



## President's Message

—Submitted By Alice Marksberry

This new millennium (2000-2001, whatever year you ascribe to) in general, has been all over the proverbial "road" in terms of *expectations* (a fresh start, new prospects/hopes for humanity); *fears* (Y2K, invasion of space creatures, the world would explode); and *results* (you fill in this blank). For us personally and professionally I would expect widely varying agreements and/or arguments to what, where and how far our profession has come so far in this new millennium and century.

A few individuals in the world outside the information arena are declaring, "*the promise of the Internet appears to be fading*" (quote from Business Week article, March 2001). I would challenge that statement. I believe that it is finally getting to the point of becoming a useful tool used by many different types of user groups for many types of reasons. It has changed the way people communicate with family and friends; it has certainly changed the way we conduct business on many levels; it has sped up the process of locating information for research and medical needs. I could go on but you already know the picture better than most of the general population.

So in regards to our Kentucky chapter, I would challenge each of us to create or expand on existing **expectations**, eliminate the **fears** and work together for the **results** we wish to achieve as a group.

What has the chapter accomplished this year? To mention just a few, we have gone to a totally electronic delivery system for our chapter bulletin. Almost 100% of our members are now subscribed to the kysla listserv, due in large part to the efforts

of Mary Vass, our listserv owner. Therefore most of our chapter's communication efforts are now done via the listserv. Both of these projects have resulted in a substantial monetary savings for the chapter. Professional development programs have been combined with our board meetings so that members have greater incentive to attend meetings. Our successful Fall conference began our 25<sup>th</sup> chapter anniversary festivities by allowing many of our past chapter presidents to gather, network and be recognized for their contributions. Additionally members had the opportunity to meet, greet and hear from SLA President-Elect, Hope Tillman. A beautiful day at the Keeneland racetrack allowed members to see the anniversary year out with a bang along with some great memories.

At this point, I would like to take the opportunity to thank many individuals within the Kentucky Chapter that contributed to accomplishing many of the goals set forth this past year.

My thanks goes out to our chapter committees for their diligent work and results such as the creation and continuing enhancement of our membership recruitment brochure. I look forward to seeing it used in the following year. The PR/Affirmative Action committee admirably discharged their responsibility for the AA award process and is currently humming along with potential articles to be submitted to SLA's *Information Outlook* as well as other potential activities. The student group has been actively involved in both the Student and Kentucky Chapters. Thanks to our web chair and a big

(continued on page 5)

## CURRENT OFFICERS

### President

Alice Marksberry  
 (859) 257-0308  
 alice@caer.uky.edu

### Past President

Linda Minch  
 (859) 231-3334  
 lminch@herald-leader.com

### President-Elect

Wenda Webster Fischer  
 (502) 244-8807  
 gibbs@infosourceinc.com

### Secretary

Andrea Peak  
 (502) 895-2405  
 apeak@aph.org

### Treasurer

Veronica Walker  
 (859) 257-0500 x2050  
 vwalk00@pop.uky.edu

### Directors At Large

Cindi Trainor  
 (859) 257-0500 x2115  
 cindi@email.uky.edu

James Manasco  
 (859) 257-8535  
 manasco@pop.uky.edu

### Listserv Information

Address: [kysla@lsv.uky.edu](mailto:kysla@lsv.uky.edu)  
 To subscribe, send message to [listserv@lsv.uky.edu](mailto:listserv@lsv.uky.edu) with "subscribe kysla firstname lastname" in the body of the message.

## Table of Contents

*President's Message* ..... page 1  
*What the Web Looks Like When You Can't See* ..... page 3  
*The KY Encyclopedia Web Version* ..... page 3  
*Keynote Speaker at the Spring Meeting* ..... page 4  
*An Evaluation of Library Instruction* ..... page 5  
*Wrestling with the OPAC* ..... page 6  
*Electronic Theses and Dissertations at UK* ..... page 6  
*SLA/KY Keeneland Meeting* ..... page 7  
*Selection and Evaluation of Engineering Web Sites* ..... page 8  
*THANKS to our Spring Meeting Sponsors!* ..... page 8

### Advertising Rates

*Full page:* \$450 per four issues, \$125 per issue  
*Half page:* \$252 per four issues, \$70 per issue  
*Quarter page:* \$162 per four issues, \$45 per issue

### About the Bulletin

*Special Libraries Association assumes no responsibility for the statements and opinions advanced by contributors to the Association's publications. Editorial views do not necessarily represent the official position of SLA. Acceptance of an advertisement does not imply endorsement of any product by Special Libraries Association. (M094(e)-1/76; Agen-Doc B76-01). The chapter bulletin is published four times a year.*

### EDITORS

Cindi Trainor  
Electronic Resources Team  
University of Kentucky Libraries  
Lexington, KY  
(859) 257-0500 x2115  
cindi@email.uky.edu

James Manasco  
Engineering Library  
University of Kentucky Libraries  
Lexington, KY  
(859) 257-8358  
manasco@pop.uky.edu

### Publication Deadlines

Deadline for submitting articles is one month prior to publication of the issue. Please submit articles for the Summer issue of the Bulletin by July 15, 2001.

Electronic format is preferred.

Send e-mail to James Manasco at manasco@pop.uky.edu, or mail your diskette to:

Shaver Engineering Library  
355 Anderson Hall  
University of Kentucky,  
Lexington, KY 40506-004

*Newsletters are posted one month after article submission date.*



---

## What the Web Looks Like When You Can't See

—Submitted by Elizabeth Smigielski

Ever wonder how a blind or low-vision person experiences the web? One might think that the web, a primarily visual medium, offers little use to the blind, but this is hardly the case. The web offers the blind and other disabled people untold freedom and independence. You may enjoy the convenience of shopping online and saving yourself a trip in the car. For the blind, however, the web expands their abilities far beyond the scope of mere convenience.

How do low-vision people or the blind “see” the web? Low-vision people use magnification software. The blind can use Braille reader pages or speech output software called “Jaws” which reads “out loud” the content of a web page. Users navigate through the web page by using the keys on a standard keyboard. Andrea demonstrated the Jaws software on Amazon.com. While it would take a little getting used to, the software gave a fair representation of the content of the page; although, it is much slower than visual scanning.

Unfortunately, fair was about the best we could hope for, and is about the best the visually impaired can hope for. The visually impaired have to contend with many accessibility problems. A site that has overpowering backgrounds, or low contrast between text and background can be impossible for a low-vision person to read. For those using Jaws, graphics are a particular problem. A page that has many graphics but scant content will have little meaning. If a graphic does not have an identification tag (an HTML “alt” tag) Jaws will simply read the image as “graphic” with no

indication of what the picture represents. Image maps, frames, and awkward navigation, such as a “click here” link are also common obstacles that render content meaningless to a Jaws user.

Anyone responsible for a web site should make an effort to make his or her site accessible for the visually impaired. If good conscience isn't a sufficient motivator, perhaps legislation will be. There is much speculation that we will soon hear of lawsuits against web site providers who are not compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Web sites and articles such as WebAble, [www.webable.com](http://www.webable.com),

Web Accessibility Initiative, [www.w3.org/WAI](http://www.w3.org/WAI), and “Is Your Site ADA-Compliant...or a Lawsuit in Waiting?” [www.icdri.org/is\\_yoursite\\_ada\\_compliant.htm](http://www.icdri.org/is_yoursite_ada_compliant.htm) offer information on improving accessibility. If you want to see if your site is accessible, go to the Bobby site, <http://www.cast.org/bobby/>, to submit your page and receive an accessibility summary.

When designing web pages, keep the visually impaired in mind and, remember that, as Andrea told us, “The web is like a woman. The prettier she is the less accessible she is.” ✕

---

## The KY Encyclopedia Web Version

—Submitted by Carrie Stephenson

Tom Kmetz, the online services coordinator at Morehead State University, began by reviewing the status of *The Kentucky Encyclopedia* at the library when he joined the staff. The 1997 print edition was dog-eared from use while the stand-alone CD-ROM version saw little use. In 1998 his director, Larry Besant, suggested he mount the CD-ROM on the campus network. He then reviewed the history of that project. Working with Dr. Scott Wymer, server administrator and programmer, for the Center for Virtual Appalachia, and the University Press of Kentucky, Mr. Kmetz succeeded in completing the task on January 1, 2001. Currently the product is in beta testing with a public unveiling planned for the summer. Only institutions will be able to subscribe. Annual subscriptions are \$0.06 per FTE student for universi-

ties, colleges, and technical schools. K-12 schools, non-profit organizations, government agencies, and public libraries will pay \$25.00 while businesses will pay \$75.00. The press anticipates that it will be at least three years before a revision is done.

After Mr. Kmetz reviewed the history of the project, he demonstrated the web version, which has some capabilities not available in the other versions. The opening page offers a search for the full-text of entries along with fielded searching. It also has a tips page and alphabetical browsing. Full-text retrieval is sorted by relevancy with the search terms highlighted. All proper names in the encyclopedia are indexed and each name has a link to all mentions of the person. The same thing is true when

(continued on page 7)

## Keynote Speaker at the Spring Meeting

—Submitted by Alice Marksberry

The conference theme of “Conquering New Frontiers: Changes and Challenges for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Libraries” was complimented by the keynote speaker’s address of “Resource Sharing in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: The Final Frontier”. Mary Jackson, ARL Senior Program Officer for Access Services, directs the North American Interlibrary Loan and Document Delivery (NAILDD) Project and chairs the NAILDD Project’s ILL Protocol Implementors Group. She is an internationally recognized authority on interlibrary loan, document delivery, resource sharing, and copyright issues. She writes, consults and speaks on these topics throughout the U.S., Canada and many other countries.

For those that could not attend this worthwhile session and conference, the following is taken, mostly verbatim, from Mary’s PowerPoint slides. We extend our thanks to her for taking her time to speak with us as a group.

Throughout the presentation, she posed a series of questions about the future of resource sharing; questions about copyright; and would highlight a variety of innovations in these areas.

*What is resource sharing?* — Interlibrary loan; —Document Delivery; —Remote circulation/unmediated ILL; —Cooperative Collection Development. The Frontier is the underdeveloped area or field for discussion or research. Is resource sharing an undeveloped area?

*What is mediated ILL?* —Current library-based service; —Loan and copy requests; —All material types; —ILL staff involved in process; —

Material is delivered to the patron’s library; —Interesting statistics: Research libraries: 2/3 photocopies to every book; Medical: 95% photocopies; Public: 95% books; —Staff is 2/3 costs of borrowing and 3/4 costs of lending; —11 to 16 day turnaround; —Very specialized (borrowing is 3-5% of circulation; —Controlled by well developed policies; —It is the only option is patron does not want to go to the material.

*Will mediated ILL disappear?* — Currently it is too slow; too labor intensive; it is not what patrons want; materials via ILL are increasingly available in electronic format.

*What is remote Circulation?* — Unmediated ILL, patron-initiated circulation, patron self-initiated ILL borrowing systems; —Patrons, books and transactions treated as if they are “local”; —Examples are OhioLINK, ORBIS, BorrowDirect (Penn, Columbia, Yale).

*Related to this, what is NISO?* — A circulation protocol; —Direct consortial borrowing, circulation and ill interaction; —Self-service/checkout system; —Remote user authorization.

*Will Remote replace Mediated ILL?* It may for libraries that: — borrow primarily books; in consortia with other interested in their model; interested in reducing ILL unit costs.

It may not work for libraries that: —do not find like-minded libraries; worry about “outsiders” using their materials; use integrated library systems from vendors who do not implement the NICP.

*Will Electronic Journals eliminate the need for photocopies?* Possibly in that there is increased

access to e-journals via aggregated collections and consortial agreements. However, in Mary’s opinion, it is take a long time, if ever, will all ILL requests be for electronic access materials. Another point to consider is whether or not librarians catalog electronic titles, especially if the library does not own that material. And how will patrons access these materials if not collected in the catalogs? Via web lists perhaps? Should libraries even permit or allow (given that a license agreement would grant) access to electronic copies, what about the costs?

*In terms of the current Copyright Act, how can electronic journals be used for ILL?* Section 108(g)(2) is the ILL clause; additionally, the CONFU Guidelines (the 5 year thing, not a rule!) also focuses the process. The CONFU process failed to develop guidelines for the digital age and the Digital Millennium Copyright Act is also a piece of the puzzle.

*Will the next revision of copyright law eliminate ILL?* The profession is closely watching some current court cases such as *Tasini vs. NY Times*. Are electronic versions simply “revisions” or something else? If it is a revision, then the author’s permission is not needed. Publishers have declared that they will pull articles if the Times lost this case. In another case of *Greenberg vs. National Geographic*, the issues were converted to CDROM. Did the photographer assign rights for this format?

*What about Distance Education?* When does an ILL user become a remote circulation user? Will state or consortia licenses provide sufficient access to electronic journal literature?



## Do You Think They Got It? An Evaluation of Library Instruction

—Submitted by Carrie Stephenson

The National ILL code has been revised to permit lenders to ship materials directly to the patron.

*Can a library joint too many Consortia?* Does remote circulation require consortial agreements? What about multiple conflicting priorities? Will there be a “merging” of consortia and which will offer the best “return on investment”?

*Where does Cooperative Collection Development fit in?* Are libraries changing what is purchased based on effective ILL/DD agreements? Patrons now have higher expectations of ILL/DD. ILL patrons want fast, personalized access at their desktops. Are libraries being compared to Amazon.com? What prevents Ill from being as fast as commercial suppliers? And finally ...

*How Can Resource Sharing Managers Plan for an Unknown Future?*

Our profession needs to use new and existing technologies and have curiosity of new products and services. We need to change our orientation and have a collaborative mindset. We need to be willing to take risks and even fail at times to face future challenges. ✕

Janet Brewer of Murray State University introduced the presentation by discussing the summative approach to evaluating library instruction (Did the student get it?) and the formative approach (What did the teacher do?). She then reviewed evaluation methods Murray State has used in the past such as pen and paper tests, self-evaluation of process/progress, and student behavior/product.

Murray presently offers a two-credit hour elective class that meets twice a week for 1 hr. 15 min. for eight weeks. Entitled “Library Orientation: the Library and Its Resources,” the class focuses on skills and applications. Usually 11 sections are offered each semester with a cap of 21 students per class. Each section requires a final project based on the project of the LIB 101 course at Seattle Central Community College.

Each instructor has different instructions and rubric for the project, which consists of locating and evaluating information resources for a 10-15 page research paper on a given topic and then writing a properly cited, annotated bibliography. The evaluative bibliography should reflect the

student’s research strategy and process including inappropriate information. This should show if the student understands how to construct a strategy appropriate to the scope and complexity of the research problem. Students also note the outstanding resources found on the topic.

Ms. Brewer gave an overview of her instructions and rubric. She includes a 3-5 minute oral presentation of the final project on exam day. Her colleague, Laura Ewald then went over her instructions and rubric. She explained that the class requires homework every night with later class assignments involving opportunities to complete and revise the final project. The in-house text is available on reserve. Library tours are separate from the class with one designed to give faculty hands on experience. The library also keeps the faculty informed through a newsletter every semester.

Ms. Brewer and Ms. Ewald provided an annotated bibliography to participants. They also shared samples of the students’ final projects. These included some at every level of proficiency. ✕

*(continued from page 1)*

round of thanks goes to the awards committee and especially to the hard-working nomination committee.

I would like to especially thank all the board members for their hard work and always coming through when I needed them most. Cindi and James have been my right hand folks in planning the logistics for board

meetings. Additionally a great job is always the case with them as bulletin editors. Cindi, we are going to miss your talents and enthusiasm. Andrea has kept me alert in that I cannot ever remember what we discussed at a past board meeting and Veronica never lets us overspend our budget (I have tried but she is just too good at her job!). Wenda and Linda have been my

“Rocks of Gibraltar” throughout the year, a warm thanks to you both. A special round of applause goes to Lil and Pat for all their efforts in regards to the Chapter’s 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebrations. Take care and I look forward to next year’s “expectations and results”. ✕

## "Wrestling with the OPAC"

—Submitted by Mary Vass

While on a very tight time schedule, these two speakers participated in customizing the OPAC for the University of Louisville Voyager system, nicknamed Minerva. They spoke about the transition for libraries from the card catalog to a text-based system, such as NOTIS, to a graphic-based system, such as Voyager. New web-based catalogs should take advantage of features that didn't exist under the previous two types of catalogs. One of the advantages of Voyager is that each site can create a somewhat unique look for its OPAC, with varying logos, color changes, customized defaults and other advantages. The speakers distributed a chart comparing the eight Kentucky public universities, plus Kentucky Community and Technical College System, in terms of the customized features chosen by each site. One of the issues addressed is creating a system that will allow each user to set up a profile, which stores his or her individual preferences, so that, for example, a user who prefers relevancy ranked keyword could have that search appear first each time. While this isn't currently possible under Voyager, it is an enhancement requested by many Voyager users. The speakers encouraged interaction and comments from the audience about what different sites are doing to make their particular version of the OPAC more user friendly. Several audience members from other Voyager libraries commented on the ways in which they have customized their own OPAC systems.

Information included in the handout was the web site address for the Kentucky Voyager Users Group: <http://www.uky.edu/OtherOrgs/KVUG/kvug.html>.



## Electronic Theses and Dissertations at UK

—Submitted by Andrea Peak

Beth Kraemer of the William T. Young Library at University of Kentucky presented *Electronic Theses and Dissertations at the University of Kentucky*. Beth is part of a pilot project begun in fall 2000 between the UK Library and Graduate School. While theses and dissertations have traditionally been published only in print, EDT projects like the one at UK and others around the country offer students many benefits, including use of multimedia/interactive content, broader/faster exposure to the work, and searchability of text.

In order to generate interest in the project, the program offered a "production grant" of \$100 to each participant. Over 100 students expressed interest and 20 were accepted. Technical issues the project developers initially had to deal with included 1) Format choices for text and multimedia (production, access, and archiving formats), and 2) Computing needs (server, software, and long-term storage/backup).

The committee researched previous EDT projects and took into consideration similar undertakings at Virginia Tech and Iowa. Another valuable resource was Network Digital Library for Theses and Dissertations (NDLTD). While Virginia Tech had created shareware database software for their similar project, UK chose to develop its own program due to server issues. The database that was developed is Z39.50 compliant, and the cataloging is based on Dublin Core and consistent with NDLTD fields.

It was decided that text portions of theses and dissertations would be accepted in PDF format and multimedia portions in various formats specified

by NDLTD. The graduate school's relationship with UMI was retained, with UMI accepting electronic formats. While UMI accepts dissertations in this format, they do not maintain the format for dissemination and storage; they microfilm the text as they do paper format dissertations.

At this time, the UK database houses 6 EDTs. These are available for viewing at <http://www.uky.edu/ETD/>. As the pilot project has come to an end, several issues have presented themselves. First, it has been determined that PDF format for text portions was not the best choice due to the proprietary nature of the pdf reader, as well as uncertainties in archival stability. The next phase of the project will have students constructing their EDTs in XML. This will require greater technical support for the students but will allow for much more powerful presentation of their theses or dissertations. Another issue to be considered is the actual archiving process. At this time the Graduate School is sending print copies of each EDT to UK Special Collections. It has been decided that the CORC cataloging format will be applied to EDTs for more flexible cataloging and searching. Issues also to be dealt with include digital fingerprinting and direct submission by students to allow for less staff involvement in that phase.

UK plans to continue the EDT project, keeping the current "ad hoc" pilot project committee in place. Beth Kraemer is working with the Kentucky Virtual Library (KYVL) to offer the EDT database as a statewide database to include EDTs from other state institu-

(continued on page 8)



---

## SLA/KY Chapter Keeneland Meeting

—Submitted by Lillian Mesner, Acting Race Day Secretary

Present: James Manasco, Larry and Jean Besant, Lillian Mesner, Deborah Sharp, Laura Whayne, Barbara Hale, Gracie Hale, Peter and Valerie Perry, Elizabeth Smigielski, Wenda Webster Fisher, Judy and Keith Wulff, and Pat Wilson.

Our 25th Anniversary outing was declared an “official” meeting as a few of us were hanging over the rail of the balcony overlooking the track and waiting for a race to begin. It was so beautiful, the food and drink had been so great, and we were having so much fun that we were feeling guilty about being there and not at work. It was decided to change to a meeting and take minutes.

We convened at noon and had a wonderful buffet. During the meal we started hatching our betting plans. It was interesting to observe people’s betting methods. The only person there who really understood what was going on was Gracie, but she doesn’t like giving advice because she doesn’t like to be wrong when people lose. She said that she couldn’t take the pressure. However, she ran a continuous tutorial all afternoon while we all tried to figure out what was going on. The only real student in the bunch was Jean Besant. She had read the paper that morning and cut out the column on the picks. Aside from also having some previous experience, she was the most deliberate in choosing her horses. After awhile we all latched onto her article and started using it. Others of us had more personal methods. Lil Mesner liked to bet on horses with women’s names, or women owners, trainers, or jockeys. This can work. Barb Hale liked cat horses

(Smelly Cat and Rude Cat) and that also worked. Larry liked high-risk bets, and at one point in the afternoon, Deb asked Gracie to put her hand on Deb’s program and see what jumped into her mind. Something must have happened because Deb won a couple of races. Everyone had their own little method and plugged along.

The races went as follows:

1st race: several of us won, Laura Whayne had her big race with a \$44 win. Larry lost quite a bit, but we were all feeling good.

2nd race: this was also good to a number of us, but Larry lost big again. We were on top of the world.

3rd race: reality started setting in. None of us won anything and Larry’s moans were getting louder.

4th race: Larry finally won \$0.40, but James won big (about the only time James won big...).

5th race: Larry started observing what Gracie was doing and started turning his fortunes around. This was Gracie’s big one with a \$127 win. Elizabeth S. also got her first win with \$26.80.

It was here that we ordered some bread pudding for a snack. What we got was nothing like any bread pudding we ever saw. It was rich and had lots of fruit and a sinfully delicious bourbon sauce. We got a buzz from it.

6th race: Elizabeth and Deb boxed a score and each won \$41.60. Larry also got back into the black ink. (Gracie just kept sailing along).

7th race: Larry won again and Elizabeth got her third win. We asked her what she was doing, but she didn’t know for sure. Wenda said that we

should put her in charge of the treasury. This was also the race where we all bet on a horse called “Royal Wulff” after Judy and Keith Wulff. The horse didn’t even show.

8th race: No one made any money here.

9th race: We all lost again and decided that we were really pooped and wanted to go home.

Our big winner was; guess who? Gracie. We didn’t want to know who the big loser was (there was the sneaking suspicion that it might be James, though), but we didn’t think that any major damage had been done.

Needless to say, all had a great deal of uproarious fun. Those who didn’t come really missed it. ✕

---

(continued from page 3)

doing a fielded search for a place or organization. All dates associated with a birth, death, marriage, or founding are included in a regularized format. The Calendar Search page offers more flexible date searching. Clicking on a date or year there reveals everything for that date or year. Every county and each of the five regions in Kentucky have an entry that is accessible through a clickable image map. They are also indexed. Entry authors are indexed. Dr. Thomas D. Clark’s historical overview is also included with links added. The version consists of 2,138 entries with 51,273 links. The entry indicates the page in the print version or its availability on the CD-ROM. Usage statistics are planned. ✕

## Selection and Evaluation of Engineering Web Sites

—Submitted by Laura Whyne

(continued from page 4)

tions. This would increase the value of the database for researchers, provide broader exposure to students' work, and provide a unique resource for KYVL. Under this proposal, individual institutions will have control over their EDT procedures, determine format standards for their institution, and maintain responsibility for archiving. They will also have the option of maintaining a separate EDT database. The UK EDT committee hopes that this statewide project will benefit other institutions in the areas of start-up help, an already-developed infrastructure that will benefit smaller institutions, and result in a more valuable resource. ✕

This program was presented at the Joint Spring Library Conference held at General Butler State Park, April 4-6, 2001. Ann and James provided a nice overview of and helpful hints for evaluating web sites. James and Ann discussed the variety in the quality of web sites and the need to evaluate them. The same evaluation techniques used for print materials can be applied to electronic resources. The quality may be determined by answering the following questions: Who created it? Why did they write it? Where did they get their information? What were they trying to accomplish? and When did they do it? Another method of evaluation presented is using Betsy Richmond's Ten Cs (content, credibility, critical thinking, copyright, citation, continuity, censorship, connectivity, comparability, and context). James and Ann discussed a few of the many evaluation resources, both print and

electronic. These were listed in their handout of their presentation.

In addressing science and engineering web sites, Ann and James primarily discussed the mega web sites, those that index science and engineering web sites. There are just too many to discuss individual web sites. They had a very useful handout that listed and described some of these mega web sites. Three of the sites from the list includes: Librarians' Index to the Internet <http://lii.org/>, Argus Clearinghouse <http://www.clearinghouse.net/>, and Infomine-Scholarly Internet Resource Collections <http://infomine.ucr.edu/>. James and Ann concluded with getting input from the audience on web site evaluation and science and engineering web sites. This presentation had a lot of good practical tips and useful sources. ✕

### THANKS!

**A huge thank you to the sponsors who made our Spring Meeting a success!!**

**Bell & Howell  
Blackwell's Book Services  
EBSCO  
LEXIS-NEXIS  
Oxford University Press  
netLibrary  
WESTLAW**