the Horizon: Part 2," *Library Hi Tech News* 23, no. 3 (Apr. 2006): 22–25.

2. Greg Scoblete, "Pure Digital Revamps Single-Use Camcorder," *TWICE: This Week in Consumer Electronics* 21, no. 10 (May 8, 2006): 8; "SanDisk Debuts Game Content USB Drives," *TWICE: This Week in Consumer Electronics* 21, no. 13 (June 19, 2006): 6; Steve Blass, "New Uses for Old Hard Drives," *PC World* 24, no. 8 (Aug. 2006): 41.

3. Snunith Shoham and Nurit Roitberg, "From Electronic Library to Learning Center in the Academic Library: Integrating Traditional and New Uses in the Library Workstation," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 31, no. 4 (Jul. 2005): 345.

4. "In-Library Public Workstations," *Library Technology Reports* 38, no. 3 (May/June 2002): 56.

5. Ibid., 59.

6. Jennifer Church, "The Evolving Information Commons," *Library Hi Tech* 23, no. 1 (2005): 75–81.

7. Karen K. Hein, "Information Uncommon: Public Computing in the Life of Reference," *Reference Services Review* 34, no. 1 (2006): 33–42.

8. According to Diana Romm, "Thin clients differ from PCs or 'fat clients' because their applications and data are stored on the server, rather than on the thin client itself. In a PC network, some applications and data may be stored locally on the personal computer itself and some may be stored on the server. In a thin client network, all of the applications and data reside on the server. The thin client is simply a device from which to send requests and on which to see the results. Thin clients are essentially empty boxes, much like the original "dumb" terminals that connected to a mainframe." Romm, "It Pays To Be Thin," *Library Journal* 131, no. 2 (Feb. 2006): 34.

9. David B. Bills et al., "The New Mobile Scholar and the Effective Use of Information and Communication Technology," *First Monday* 11, no. 4 (Apr. 2006): 1–14. http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue11_4/index.html (accessed Jul. 6, 2006).

10. Ibid., 4.

11. "OverDrive Announces OverDrive Download Station," *Advanced Technology Libraries* 35 (Apr. 2006): 7.

12. It is important to note that the costs included in this article were actual costs at time of purchase. Prices for USB-ready zip and floppy drives continue to fall.

13. Matt Hines, "Gadgets Present Security Conundrum," *eweek* 23 (May 22, 2006): 20.

14. Jane H. Tuten and Karen Junker, eds., *Appropriate Use Policies for Computers in College/University Libraries CLIP Note #31* (Chicago: ALA, 2002).

15. Monique Sendze, "The Battle to Secure our Public Access Computers," *Computers in Libraries* 26, no. 1 (Jan. 2006): 10–16.

16. Mark Van Hoorebeck, "Health and Safety and Piracy: Legal Risk Minimization in Libraries," *Electronic Library* 22, no. 3 (2004): 235.

17. Ibid.

18. Toby Burrows, Personal Electronic Archives: Collecting the Digital Me," *OCLC Systems & Services: International Digital Library Perspectives* 22, no. 2 (2006): 85–88.

19. Jan Axelson, *USB Complete: Everything You Need to Develop USB Peripherals,* 3d ed. (Madison, Wisc.: Lakeview Research, 2005), 10.

FROM THE EDITOR CONTINUED FROM PAGE 7

There are several people I need to thank on the homefront. While professionally rewarding, the editorship of a journal is a time-consuming task and requires institutional support. I would not have been able to assume this role without the support provided by my institution, The Pennsylvania State University Libraries. In particular, I want to thank Dean Nancy Eaton, Associate Dean Sally Kalin, and Gary W. White (head of the Schreyer Business Library). Additionally, I am grateful for the financial support provided through the Louis and Virginia Benzak Business Librarian Endowment. Monies from this endowment have enabled me to employ Christopher T. White (a gifted doctoral student in English) as an editorial assistant. Finally, I want to thank my husband and son for their willingness to pick up the slack at home when I have been preoccupied with deadlines.

ERRATUM

The From the Editor column in the Winter 2006 issue (Volume 46, No. 2) contains an error on page 5. The corrected text should read:

RUSQ employs a double-blind review process, meaning that the author does not know the identity of the reviewer, nor does the reviewer know the identity of the author. Manuscripts submitted to *RUSQ* are sent to two reviewers for evaluation.

The editor apologizes for the error.