions. In the classroom, the call for accountability supports the movement toward outcomes-based assessment. In the library, it has influenced the development of new approaches to data collection and reporting, strategic planning and budgeting, and recognition that libraries must embrace a "culture of assessment." Retitled for the 21st century, this new edition of Dougherty and Heinritz's *Scientific Management of Library Operations* (2nd ed., 1982) presents a variety of approaches to engaging in rigorous inquiry into workplace activities, processes, and workflows.

In the current edition, Dougherty presents an argument for the importance of assessment of the work environment, an introduction to the tradition of "scientific management" (a term associated most closely with the work of Frederick Taylor in the early 20th century, and with W. Edwards Deming's Total Quality Management [TQM] movement in the 1980s), and an overview of how several specific tools for scientific management might be applied in the library context (for instance, process analysis, diary studies, time studies). The goal of the text is not simply to introduce the reader to these approaches for assessing the work environment, however, but to "rescue" these tools of analysis from what the author perceives as a general sentiment that they are outdated. Terms like "scientific management," "Taylorism," and "TQM" call to mind specific approaches to management that Dougherty recognizes many have rejected, and this text is essentially a plea not to "throw the baby out with the bathwater." Dougherty argues that anyone concerned about library assessment or library management today should continue to take advantage of the analytical tools developed as part of the

scientific management movement even if he or she has no desire to embrace the management philosophies they were used to support.

There are statements found throughout this volume that make this argument compelling. “[Almost] any library process could be improved if one were only willing to conduct a thorough study,” Dougherty writes. Without data, he continues, no decision about library processes or services can “proceed beyond an emotional level.” Few who have been involved in library assessment, or who have confronted the limitations of prevailing methods for the measurement of library service activities, would disagree with these statements. The limitations of his argument are more obvious when one considers the examples Dougherty provides for applying these analytical tools.

Consider, for example, Dougherty’s description of the use of check sheets for the assessment of reference services. While check sheets (or “tally sheets”) remain the basic tool for the assessment of reference services in many libraries, and Dougherty has updated his discussion to account for the development of software applications such as RefTracker (www.altarama.com.au/reftrack.htm), this reader was struck by the narrow scope of the description provided. Consistent with the underlying philosophy of scientific management, Dougherty’s description of the correct use of check sheets focuses on the mechanics of their use and not on how this type of data collection may (or may not) contribute to a useful assessment of the reference service program at the participating library. Knowing how to make use of a check sheet system to assess and improve reference service processes is an important skill for today’s librarian, but it is just as important to know how limited the check sheet, as a tool of analysis, can be in terms of meeting those goals.

Another limitation can be found in Dougherty’s discussion of the ways in which these tools of analysis can be applied to “[documenting] the contributions

of library resources and services to the quality of an undergraduate student’s experience” (p. 183) or, more to the point, how they cannot. In a description of how to conduct a cost-benefit analysis, he writes:

I’m familiar with quite a few college librarians who are scrambling to document their library’s impact. I’m not suggesting that such analyses are impossible, only that they are very difficult to carry out to the point of having meaningful results. It might be possible to document a library’s contributions, but I don’t see how those contributions can be meaningfully translated into dollars.

I agree with Dougherty both that this is a critical concern for library directors today and that it is complicated. I agree, further, that the tools provided by this text are likely not equal to the task. Unfortunately, in agreeing with the author on these points, my commitment to his overall argument (that is, that one should embrace these approaches to the assessment of the efficiency and effectiveness of the library as workplace) is weakened.

In considering Dougherty’s statements regarding the limited utility of these tools for assessing the impact of the library on the student experience, I was reminded of the qualitative approaches to assessment described in the recent collection by Nancy Fried Foster and Susan Gibbons, *Studying Students: The Undergraduate Student Experience at the University of Rochester* (2007).¹ Foster and Gibbons demonstrate how qualitative approaches to inquiry, equal in rigor to the quantitative approaches favored by earlier generations that are the focus for the current work, can guide library approaches to assessment and accountability. In the end, a comprehensive approach to these issues must draw on both traditions—quantitative and qualitative—and this is a dimension to the argument that I do not find in the Dougherty text. This is not to take away from the very effective intro-

duction to scientific management tools that Dougherty provides. It is simply to suggest that those tools no longer form the foundation of scientific study of the library as workplace, or the library as a feature of the campus and community, as they may once have.

It is unusual to find a text focused on operational issues in library management returned to the shelves after a gap in revision of a quarter-century. Clearly, there are many features of this text that deserve renewed consideration, especially the author's call for embracing what, in another recent work, Susan Gibbons (2007)² referred to an "R&D mind-set" in the library. The fundamental lesson of the current work is not that check sheets, time studies, and other tools of scientific management need be adopted, but that there are few decisions about the work we do that would not benefit from rigorous analysis and a commitment to improve that work based on the results of such analysis.—*Scott Walter, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.*

Notes

1. Nancy Fried Foster and Susan Gibbons, *Studying Students: The Undergraduate Research Project at the University of Rochester* (Chicago: Association of College & Research Libraries, 2007).

2. Susan Gibbons, *The Academic Library and the Net Gen Student: Making the Connections* (Chicago: Association of College & Research Libraries, 2007).

Howard F. Greisdorf and Brian C. O'Connor. *Structures of Image Collections from Chauvet-Pont-d'Arc to Flickr*. Westport, Conn.: Libraries Unlimited, 2008. 192p. alk. paper, \$45 (ISBN 1591583752). LC 2007-33044.

Based on the description of this book, readers would likely expect a theoretical, practical, or contemplative book on the history of image collections, digitization's impact on image collections, methods of constructing image collections, or points of consideration in defining and building

image collections. The book does not fully address any of these points; instead, it offers an uneven mixture of broad strokes and detailed information that will be unlikely to appeal to scholars. General audience readers may find the book a useful prompt for discussions on the concept of image collections; however, the book's description does not lend itself to interesting those readers.

Even though the book's contents do not match the description, the book still has ambitious goals. The book seems to be attempting to serve as a primer for the human element of image comprehension and usage as well as a primer to image collections as a whole, while also attempting to destabilize traditional notions of high art by countering the idea of image collections as those designed and selected by experts. It succeeds and fails in these goals in different ways in each of its five sections. Part of the failure is due to readability problems from being written by two writers with different styles, and this is even explained in the preface. Other problems stem from the sometimes disjointed structure of the book, with the final section adding material that would have been more appropriately covered earlier on, and from the occasional oversimplification of concepts. Issues of structure and style should have been smoothed over with the editor, but perhaps the time-sensitive nature of the material required an overly short editorial process.

The book's five sections are: "Seeing and Believing," "The Language of Image Structures," "Image Collections," "Groupthink, Deindividuation, and Desensitivity," and "Lessons from the Future." The first offers a broad discussion of human vision and methods of organizing collections. This section could be useful for a reading group discussion of image collections; and, indeed, the section states that it aims to raise questions and spark interest in the idea that the "structuring image collections is no longer a mundane issue but the basis for challenging philosophical debate." The first section also