

Report Content

The general process involved in writing a report for either a Preconference or Program session is to provide a record of what was said by the speaker(s) and, to a lesser extent, by the audience members. Your role is to synthesize and give the gist of the presentation; it does not have to be verbatim or rely on direct quotations. Similarly you may want to summarize comments made by audience members, but you are not required to provide direct quotations; nor do you have to record all comments or observations.

For Vision session papers, the report should be as close as possible to a direct transcript while maintaining a logical flow of ideas.

When organizing your report, it is not necessary to follow the precise structure followed in the presentation but rather use your own discretion. It is completely acceptable to impose order on an oral presentation by, for example, identifying themes or concepts and then devoting a paragraph to each theme or idea. Sometimes PowerPoint slides or handouts can provide an organizing principle for the paper.

Although you can, as a recorder, characterize the nature or tone of a discussion—“discussion was heated” or “several members of the audience were strongly against the proposal”—you should not editorialize or offer your own opinions on the topic itself. Use tact when describing differences of opinion during a discussion period or to describe any other untoward or uncomfortable exchange, incident, or statement that is part of a presentation or question-and-answer period.

Important Notes for Recorders:

We require you to submit a draft of your report to the session presenter(s) before you send a final version to us. Try to write your report as soon as possible following the conference. When we receive your report, we may have suggestions for improving presentation or expression. We will ask for your input regarding substantive suggestions, but minor revisions, including grammatical and spelling errors, will be made at the editors’ discretion.

Important Note for Speakers Preparing Papers:

Unless you have made arrangements with the Program Planning Committee or the Proceedings editors to have a recorder for your session, you are responsible for preparing a paper for the Proceedings. You may be contacted by a reporter for the NASIG Newsletter, but a newsletter report does not take the place of a paper written for the Proceedings. If in doubt about whether you need to write a paper for the Proceedings, contact the editors well in advance prior to the conference.

Multiple Authors:

In those sessions with more than one author for the paper (a Program session with multiple presenters, for example), a single paper must be written. Authors need to coordinate with each other in order to submit the paper. The paper can be written by a designated author or each author can be responsible for a section of the paper. Please ensure that authors are clearly identified, and that the organization and the flow of the writing is clear. The recorder or first presenter is designated the corresponding author. He or she is expected to pass on communications with the editors and publisher to co-authors.

How to Submit Your Paper:

Papers must be submitted via email to the production editor, Paul Moeller, at Paul.Moeller@Colorado.EDU. The text of your paper should be submitted as an attachment with each illustration and/or table as additional, separate attachments. Please use the corresponding author's surname as the filename for your paper. For example, if the corresponding author's last name is Smith, save your report as Smith.doc. Figures and tables should be named as their number, for example, SmithFig1.pdf.

- **Deadline: July 30, 2018**

License to Publish:

A Taylor & Francis License to Publish form is required before the paper can be published in *Serials Librarian*. The corresponding author completes the form including the title of the manuscript exactly as it appears on the manuscript and all of the authors' (presenters and recorder, if applicable) names. Check the appropriate box, sign the form, and submit it via email to the production editor, Paul Moeller. . The form is available at:

https://amo_hub_content.s3.amazonaws.com/Association92/files/conference%20proceedings/2016_Society%20Licence%20to%20Publish_final.pdf

Proceedings authors retain copyright of their articles and are asked to grant Taylor & Francis a license to publish the version of record of an article. Please see the rights as listed with the License to Publish form. If you have any specific questions regarding the License to Publish form, please contact the production editor at Paul.Moeller@Colorado.EDU.

Style Guide

Style: The general style of the paper should follow the 16th edition of the Chicago Manual of Style. Underlined words will be typeset in italics. The use of quotation marks for emphasis is discouraged.

Font: Times New Roman

Spacing: Double-space your entire paper, including block quotations. Make sure your Notes section is also double-spaced. Avoid the use of extra line spacing after paragraphs.

Margins: Leave 1 inch margins all around: top and bottom, left and right.

Indent paragraphs: Indent paragraphs. Do not use spacing to indicate paragraph breaks.

Special formatting: Do not use special formatting such as page breaks, page numbers, footers/headers, embedded footnotes, etc. Do not use Endnote or Footnote features. Italics are acceptable and will be used for emphasis. Bold text will be converted to italics.

Manuscript Length (double-spaced):

Preconference/Postconference workshops: 10-15 pages

Vision session: 10-15 pages

Program session: 6-12 pages

Acronyms: All acronyms should be spelled out in their first occurrence (see below for exceptions). If an acronym appears in the abstract, it should be spelled out there AND again in its first occurrence in the body of the paper.

Spelling: See last page of this document.

Numbers

- percentages are represented as 25 percent NOT 25 % or twenty-five percent
- numbers 1-99 are spelled out (except when expressing percentages); numbers 100 and above are represented in their Arabic numeral form (unless the number starts a sentence)
- fractions are spelled out: two-thirds not 2/3

Template:

**Why Can't Students Get the Sources They Need? Results from a Real Electronic
Resources Availability Study**

[Title - 12 pt Times New Roman, Bold, Title Case (upper/lower)]

Sanjeet Mann
Presenter

Sarah sutton
Recorder

**[Presenters and Recorders - 12 point Times New Roman. Listed in order of importance.
Usually authors will be listed alphabetically if the contributions were equal.]**

Availability studies are used to estimate the proportion of items in a library collection that are available to users, and the proportion of items in a library collection that are unavailable to users as a result of system and/or human errors. Sanjeet Mann of the Armacost Library at the University of Redlands used a series of availability to studies to more accurately understand and troubleshoot the e-resources access errors that keep undergraduate students at the University from obtaining the full text of electronic resources. In this presentation, Mann shared the details of his process, his results, and the implications of those results for improving local search systems as well as a conceptual model of e-resource availability errors based on the results of his research.

[Abstract: Do not use a heading for the Abstract. Text is in 12 point Times New Roman Abbreviations should be spelled out in the Abstract, and again on first mention in the body. Four to six sentences, not repeated verbatim in the body of the paper. Rule of thumb: 100-150 words.]

KEYWORDS resources troubleshooting, availability studies, usability studies, e-resources

[**Keywords:** 4-6 words or phrases supplied by authors. Keywords should be in lowercase, separated by commas, in no particular order, and without ending punctuation. Spell out abbreviations, even those that are spelled out first in the Abstract and/or again in the body.]

BODY OF PAPER

Use 12 pt Times New Roman and indent paragraphs. Within the body, titles for **Figures** and **Tables** are called out (placed appropriately) in a separate paragraph. **Headings in the body** can have 3 levels.

Chicago Headings

Level Format

- 1 Centered, Boldface or Italic Type, Headline-style Capitalization**
- 2 Centered, Regular Type, Headline-style Capitalization**
- 3 Flush Left, Boldface or Italic Type, Headline-style Capitalization**

Figures:

Each illustration, such as a photograph, chart, or other graphic, must be submitted as a separate file and NOT embedded in the text. If copyright permission is required to use the illustration(s) it is the author's obligation to obtain this. Submitted illustrations should be in black and white, or they will be converted to black and white for print publication (illustrations may be published in color in the online version of the journal). Files should follow these guidelines:

- 300 dpi or higher
- Sized to fit on journal page
- TIFF, PDF, PSD, JPEG or Microsoft Word format only
- Submitted as separate files, not embedded in text files

Tips for figures:

- Check the resolution to make sure the figure is clear and easy to read.
- Make sure a conversion to b/w will not compromise readability (for example, a chart that relies on a color-based legend). It is best to submit two version, one in b/w and one in color.
- The title should NOT be included as part of the figure itself
- Check all text for typos and to make sure it conforms to preferred spellings.
- Make sure it is not too large to fit on the journal page. If it is necessary to shrink the figure, make sure it is still readable.

Each figure should be numbered in the order they are referenced in the paper, and referenced directly in the text. For example: "Figure 1 illustrates ..." or "(see Figure 2)."

- An insertion point needs to be marked in the manuscript for each figure, and should be placed after the paragraph the figure is mentioned in. At the insertion point, include the full title for the figure.

Example:

Figure 4 Print Holdings Screen in CUFTS

Tables:

Each table should be submitted as a separate Word file and NOT embedded in the text.

Tips for Tables:

- The title should NOT be included as part of the table itself.
- Check all text for typos and to make sure it conforms to preferred spellings.
- Make sure that columns and rows have headers, as needed.
- For larger tables, they may have to be broken up in multiple pages.
- Each table should be numbered (in the order they are referenced in the paper) and referenced directly in the text. For example: "Table 1 shows ..." or "(see Table 2)."
- An insertion point needs to be marked in the manuscript for each table, and should be placed after the paragraph the table is mentioned in. Include the full title for the table at the insertion point.

Example:

Table 4 Terminology Comparison

NOTES

Citation Style: Chicago Notes and Bibliography

Chicago-Style Citation Quick Guide:

http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide.html

Refer to the 16th edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style* for detailed instructions.

For all online resources, even those with a formal publication date, Taylor & Francis requires an accessed date or last updated date.

For journal articles, include a digital object identifier (DOI) if you can readily find it

Use superscript numerals in the body, but regular font in the Notes. Do not use the embedded footnote or endnote feature in Word! The numerals should be at the end of the sentence in which reference is first made.

Example:

The OhioLINK OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc. (OCLC) Collection and Circulation Analysis Project found that for Ohio libraries, only about 6 percent of the collection drove 80 percent of the usage, which contests the widely held belief that the 80/20 rule applies to library circulation (i.e., 20 percent of the collection drives 80 percent of the usage).¹

NOTES

1. OhioLINK Collection Building Task Force, Julia Gammon, and Edward T. O’Neill, “OhioLINK OCLC Collection and Circulation Analysis Project 2011” (Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Research, 2011), accessed June 9, 2014, <http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2011/2011>.
2. Library as Incubator Project, “American Library Association Conference 2013 Wrap-Up,” *The Library as Incubator Project Blog*, July 3, 2013, accessed June 9, 2014, <http://www.libraryasincubatorproject.org/?p=11056>.
3. Arlee Turner, Bernadette Welch, and Sue Reynolds, “Learning Spaces in Academic Libraries—A Review of the Evolving Trends,” *Australian Academic & Research Libraries* 44, no. 4 (December 2013): 226–234, doi:10.1080/00048623.2013.857383.
4. I. Elaine Allen and Jeff Seaman, “Grade Change: Tracking Online Education in the United States” (Oakland, CA: Babson Survey Research Group and Quahog Research Group, LLC, 2014), accessed June 9, 2014, <http://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/gradechange.pdf>.
5. Ibid.

6. Indiana University Office of Online Education, "Online Education by the Numbers," *IU Online Newsletter* 2, no. 3 (April 16, 2014).
7. Office of the Registrar, "Fall 2014 Online Courses Schedule," *Indiana University Southeast*, accessed June 9, 2014, http://www.ius.edu/registrar/schedule-of-classes/semesters/fall-2014/online_all.
8. IU Online, "Undergraduate Degrees," *Indiana University*, accessed June 9, 2014, http://iuonline.iu.edu/programs/browse/browse_degree.php?type=ug_degree.
9. Association of College & Research Libraries, "Standards for Distance Learning Library Services," (Chicago: American Library Association, July 1, 2008), accessed June 9, 2014, <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/guidelinesdistancelearning>.
10. Allen McKiel, "Survey Analysis," in *2008 Global Student E-Book Survey* (Palo Alto, CA: ebrary, 2008), 32–38, accessed June 9, 2014, http://www.ebrary.com/corp/collateral/en/Survey/ebrary_student_survey_2008.pdf.
11. Michael Rogers, "Survey Reveals College Students' Growing Preference for E-Texts," *Library Journal* 126, no. 2 (February 2001): 31.
12. William Douglas Woody, David B. Daniel, and Crystal A. Baker, "E-Books or Textbooks: Students Prefer Textbooks," *Computers & Education* 55 (2010): 945–948, doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2010.04.005.
13. Sarah Smyth and Andrew P. Carlin, "Use and Perception of Ebooks in the University of Ulster: A Case Study," *New Review of Academic Librarianship* 18, no. 2 (November 2012): 176–205, doi:10.1080/13614533.2012.719851.

14. Mara Rojeski, "User Perceptions of Ebooks versus Print Books for Class Reserves in an Academic Library," *Reference Services Review* 40, no. 2 (2012): 228–241, doi:10.1108/00907321211228291.
15. University of California Libraries, "UC Libraries Academic E-Book Usage Survey: Springer E-Book Pilot Project" (University of California Libraries, May 2011), accessed June 9, 2014, http://www.cdlib.org/services/uxdesign/docs/2011/academic_ebook_usage_survey.pdf.
16. Gerard Ward, "62% of 16-24s Prefer Books as Physical Products," *Voxburner*, November 25, 2013, accessed June 9, 2014, <http://www.voxburner.com/publications/347-62-of-16-24s-prefer-books-as-physical-products>.
17. University of California Libraries, *UC Libraries Academic E-Book Usage Survey*.
18. Ibid.
19. Ferris Jabr, "Why the Brain Prefers Paper," *Scientific American* 309 (November 2013): 48–53, doi:10.1038/scientificamerican1113-48.
20. Joint Information Systems Committee, "JISC National E-Books Observatory Project: Key Findings and Recommendations Final Report" (London: JISC Collections, 2009), accessed June 9, 2014, <http://observatory.jiscebooks.org/reports/jisc-national-e-books-observatory-project-key-findings-and-recommendations/>.
21. Ibid.
22. Edward W. Walton, "From the ACRL 13th National Conference: E-Book Use versus Users' Perspective," *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 14, no. 4 (December 2007): 19–35.
23. Ibid.

24. Justin Littman and Lynn Silipigni Connaway, "A Circulation Analysis of Print Books and E-Books in an Academic Research Library," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 48, no. 4 (October 2004): 256–262.
25. Smyth and Carlin, "Use and Perception of Ebooks in the University of Ulster."
26. comScore, Inc., "U.S. Digital Future in Focus 2014" (Reston, VA: comScore, Inc., 2014), accessed June 9, 2014, [https://www.comscore.com/Insights/Presentations and Whitepapers/2014/2014 US Digital Future in Focus](https://www.comscore.com/Insights/Presentations_and_Whitepapers/2014/2014_US_Digital_Future_in_Focus) (requires sign up).
27. Clifford A. Lynch, "Ebooks in 2013," *American Libraries E-Content Supplement* (June 2013): 12–16, accessed June 9, 2014, <http://www.americanlibrariesmagazine.org/article/ebooks-2013>.
28. Ibid.
29. "About Us," *Libraries for Universal Accessibility*, accessed June 9, 2014, <http://uniaccessig.org/lua/about-lua/>.
30. Adina Mulliken, "Thoughts and Tips about Ebook Accessibility," *Libraries for Universal Accessibility* blog, May 15, 2013, accessed June 9, 2014, <http://www.uniaccessig.org/universal/node/97>.
31. Ava Seave, "You'll Need a PhD to Make Sense of the Pricing Schemes Publishers Impose on Libraries," *Forbes* blog, November 19, 2013, accessed June 10, 2014, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/avaseave/2013/11/19/youll-need-a-phd-to-make-sense-of-the-pricing-schemes-publishers-impose-on-libraries/>.

32. David Stern, "Ebooks: From Institutional to Consortial Considerations," *ONLINE* 34, no. 3 (June 2010): 29–35, accessed June 10, 2014, <http://www.infotoday.com/online/may10/Stern.shtml>.
33. Mirela Roncevic, "E-book Platforms for Libraries," *Library Technology Reports* 49, no. 3 (April 2013).
34. Richard Kaplan, ed., *Building and Managing E-Book Collections a How-to-Do-It Manual for Librarians* (Chicago, IL: Neal-Schuman, 2012).
35. Sue Polanka, ed., *The No Shelf Required Guide to E-Book Purchasing* (Chicago, IL: ALA TechSource, 2011).
36. *Occam's Reader*, accessed June 10, 2014, <http://occamsreader.org/>.
37. Emily Gillingham, "26% of Book Collections Are Now Digital," *Wiley Exchanges blog*, August 13, 2013, accessed June 10, 2014, <http://exchanges.wiley.com/blog/2013/08/13/26-of-book-collections-are-now-digital/>.
38. "LRCCD Libraries Electronic Collection Development Policy," *Cosumnes River College*, accessed June 10, 2014, http://www.crc.losrios.edu/Student_Services/Library/About_the_Library/LRCCD_Libraries_Electronic_Collection_Development_Policy.htm.

APPENDICES (IF ANY)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS (IF ANY)

CONTRIBUTOR NOTES

Sanjeet Mann is Arts and Electronic Resources Librarian, University of Redlands, Redlands, California.

Sarah Sutton is Assistant Professor, School of Library and Information Management, Emporia State University, Emporia, Kansas.

Contributor Notes - Level 1 heading. First name, initial, last name, suffixes, position, affiliated institution, city, state (where applicable), and country (e.g., USA). Do not include street addresses, zip codes, etc. Do not reorder contributor notes to re-group the authors by their affiliation. Presenters first, followed by the Recorder.

Preferred Spellings

Refer to MerriamWebster Online (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/>) for terms not included in this list.

3-D
A-Z
audio-visual
Bachelor's degree
backfile
benefitted
"Big Data"
"Big Deal"
bioterrorism
byproducts/bypass
cancelled
cataloging/cataloger
check-in (noun or adjective), check in (verb)
Cold War
coursepack
decision-makers
e-mail, e-journal, e-book, e-resource
electronic resource management (ERM) system (plural, ERM systems)
end user
full text (noun), full-text (adjective)
fundraising
grassroots

healthcare
inservice (training)
Internet
interrelated
interlibrary
keyword
knowledgebase
lifecycle
link resolver
Master's degree
multifaceted
ongoing
online
onsite
Open Access
open source (noun), open-source (adjective)
OpenURL
PhD
policy-makers/policy-making
postmodern
preconference
pre-existing/pre-empting
Serials Solutions (two words)
trade-off
USA PATRIOT Act (not PATRIOT Act nor Patriot Act)
United Kingdom (noun), U.K. (adjective), UK (in end notes and contributor notes)
United States (noun), U.S. (adjective), US (in end notes and contributor notes)
URL
website/webinar/webcase but Web, Web page, Web-based
West/Western
workflow, workload
worldwide