

# Book Reviews



*Criteria for Promotion and Tenure for Academic Librarians.* Comp. Virginia Vesper and Gloria Kelley for the ACRL (Clip Note no. 26). Chicago: ALA, 1997. 143p. \$28.50, alk. paper (ISBN 0838979289). LC 97-39396.

The issues of promotion and tenure, as well as faculty status, for academic librarians have always been complex and at times controversial. This complexity is apparent in a review of the survey on which this volume is based; it highlights the differences and similarities between classroom faculty and academic librarians. Readers also are furnished with background and perspective on the various arguments that have evolved over the years concerning these issues.

The primary objective of the survey was to determine whether "librarians with faculty status have a greater opportunity for tenure and promotion than librarians with academic or professional status." Those with and without academic rank, as well as librarians with and without faculty status, were surveyed. In addition to these findings, promotion and tenure criteria from some institutions of higher education were collected and compared.

Vesper and Kelley reproduce a number of the promotion and tenure documents from the academic institutions included in the survey. The book includes documents from public institutions such as Arizona State University, West Campus, and State University of New York (SUNY) at Plattsburgh, as well as private institutions such as Alfred University and Eckerd College. This material provides invaluable information about how peers from public, private, and unionized institutions are handling the (for the most part) subjective task of formulating promotion and tenure criteria. Knowledge and mastery of subject matter, effectiveness of teaching, scholarly ability, univer-

sity service, and the potential for continued growth are a few of the categories most commonly used to evaluate and assess librarians.

Both raw-number composites and percentages are given for all survey results. A particularly important feature of the survey is the correlation of degrees held to that of faculty rank (i.e., instructor, assistant professor, etc.). The usual question as to whether the MLS is considered the terminal degree at each of the respective institutions is included; respondents were also asked what degree should be required for librarians holding each faculty rank. Also included is a list of the names and addresses of CLIP Note Committee members and a two-page bibliography.

Vesper and Kelley have done a remarkable job in compiling ACRL CLIP Note no. 26. This volume will provide guidance for academic libraries and librarians who are in need of instruments or templates for their promotion and tenure review process. It will be indispensable for administrators and librarians interested in faculty status, tenure, or promotion for academic librarians.—*Felix E. Unaeze, Ferris State University, Big Rapids, Michigan.*

**Fabian, Bernhard.** *In Close Association: Research, Humanities, and the Library.* Trans. John J. Boll. Champaign: Graduate School of Library and Information Science, Univ. of Illinois (Occasional Papers, no. 208), 1998. 70p. \$12, alk. paper.

At the end of this booklet, the reader is informed that the publisher is consistently ranked as one of the top three library and information science programs in the United States, while its university is consistently ranked as one of the top universities. Woe to their respective, supposedly lower-ranked peers, after reading this mess of a study.

In 1983, Bernhard Fabian published *Buch, Bibliothek, und Geisteswissenschaftliche Forschung: Zu Problemen der Literaturversorgung und der Literaturproduktion in der Bundesrepublik (The Book, the Library, and Research in the Humanities: On the Problems of Caring for and Providing Literature in West Germany)*. The study was masterly—the right book written for the right audience at the right time. So, initially, I was overjoyed to begin reading *In Close Association*, which I thought would be Fabian's updated discussion of these issues for an English-speaking audience in 1998.

Fabian offers a commentary on the relationship between libraries and their users; specifically, he views—from a scholar's perspective—the methods of supplying necessary research materials in the humanities. Since 1983, of course, libraries, the publishing world, scholars' requirements, and our concept of the humanities have changed dramatically. The humanities have developed in the past fifteen years, both in Germany and the United States, in at least three profound ways: (1) interdisciplinary study programs have emerged at universities (sometimes at the expense of less popular disciplines); (2) publishers have overhauled their commitment in the marketplace, according to their consumers' perceived wants; and (3) libraries continue to meet the increasingly sophisticated needs of their users, especially with respect to new media and off-site access to these and other of the libraries' resources.

Although I did find the section on interlibrary lending pertinent to the book's objective, *In Close Association* is otherwise a study with many obvious weaknesses. The title itself is false advertising. The reader is led to believe that the study is tailored for American readers and will treat current themes of interest to them. Instead, one is faced with an undue emphasis on Germany with dated, irrelevant overviews. Far too much of the discussion regurgitates specifically German issues from the 1983 book. Are such topics really of interest to the intended audi-

ence? I would contend that they are not; but if they are, should they not at least also reflect the present situation in Germany? Moreover (again if they are of interest), should the author not include references to other recent studies that treat the topics at hand (e.g., Hans-Peter Thun's *An Introduction to Librarianship in the Federal Republic of Germany* [1996] and my *Odyssey of a German National Library* [1996])? The author uses only endnotes; they are dated, and more than a few are extraneous. Moreover, the work needs an index and a bibliography.

In addition, there is the question of John J. Boll's role in the project. In the preface, Boll is frank about changing Fabian's 1983 book. Boll translated it. More important, with Fabian's approval, Boll omitted about half of the original while updating and adapting the rest for "American conditions and needs." Boll's actual breakdown of the original work versus the present work is as comic as it is mind-spinning: 45 percent of the present work is unchanged from the original; 38 percent is new text (by Boll? by Fabian? presumably the former); 17 percent updates the original; and 32 percent of the original work's pages and 36 percent of its text were omitted. What does it all mean? Who knows? What is clear (or rather unclear) is that at no point in *In Close Association* do we really know whether Fabian or Boll is the author, or whether certain prices and numerical data are based on 1983 or 1998 figures (or those from another year). In any case, comparing the 1998 text to the 1983 original is a task that presumably few people would want to be assigned.

Several questions could—and should—have been addressed in this book. Given the book's title, the questions are relevant and timely. To what extent will the Internet impact how scholars work in the humanities? How will distribution patterns (e.g., superstores, vendor—library relations, electronic sales) affect the provision of materials in the humanities for libraries and scholars? How will specific genres in the humanities (e.g., fiction) be distrib-

uted and consumed in the future? And in what formats? These questions demand serious answers, however impressionistic and futuristic; Fabian and/or Boll do not spend sufficient time on them.

They do address the relationship of electronic journals and the humanities, but by then it is far too little and, arriving immediately before the epilogue, too late. Surely, in the late 1990s, the authors cannot still believe that the Online Conspicuous Database "should ultimately become a useful guide to holdings strengths and help in coordinated acquisitions policies." I suppose they have a point if you do not mind leading yourself blindfolded down a dark tunnel. Yet the authors continue undeterred: they would rather persuade the reader that the conspectus is designed to provide complete standardized information on the location of specific humanities collections and their relative strengths in North American research libraries. The dream lives on.

Finally, the authors are unreasonably anachronistic. Their prediction that monographs and journals on paper will remain dominant in the humanities and their opinion that the book in paper format is still the ideal standard for publication in the humanities are both akin to the ideas of an ostrich that has yet to stick its head out of the sand for fifteen years. Scholars' habits and publishers' products have changed, and betting everything on the primacy of paper is, as we enter the next century, no sure thing.

How very disappointed I was after reading this book. What a waste of a grand opportunity.—*Michael P. Olson, Harvard University.*

*Guidelines for Educational Use of Copyrighted Materials.* Ed. Peggy Hoon. Pullman, Wash.: Washington State Univ. Pr., 1997. 34p. \$15 (ISBN 0-87422-161-7). LC 97-32885.

Succinct, well organized, accessible, practical, dry—these all describe this helpful manual on copyright law for educators. Prepared by copyright specialist and attorney for Washington State University

Peggy Hoon, the document was originally drafted to provide operating guidelines for the WSU community. In response to widespread interest, its publication and distribution has been increased. The guidelines are applicable and easily adapted to all educational institutions, public and private.

The work is well organized by type of publication and type of use. There is no index, but a detailed table of contents facilitates finding pertinent sections within this slim paperback volume.

The book opens with a discussion of the purpose of copyright, rights of the owner, and a brief description of the commonly used term *fair use*. The common misconception that educational use, in and of itself, constitutes fair use is shattered in the opening pages. Infringements of copyright law may result in personal as well as institutional liability.

After a brief introduction to the concept of copyright, the book focuses on its primary purpose, which is to explore the practical issues of using copyrighted materials. A review of the protections that apply to printed materials is extremely useful, covering both published and unpublished works, and facts and ideas. The discussion helps clarify confusing problems in determining whether copyright protection exists, based on the date of creation and/or publication of a work. The confusion is further simplified by the inclusion of an easy-to-read chart (appendix G) produced by noted copyright lecturer and authority Laura Gasaway.

The author then outlines, in a succinct and usable format, what constitutes permissible use in research, in the classroom, for library reserves, library photocopying, and interlibrary loan. This is the heart of the publication, providing practical advice on the legal use of copyrighted materials.

In sidebars, the author poses frequently asked questions (FAQs) to illustrate points. The format is difficult to use to find an answer to a specific need; an index would have served better for that