Based on the generality of his request, it is surprising to see how little redundancy there is among the chapters. Chapters 9, 10, and 11 provide critical thinking and conjecture on the current status and future prospects of information literacy. These three chapters reflect a comprehensive grasp of this important topic.

Change in academic librarianship continues to occur at an unprecedented rate and no slowdown is expected. The better we understand this phenomenon and its ramifications, the better library service we can provide students and faculty. To enhance our comprehension of change at various levels in the academic library, we must hear what is on the minds of both library administrators and practicing frontline librarians. This book does well in offering these precious insights.—Donald E. Riggs, Nova Southeastern University.


Nearly every practicing librarian and information professional benefits from digitized cultural resources. Academic librarians welcome the ease of access and depth of coverage provided by JSTOR and other databases. Another aspect of our professional lives, albeit an unsavory one, involves how libraries, museums, and archives remain stable and sustainable in the current climate of economic hardship. As Diane Zorich reports in this timely survey, fiscal woes also affect organizations and agencies that implement and maintain digital cultural heritage initiatives (DCHIs). Not only are DCHIs having a tough time weathering the current economic climate, many are facing a potential crisis of economic sustainability.

A *Survey of Digital Cultural Heritage Initiatives and Their Sustainability Concerns* is part of the Council on Library and Information Resources’ (CLIR) series of studies of cultural heritage initiatives and digitization projects. As a response to issues raised in Charles Henry and Stanley Katz’s working paper, “American Cultural Heritage Initiatives: A National Review,” CLIR commissioned experienced museum consultant and digital cultural heritage expert Diane Zorich to lead this study. Surveys were conducted in the fall of 2002, and the final report was written in May 2003.

This study surveyed a representative sample of agencies, institutions, and groups associated with all aspects of DCHI, which Zorich broadly defined as organizations or programs that develop or implement digital products, or address pertinent DCHI-related issues such as standards, intellectual property, best practices, or policies. A total of thirty-three organizations and five funding agencies were selected to present “a cross-section of the cultural community.” This group included libraries, museums, archives, performing arts organizations, scholarly associations, publishing groups, standards developers, and humanities centers.

The bulk of this monograph is a review of the survey’s findings. Within the DCHI sample were a variety of mission statements, products, services, organizational and governing structures, business models, and sources of financial support. The smaller section on funding agencies focused on why agencies fund DCHI organizations, how the economy has affected funding agencies, and how sustainability has been encouraged and evaluated. A final, brief section presents recommendations and a summary.

Not surprisingly, the poor state of the economy “was a near-universal lament
among survey participants.” What is a bit more surprising is how far many DCHI administrators felt they were from achieving sustainability. For instance, the survey initially asked DCHI respondents to describe the steps they took to become sustainable and then outline their efforts to maintain sustainability. Few respondents were able to answer the second part of the question. Most DCHIs had, as one respondent phrased it, “hovered on the brink of sustainability” from the start.

DCHIs have existed for more than a decade. Although the unique services they provide indicate creative planning and development, DCHIs are often hampered by a lack of equally creative thinking and fiscal circumspection when it comes to how they are funded and maintained. Far too often, Zorich reports, digital initiatives are viewed by funding administrators as “special projects” rather than long-term cultural investments. The effects of this planning result in such problems as overworked staffs at DCHIs and tightening budgets at a time when users are becoming more accustomed to DCHI services. As Zorich discovered, many DCHIs “emerge with great passion, but are unrealistic about their capability and capacity in terms of staff and economics.”

Zorich’s review of how DCHIs are struggling with sustainability is, in her words, “sobering.” Fortunately, Zorich’s analysis also includes a series of recommendations offering hope for DCHIs. Certain examples, such as JSTOR, provide strong models of sustainability. The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation provided funds to create and “incubate” JSTOR and continues to assist with digitization of select journals. However, JSTOR is now “an independent entity” that is supported mostly by archive and access fees from subscribing libraries.

Zorich’s survey is important for several reasons. First, it clearly identifies the fiscal problems faced by DCHIs, citing both a long list of specific problems and a shorter list of general conditions involving the many ways that DCHIs are managed and maintained. More important, it also includes a series of tangible recommendations in such categories as planning and marketing, training, and fostering communication both within individual DCHIs and between DCHIs. Although not a panacea for the dire economic situation faced by many DCHIs, Zorich’s study does offer sound suggestions that can help strengthen DCHIs and assist them find their way to sustainability. As such, it should be required reading for any organization with a DCHI in its current or future plans. (This publication is available in print and online from the CLIR Web site: http://www.clir.org/pubs/abstract/pub118abst.html.)—Gene Hyde, Radford University.