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Charleston Conference Reports compiled by: Ramune K. Kubilius (Collection Development / Special Projects Librarian, Northwestern University, Galter Health Sciences Library) <rkubilius@northwestern.edu>

Column Editor’s Note: Thank you to all of the conference attendees who volunteered to become reporters, providing highlights of so many conference sessions. In this issue, we are providing the fourth installment of reports. Visit the Charleston Conference Website for reports that have not been published yet, as well as handouts and presentation outlines from many conference sessions. The 2008 Charleston Conference Proceedings will be available this fall. — RKK

Lively Lunches — Friday, November 7, 2008 continued

Facing Hard Times: A Briefing on Scholarly Communications — Presented by Julia Bixrud (Assistant Executive Director, External Relations, ARL, & Assistant Director, Public Programs, SPARC, Association for Research Libraries (ARL)); Molly Keener (Reference Librarian, Wake Forest University Health Sciences, Coy C. Carpenter Library); Cheryl S. McCoy (University Librarian, Natural Sciences / Government Documents, University of South Florida); Ramune K. Kubilius, Moderator (Collection Development / Special Projects Librarian, Northwestern University, Galter Health Sciences Library)

Reported by: Ramune K. Kubilius (Northwestern University, Galter Health Sciences Library) <rkubilius@northwestern.edu>

Thursday and Friday lunchtime scholarly communication discussions approached the topic differently. In Friday’s session, moderator Kubilius shared definitions, activities, and job description fragments that might fall under the “scholarly communication” umbrella. Bixrud provided an overview on life cycle management issues surrounding the “stuff” (documents, texts, other) being created; the structures and services for dealing with them, the people (“us” and “them”) experiencing changing jobs. Libraries need to know institutional cultures — we go out and “get stuff,” or lead users to it. Institutional, national, world-wide policies will shape access. Take advantage of organizations’ (ACRL, SPARC, etc.) sites, toolkits, training (many were in McCoy’s handout). McCoy shared her experience in state-wide (11 universities) initiatives addressing Janus Conference Challenge Six, on scholarly communication. She chaired a group that communicated virtually, coordinating statements on a mission, plans, and activities. Perhaps a Florida digital library will be the next step? Keener discussed her institution’s strategies and activities: campus-wide scholarly communication committee, education of library staff, liaison librarian involvement, and partnering with media offices who refer publication-end questions to the library.

Public Access Policy support is essential, not only for biomedical authors. A library-sponsored workshop was warranted with implementation of electronic theses and dissertations, then a move towards an institutional repository. Curious attendees asked how much of Keener’s day is spent on the activities she described. Reply: 40-60%.

Tossing Traditional Collection Development Practices for Patron Initiated Purchasing: A Debate — Presented by Sue Polanka (Head, Reference/ Instruction, Wright State University Library); Alice Crosetta (Assistant Professor of Library Administration; Coordinator, Collection Development; Acquisitions Librarian; Carlson Library, University of Toledo); Michelle Harper (Global Product Manager, NetLibrary)

Reported by: Kristine E. Mudrick (Francis A. Drexel Library, Saint Joseph’s University) <kmudrick@sju.edu>

Polanka, Crosetta and Harper delivered a lively presentation on “patron-initiated purchasing,” where patrons decide what will be added to a library collection. Recording answers to several questions using clickers and immediately presenting the results engaged the audience and fostered discussion. Polanka and Crosetta presented from the perspectives of a library where ebooks are popular and of a second where they aren’t, demonstrating that what works for one library may not work for another. Harper provided an overview of patron-driven acquisitions and described OCLC’s NetLibrary as an example of ebook content delivered effectively and at reasonable cost. Librarians need to recognize the needs and preferences of their patrons and their institution’s curriculum. They need to be willing to relinquish at least some control of purchasing to patrons who may not be subject experts and who may not be interested in the overall development of the library collection. Patron-initiated purchasing can be managed by providing access to a wide variety of titles. Buying books at the point of need means that these books will definitely circulate and instant delivery increases patron satisfaction but this method would likely not be used as a single solution for collection development.

Usage Statistics: Best Practices and Practical Applications from a Librarian’s Perspective — Presented by Cory Tucker (Head, Collection Management, UNLV); Bonnie Tijerina (Digital Collection Services Librarian, UCLA); John McDonald (Director, Information & Bibliographic Management and Faculty Relations, Libraries, Claremont University Consortium); Virginia Kimman (Electronic Resources Librarian, Longwood University)

Reported by: Susan L. Kendall (Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Library, San Jose State University) <susan.kendall@sjsu.edu>

This standing room only session featured a dynamic panel. Tijerina from UCLA moderated the panel. McDonald gave an overview of the COUNTER 3 release implications. New reports include statistics on full text articles per month and year. There are also new features in consortia reports and in specifications of report delivery. COUNTER 3 will include auditing certification for database vendors. SUSHI is now a requirement for compliance. Future issues include new media materials compliance; new communities.

Tucker demonstrated a program on usage statistics for budget justification which in turn assists in strategic planning projects. The result has been improved marketing of databases to faculty and students and giving feedback to vendors. Cory reported on the workflow the department follows in collecting the statistics. Reports on costs per search and full text views are written and the reports are then sent to the provost twice a year.

Kimman reported that her university has a smaller student population. Instead of using a commercially produced ERM, they developed a Microsoft ACCESS program to track trends and uses. Virginia suggested that the electronic librarian wiki http://www.electroniclibrarian.org/wiki has a portal on best practices on usage statistics.

Walking the Usage Tightrope: Publishers and Librarians Explore the Delicate Balancing Act between E-Content Usability and Intellectual Property Protection — Presented by Jackie Zhanghi-LaPlaca (Director of Electronic Databases, IGI Global); Jim Dooley (Head, Collection Services, University of California, Merced); Kirstin Steele (Head of Collection Management, Citadel); Selden Durgom Lamoureux (Electronic Resources Librarian, North Carolina State University Libraries)

Reported by: Ann Marie Miller (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <aannmarie.miller@gmail.com>

Breaches of security, licensing agreements, and how they are accidentally violated, were the topics of this session. There is a balance between usability versus security. (A lot of the presentation was rather technical and I can’t say that I understood the entire thing, as someone who is just entering the profession.) Most of the session time was spent in the audience asking questions of the librarians who were in charge of the entire thing, as someone who is just entering the profession.) Most of the session time was spent in the audience asking questions of the librarians who were in charge of the session. It becomes an issue, that while libraries want to make sure the system is usable, users often don’t understand what types of usage violate the intellectual property rights of the creators. A lot of the questions presented scenarios where someone had violated intellectual property rights and was dealt with, and the problems that result when an entire service is taken away because of the actions of a single user.

Oberving Faculty and Graduate Students Using Journal Literature: A View from the Field — Presented by Helen Anderson (Head, Collection Development, University of Rochester); Katie Clark (Associate Dean, Public Services and Collection Development; University of Rochester)

Reported by: Amelia Glawe (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <GLAWEA@mailbox.sc.edu>

Anderson and Clark discussed their findings during a study of the search and usage of journal articles among college graduate students and faculty. During this study, the researchers, with the help of an anthropologist, reviewed transcripts of a series of videotaped interviews conducted in connection with two grant funded projects at the University of Rochester. During their studies, the researchers found that graduate
students were admittedly not confident searchers, whereas members of the faculty were very confident with their search technique. Graduate students tended to save or print every article they thought may be important whereas faculty rarely printed or saved articles. Graduate students expressed a tendency to search authors and/or journals as it is still a new product.

Monographs in the Age of Mass Digitization — Presented by Robert H. McDonald (Associate Dean for Library Technologies, Indiana University), Dana Sally (Dean of Library Services, Western Carolina University), Heath Martin (Collection Development Librarian, Western Carolina University); Amy Miller, New Speaker (Ingram Digital)

Reported by: Audrey Powers (Univ. of South Florida) <apowers@lib.usf.edu>

This session included many thought-provoking aspects regarding print content being transformed digitally. The audience was inspired to think about the monograph as a concept that can be produced in many ways. A comparison of the process and development of print to the process and development of digitization was given to point out that they all perform the same function; to store, preserve and distribute content. Essentially, print equals digital and vice versa; thus, print content must be digitized and digital materials must be printed. With the capability of global print on demand, collections can be exposed and content preserved. Digitization initiatives are in their infancy, however, access and delivery of content and in any and all ways is an important task to accomplish.

China: Market Contours and Opportunities — Presented by Greg Tananbaum (Consultant, ScholarNext); Boc Horton (Senior Vice President of Research Solutions, ProQuest)

Reported by: Cordelia Wilson (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <Wilson52909@aol.com>

Tananbaum provided an overview of developing trends in China’s market. China has invested heavily in its academic sector resulting in dramatic increases in the number of universities, college students and university faculty. Encouraged by Chinese governmental incentives, its scholars have published a large number of papers.
in Western journals. Yet, the research, in proportion to its quantity, is not frequently cited by Western scholars. Gronbaek examined barriers that may be limiting the influence of Chinese scholarship and presented his original study on the perceptions of Chinese academics regarding the Western reception of their research. He concluded that Western publishers and information providers should be seeking ways to tap into the enormous potential of the growing Chinese academic market.

Horton discussed how the cultural influence of Confucianism can be seen in Chinese business protocol, especially in the concepts of face (mianzi) and connections (guanxi). Specifically, he addressed in detail the dos and taboos in handling business cards and attending or hosting a Chinese banquet. He ended by briefly speaking about the electronic journal publishing environment in the country and the active role that ProQuest has been playing in the Chinese information market for over a decade.

**Retrospective Titles: Verification and Online Access** — Presented by Charles F. Hillen (Head, Monograph Acquisitions and Metadata Services, The Getty Research Institute); Ann J. Roll (Acquisitions Librarian, The Getty Research Institute)

Reported by: Kelly Smith (Eastern Kentucky University Libraries)
<kelly.smith2@eku.edu>

Hillen and Roll presented their process for pre-order verification of online availability of retrospective titles. The library focuses on the history of art, architecture, and archaeology, and relevant materials in the humanities and social sciences. The collection currently includes over a million records from various sources, including books, periodicals, and auction catalogs. The collections’ scope ranges from prehistory to contemporary art with a focus on Western Europe, but is expanding to include Latin America, Eastern Europe, and Asia. They also house a unique conservation collection, a photo study collection, institutional records and archives, and special collections.

With no date or language restrictions, selection and acquisition can be challenging. The Getty Library has 12 approval plans in addition to firm orders and fulfillment of researcher requests. They employ the OCLC WorldCat Selection service. Staffing in Collection Development includes two bibliographers and one full-time assistant. Acquisitions has six FTE staff including one supervisor, two working on firm orders, and three in receiving.

When a retrospective request is received, staff members have four options for locating the materials: vendor selection tools; online secondhand booksellers, free digitized versions on the open Web, and OCLC. They start by searching for open access versions, beginning with the Internet Archive (www.archive.org), a repository of public domain digitized material to which the Getty also contributes content. The presenters cited as a recent example a rush order for a French title published in 1887 that would have been difficult to obtain in print — they found it in the Internet Archive. They also maintain a list of publishers and libraries that offer free digitized versions such as escholarship (escholarship.edlib.org) and Gutenberg-e (www.gutenberg-e.org). Finally, they search grey literature and individual small publishers, a step which is particularly helpful in locating materials for the conservation collection. They will consider adding more sites to their verification process over time, but will carefully assess the potential for pay-off.

Sites like Gutenberg-e don’t have a lot of content yet. According to the presenters, “While library vendors are centralizing the purchase of eBooks that are available through major distributors, there is no centralized location in which to locate free materials.”

Vendors are unlikely to take on this task because there is nothing to sell. They are trying to encourage other vendors to consider developing services, for which libraries may be willing to pay to save staff time. At one point, the Digital Library Federation had an idea for a Registry of Digital Masters (RDM) that would be a “one stop shop for Institutional Repositories.” They were unable to find a host for the registry. OCLC is currently housing some records for these.

Currently, we have to balance cash flow (i.e., free access) with cost-benefit (i.e., staff time to search for free access). At this point, the Getty Library thinks that the experiment is worth the trouble. It is arguable that staff time is wasted because, for them, the full gamut of research, ordering, payment, and receiving, is much more time consuming and costly. However, because of the pre-order search and discovery process, patrons and staff have reacted positively when notified that free online access is worth the trouble. It is arguable that staff time is wasted because, for them, the full gamut of research, ordering, payment, and receiving, is much more time consuming and costly. However, because of the pre-order search and discovery process, patrons and staff have reacted positively when notified that free online access is worth the trouble.
ONIX-PL: Linking Electronic Resources and their Licensing Terms — Presented by Friedemann Weigel, Moderator (Managing Partner, Director IT, Harrassowitz); Bob Boissy (Manager, Agent Relations, Springer); Rick Burke (Executive Director of SCELCE, the Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium); Brian Green (Executive Director, EDItEUR)

Reported by: Patrick Carr (East Carolina University, Joyner Library) < carrp@ecu.edu>

ONIX for Publications Licenses (ONIX-PL) is an XML format enabling a library’s users and personnel to view listings of the licensing terms of accessible e-journals and databases. Green began the session’s discussion by providing background information on the standard. He explained that the EDItEUR group is developing ONIX-PL along with OPLE, an open source editing tool, to assist libraries in carrying out the increasingly difficult task of tracking and communicating e-resource licensing terms. He stated that the standard should be ready for general use by the end of 2008. Burke continued the discussion by describing the use of the Serials Solutions electronic resource management system of the Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium (SCELCE) in order to test ONIX-PL. Next, Boissy offered a publisher’s perspective on the standard. He highlighted the factors that should motivate publishers to participate in the standard and described Springer’s experience using its license agreements to test the standard. Each presenter in the session agreed that ONIX-PL has the potential to enable librarians, publishers, subscription agents, and other stakeholders to more effectively address the complexities of e-resource management.

The Impact of BioOne Journal Packages — Presented by Lutishoor Salisbury (Librarian/University Professor, University of Arkansas) — (Note: Co-presenter Carolyn Mills (Biology Librarian, University of Connecticut) was not present.)

Reported by: Brett Barrie (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <BARRIE@mailbox.sc.edu>

Mills, who conducted the study alongside Salisbury, was unable to give her half of the presentation. Both halves of the presentation were covered by Salisbury and analyzed the various statistics of BioOne articles.

BioOne was launched in 2001 and developed by the American Institute of Biological Sciences, SPARC, and the Big 12 Libraries. It offers full text online access and offers navigation between journals from different societies. BioOne is offered in three different packages, BioOne1, BioOne2, and open access. It covers the life sciences, including agriculture, biology, zoology and botany. The packages are developed by aggregating content with regards to whether they were refereed, reviewed or indexed. More than half of BioOne’s articles are indexed in more than seven databases. It was developed with cost effectiveness in mind and offers a pay per view option. The H index of BioOne is comparable to both SCOPUS and Web of Science.

Video – The Final Frontier? — Presented by Stephen Rhind-Tutt (President, Alexander Street Press); Deg Farrelly (Associate Librarian, Arizona State University).

Reported by: Jack Montgomery (Western Kentucky University) < jack.montgomery@wku.edu>

Rhind-Tutt began this presentation by stating that video in the digital format has been developing for 40 years and is the final frontier of media development.

It is a physically dense, yet engaging medium that presents a radical new way to study, teach and learn. We must began to understand that the video clip is now the study, teach and learn. We must began to understand that the video clip is now the study, teach and learn. We must began to understand that the video clip is now the study, teach and learn. We must began to understand that the video clip is now the study, teach and learn. We must began to understand that the video clip is now the study, teach and learn. We must began to understand that the video clip is now the study, teach and learn. We must began to understand that the video clip is now the study, teach and learn. We must began to understand that the video clip is now the study, teach and learn. We must began to understand that the video clip is now the study, teach and learn. We must began to understand that the video clip is now the study, teach and learn. We must began to understand that the video clip is now the study, teach and learn. We must began to understand that the video clip is now the study, teach and learn.

Farrelly then discussed the historical, legal and license issues surrounding the digital video presentation. He sees digital video as a key element in the asynchronous evolution of the general educational experience. Even as different forms of purchasing and licensing have evolved from we are still far removed from the simplicity of consistent pricing and delivery models, standardized licensing as well as one-stop shopping. In addition we have a major task in converting conventional video media into a digital format.

Librarians have a unique opportunity to be involved in the development of a new media-paradigm.

continued on page 86
A Tale of Three Surveys: How Librarians, Faculty and Students Perceive and Use Electronic Resources — Presented by Allan McKeil (Dean of Libraries, Western Oregon University)

(Changed from original title: Student's Perception of E-books — Survey Results and Discussion; Original Speaker: Kevin Sayer, President, ebrary)

Reported by: Ruth Connell (Grasselli Library, John Carroll University)
<Connell@jcu.edu>

The scholarship process is changing and the role of journals in the scholarly communication process is also changing. Researchers are becoming increasingly engaged in collaborative projects and the dispersion of authors is more widespread. Scholars and their institutions are using citation analysis and citation mapping to track the interaction between scholars and between institutions. It has become necessary for researchers/administrators, publishers, and libraries to make use of metrics to understand what these interactions mean.

Factors driving this change include: increased emphasis on evaluation and assessment; funding pressures (budgetary and research pressure); the efforts for promotion and tenure are moving to a more quantitative measure; cross collaboration within medical research publications is tied back to funds; the global competition in the sciences; the changing nature of scholarly journal publishing; and the open access mandates.

Ten rules in using publications and citation analysis:

1. Consider whether available data can address the questions
2. Choose publication type field definitions and years of data
3. Decide on whole or fractional counting
4. Judge whether data requires editing
5. Compare like with like
6. Use relative measures, not just the absolute counts
7. Obtain multiple measures
8. Recognize the skewed nature of citation data
9. Confirm that the data collected are relevant to the question
10. Ask whether the results are reasonable

Data Mining, Advanced Collection Analysis, and Publisher Profiles: An Update on the OCLC Publisher Name Authority File — Presented by Timothy J. Dickey (Post-Doctoral Researcher, OCLC); Lynn Silipigni Connaway (Senior Research Scientist, OCLC Research)

Reported by: J. Michael Lindsay (Preston Library, University of Tennessee)
<jmlindsay@me.utmck.edu>

Connaway was unable to attend the conference, so Dickey was the sole presenter. The OCLC database, containing over 125 million records, contains a vast amount of information on books, including data on publishers, subjects, and non-English materials, but effective analysis of this data has proved elusive. This presentation reported on a data mining project undertaken by OCLC to profile publishers in their name authority database. The goals of the project were to arrive at authoritative publisher names, understand the common variants in publisher and place names, and draw out definitions for publishing entities. In addition, the researchers wanted to understand the hierarchical relationships between publishers; that is, to understand which imprints were parts of which publishers. The researchers faced challenges with these records due to varying cataloging practices, differing abbreviations, and due to errors and misspellings in the records. These challenges were overcome by pulling records based on ISBN prefixes, clustering the data, classifying similar objects into groups, and partitioning that data. A relational database was created, preserving the hierarchical relationships. The project resulted in a variety of reports including: lists of top university presses, publisher mergers and acquisitions, top US publishing entities by ISBN, and profiled the languages published materials are in. These results demonstrated a successful methodology, and pointed the way to continuing research.

Collection Analysis and Assessment: Finding the Best and Worst in the Library Collection — Presented by Jennifer Arnold (Director of Library Services, Central Piedmont Community College, Charlotte, NC)

Reported by: Linda Rousseau (Charleston Southern University)
<l Rousseau@csuniv.edu>

Ms. Arnold accomplished a yeoman’s task in trying to present in one short session the process CPCP experienced to upgrade their library collection. Fortunately, she provided an extensive slide presentation that could serve as an excellent guidebook to others contemplating weeding. Ms. Arnold explained that the evaluation of the collection resulted from a recommendation by the regional accreditation agency to upgrade and upgrade the collection by weeding the older materials. As is usually the case, the libraries’ mission is to support the curricular and program needs of CPCP. According to Ms. Arnold, serious assessment of the collection had not occurred in years.

The highlights of the presentation were several: planning for weeding is absolutely essential to attain quality results; the process should also include the careful analysis of the sufficiency of the collection to support the curricular and programs needs of the institution; establish a reasonable timeframe and focus on weakest area(s); provide written instructions; involve collaboration of administrators, faculty, staff and students; “…upfront and consistent[ly]…”
offered more than they can afford. There are capabilities and there is scalability. Using lists of features that may not be economically feasible, or, in the case of publishers, but it might be argued that librarians and users too often have “pie in the sky” wish point he indicated that publishers sometimes “have eyes bigger than their stomachs,” and sales of a library’s special collections materials may serve as a source of revenue.

Microfilm is deteriorating. It was also noted that commercial vendors’ reproduction processes that take place behind the scenes. At one point he indicated that publishers sometimes “have eyes bigger than their stomachs,” but it might be argued that librarians and users too often have “pie in the sky” wish lists of features that may not be economically feasible, or, in the case of publishers, more than they can afford. There are capabilities and there is scalability. Using microfilm as a backup for print journals, newspapers and documents, to free up shelf space, and to replace missing materials. Sometimes the cost of subscribing to the online version of a journal may be more costly than a library can afford for archival material. In special libraries, primary source materials are often microfilmed as a means of preservation. This microfilm provides a true photographic copy and also allows researchers to use materials without damaging the original paper documents. Lending or selling these microfilm copies extends access to off-site researchers. Massey also provided many practical tips, such as replacing rubber bands with acid-free wrappers and placing desiccation packets in storage drawers to absorb moisture, and she drew attention to the fact that a vinegar-like smell is a sign that microfilm is deteriorating. It was also noted that commercial vendors’ reproduction and sales of a library’s special collections materials may serve as a source of revenue for a library. Many libraries are investing in equipment so that the materials do not have to be removed from the premises during the reproduction process.

As Massey reminded the audience, the shelf-life of properly stored microfilm is 300 years. Microfilm is used as a backup for print journals, newspapers and documents, to free up shelf space, and to replace missing materials. Sometimes the cost of subscribing to the online version of a journal may be more costly than a library can afford for archival material. In special libraries, primary source materials are often microfilmed as a means of preservation. This microfilm provides a true photographic copy and also allows researchers to use materials without damaging the original paper documents. Lending or selling these microfilm copies extends access to off-site researchers. Massey also provided many practical tips, such as replacing rubber bands with acid-free wrappers and placing desiccation packets in storage drawers to absorb moisture, and she drew attention to the fact that a vinegar-like smell is a sign that microfilm is deteriorating. It was also noted that commercial vendors’ reproduction and sales of a library’s special collections materials may serve as a source of revenue for a library. Many libraries are investing in equipment so that the materials do not have to be removed from the premises during the reproduction process.


Beckett gave a “tour” of the processes that take place behind the scenes. At one point he indicated that publishers sometimes “have eyes bigger than their stomachs,” but it might be argued that librarians and users too often have “pie in the sky” wish lists of features that may not be economically feasible, or, in the case of publishers, more than they can afford. There are capabilities and there is scalability. Using Atypon as an example, he shared insights and experience about issues: production, discoverability, marketing, and “business intelligence” (reports). His comment, that inventive promoting (by publishers) becomes complicated for libraries, probably resonated with librarians in the audience. New features that are coming soon (or already here): sharing, analysis of information, new forms of communication, international distribution (DataVerse Project), data analysis (SETHI Project). What is it the “version of record” or, as Sally Morris calls it, the “evolving agglomeration.” In the question session, costs were mentioned outright — costs do not really drop in electronic publishing, because there are staff costs involved in building increasingly complex systems. We figured journals out some time ago, but “it all hasn’t shaken out in the book space yet”…A colorful wheel graphic, depicting electronic production, proved to be popular enough to receive requests on its availability.

Closing the Loop: Making Collections Relevant through Assessment — Presented by Teri Koch (Head, Collection Development, Drake University); M. Sara Lowe (Electronic Resources Specialist, Drake University)

This presentation provided a case study of Drake University’s Cowles Library assessment program. Academic libraries must demonstrate the value of their collections in order to maintain funding, and this is done by purchasing high-quality materials patrons will use, and so proving their value. The speakers showed how closing this loop with ongoing assessment can greatly benefit the library by providing a higher level of accountability and relevance. Through assessment, this library was successful in securing a portion of the IT fee charged to students, which is used to purchase new resources.

As part of their assessment, the Collection Development Committee carried out a monograph and a serials analysis. The serials analysis concentrated on a print to online migration, where the first stage involved removing print serials for which they had perpetual access. The committee gathered information from WorldCat Analysis and Ulrich’s and the library liaisons worked with department liaisons in reviewing the information, such as title lists, online availability, perpetual access, etc. They kept a blog where faculty could comment on cancellation decisions. The serials analysis resulted in $20,000 savings in their print to online migration, and an additional $28,000 savings by canceling microform subscriptions (when duplicated in other formats) and newspaper cancellations. The monograph analysis consisted in using WorldCat Collection Analysis and running brief tests of the collection against other libraries. The resulting collection levels were compared against the library’s conspectus level.
and resulted in evidence as to where they could cut back in acquisitions and where they needed to be more active.

As part of their ongoing analysis, Scholarly Stats is used for usage statistics and cost-per-use analyses are done monthly. This information is fed back into the loop: assessment tools, library repositories, acquisitions budget (includes IT fee), purchase, assessment tools, etc.

Currently the IT fee is 20% of their acquisitions budget, up from 5% when this process started in 2002. The IT fee is used mainly for electronic databases, simplifying the Library Dean’s reporting of how these funds are used.

Biedenbach and Keller offered the perspectives of a publisher and an access provider on metadata and it was very insightful to think about metadata from a non-library viewpoint. It opened my eyes to how many different standards are currently being used in the fields of digital preservation, document delivery, cataloguing records, agencies and booksellers, search engines, and local loading. Besides the different fields of use for metadata, not everyone wants the same set of metadata, delivery method, or range of data, nor does everyone receive metadata based on the same data architecture. However, there are a few initiatives, like KBART, that are attempting to make unified data flows a possibility. No conclusions were posited, but it was a call of awareness: although one standard doesn’t allow for individual preferences, it would allow information to flow much more fluidly.

That’s all the reports we have room for in this issue, but we do have more reports from the 2008 Charleston Conference. Watch for the remaining reports in our Dec. 2009-Jan. 2010 issue. You may also view a PDF file with the remaining reports which have not yet been published in print at www.katina.info/conference. Again we want to thank all of the conference attendees who volunteered to become reporters, providing highlights of so many conference sessions. For information about the 2009 Charleston Conference visit the Charleston Conference Website at www.katina.info/conference. — KS

---

IMHBCO (In My Humble But Correct Opinion)

**The Journal Issue and the Record Album: Two Fundamentally Irrational Information Products**

by Rick Anderson (Associate Director for Scholarly Resources & Collections, Marriott Library, University of Utah; Phone: 801-721-1687) <rick.anderson@utah.edu>

Over the past few years I’ve become more and more convinced that the scholarly information world has a lot to learn from the music industry. Not so much from what the latter is doing either right or wrong, but from what has happened to it over the past 100 years, how it has happened, and why.

From the early decades of the 20th century until the 1950s, “buying a record” generally meant buying a shellac disc that contained only a bite-sized portion of music: a popular song, a single performance of a jazz composition, a brief piece of light classical music. Each disc could hold about three minutes of recorded sound. If you wanted to listen to something longer (an entire symphony, for example), you had to buy an “album”—a package of multiple records that you played in sequence.

In the 1950s, technological advances made possible the advent of the vinyl “long-playing record,” or LP. LPs were two-sided, and could hold twenty or twenty-five minutes of music on each side. They quickly changed the way musicians made music and the way record labels marketed it: having two chunks of twenty or more uninterrupted minutes to work with opened up all kinds of new expressive possibilities, and also made it possible to put together programs of ten or twelve songs and sell them as a one-disc package. “Singles” (smaller records containing one song on each side) declined sharply in popularity over the next couple of decades, and increasingly, when people talked about “buying a record,” they came to mean buying an album—which was no longer a physical “album” of separate discs, but rather an album of songs on two sides of a single disc.

The significance of this development to the future trajectory of the music business can hardly be overstated. For the first time, the way most people gained access to a song that they had heard and enjoyed on the radio was not to pay $1 for a recording of the song itself, but to pay $7 for a collection of ten or twelve songs that included the one they wanted. Record labels were thrilled; selling music quickly but to pay $7 for a collection of ten or twelve records that you played in sequence. When compact discs took over from vinyl LPs in the late 1980s, the possible length of an album had increased (from about 45 minutes to 80), but the fundamental, album-based marketing model remained virtually unchanged.

Now let’s consider the scholarly journal. For centuries, journals were printed publications and were therefore subject to all the physical limitations of print. Since paper is expensive and heavy and hard to distribute, journal articles had to be gathered into batches before they could be printed and sent out to subscribers — selling articles individually wasn’t feasible. This meant that the only way for researchers to get access to the articles they wanted was to buy articles they didn’t want.

It was kind of like buying albums — only the journal was even more of a gamble. Subscribing to a physics journal because you had a research interest in physics wasn’t like buying a country album because you liked a particular song on it; rather, it was like asking a country music label to send you every album it released because you liked country music in general. The problem with such an arrangement would be obvious: while every album would probably have one or more songs you did like, each would also have songs you didn’t like and wouldn’t have paid for if you could have picked them out one by one. The same was, and remains, true for journals: very few people read every article in every issue of the journals they subscribe to. Instead, their subscriptions act as a kind of security blanket — a guarantee of access to some of what you want, secured by the simultaneous purchase of what you don’t.

Obviously, the physical culture surrounding the acquisition of both music and journal content has changed radically in recent years, and for a single reason: the Internet, which has liberated both kinds of information from the constrictions of physical format, thus making it possible for both songs and articles to be sold in the way that makes the most sense: by the piece. What’s interesting, though, is how completely the music marketplace has changed in response to this development, and how little the fundamental structure of the scholarly information marketplace has changed. In the music realm, we have moved very quickly back to the model that prevailed between the 1920s and the 1950s, when the basic sales unit was the song. Yet even though scholarly journals have moved aggressively out of the print environment, continued on page 89