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On February 1st, the Society for Scholarly Publishing (SSP) held its seventh librarians focus group meeting, “A Forum for Publishers and Librarians” in Washington DC. There were about sixty-five publisher attendees in the audience who provided questions for the librarians on the panel. The librarians were drawn from a range of institutions of different sizes: Catherine Murray-Rust, Georgia Tech; Helen Josephine, Stanford University; Emily McElroy, Oregon Health and Science University; Julia Gammon, University of Akron; Bryan Skib, University of Michigan; Shawn Martin, University of Pennsylvania Libraries; and moderated by Helen Atkins of the American Association for Cancer Research.

This year’s topics were requested by the publishers, and discussions included:

- What are the budget, funding, and spending patterns within libraries in the current economic environment?
- How do librarians evaluate content? What data do you gather? What is the role of the teaching faculty in decision making?
- What role do mobile applications play in libraries?
- What are the factors in eBook purchasing decision making? What role does print play, if any?
- What makes a good e-journal? What enhancements would you like to see in them?
- What are the functions of your institutional repository, and what role is the library playing in publishing?

All of the panelists reported that the continued recession is placing pressure on their libraries and the services they are able to offer. Gammon noted that “serials ate the book budget” entirely, and at Akron the monographs are now funded solely out of student library fees. McElroy noted that while the materials budget at Oregon Health & Science University is still at 60%, building operations has been cut. OHSU has been fortunate that the academic departments and clinicians have been willing to share the costs of particular resources, though McElroy noted that at any time, faced with their own budget pressures, the departments might choose to pull back. Schools with large endowments are more insulated. But at Penn, where the faculty expects a high level of service, the library must continually prove its worth. At Michigan, every significant price increase of a digital resource or journal package must be justified, and the library has cut 1,300 subscriptions. Library budgets are flat at Stanford, and positions have been frozen. Collections have been pruned, and as Josephine described, “every purchase is a decision, nothing is automatic.” At Michigan, the healthy research dollars the school brings in help to supplement the library’s collection, but the way in which outside grant money is allocated to libraries is not uniform. Murray-Rust noted that faculty expects the library to support the areas of research in which they have been awarded grants, and yet the library rarely receives funds for that purpose.

State-wide consortia have played an important part in managing collections through state funding. In Ohio and Oregon, the state-wide consortia are encouraging libraries to collaborate on monograph collections. OhioLink recommends that no more than five libraries in the state hold a title and ORBS recommends just three. While these policies do not preclude more libraries from purchasing copies, they do relieve pressure on already-strained budgets. Murray-Rust worries that as funding to Galileo is reduced, Georgia Tech will need to find room in its budget to cover key resources that were historically paid for by the state.

A number of publishers wanted to know how librarians are evaluating content and assigning value to the resources they are licensing and how they make decisions about new resources. Faculty input continues to be important, though the librarians reported pressing their faculty on the topic — is a journal important for the faculty member’s research or graduate/university students? Would the faculty member serve on the journal’s board or consider publishing in the journal? Michigan surveys its faculty on these points to get a better sense of the context for a journal’s use. Other libraries set up faculty focus groups to determine what to purchase, but note that the library is also purchasing software and equipment, not just journals and databases. Also, if faculty members request a journal from a publisher with a high inflation rate or a difficult license agreement, the librarian may well try to dissuade them. Monthly usage reports help the librarians compare resources, and turn-away stats show them which resources they need to consider licensing. The librarians suggested that better interlibrary loan statistics would further aid them in determining what additional material to collect. The librarians did assure the attendees that none of them have ever cancelled a journal because of the availability of an open-access title in the same field.

Publishers are also investing in mobile interfaces and wanted to know how mobile devices are changing library use. Stanford is supplying students with e-readers, and their Kindles and Sony readers are frequently checked out. Stanford is also experimenting with an iPad checkout to gauge how students might use them for academic purposes. They also developed an iPhone app for students to locate call numbers, but as the app was not synced with the catalog, it was of limited utility. Other librarians stated that they do not have the resources to build a good mobile interface and thought this was an area for publishers to enter. Medical personnel, who may seem like ideal users of academic resources on mobile devices, face restrictions as to which devices can be accessed in hospitals. And publishers should also remember that many students, especially those at state institutions, simply do not have smart phones. When they do own them, students are also more apt to use a smart phone for IM chat or to check a library’s hours, and it’s not clear that they are moving toward conducting research on a mobile platform. Finally, while, librarians do want to see further development from the publishers in this area, they do not want to financially support this development.

The perennial question of eBooks was raised once again at this year’s focus group. What are the barriers to moving to e-only and when will we see a higher adoption rate? Money is one factor — each of the librarians had already described a diminishing monograph budget as journals, and especially big deals, take a larger slice of their decreasing budgets. In this climate, there is some hesitancy to moving forward with eBook packages that may “journalize” the monograph market. Only twenty percent of monographs are released simultaneously in print and e-versions, so the libraries are often purchasing print books before they have an electronic option. If a faculty member has requested a book, the library does not have the time to wait for the e-version. Dealing with individual publishers is too time consuming and librarians don’t want to wrestle with different license terms — it’s simply easier to order eBooks through an outlet like Yankee Book Peddler. Libraries are also running into problems on their end as they face a backlog of eBooks to incorporate into their OPACs. The librarians would like to see more uniformity across eBook platforms, and they are also still grappling with how to use them in their libraries. How do you share an eBook through interlibrary loan? Patrons do not want restrictions on the number of times they can download a book, and they don’t want to read a book on a publisher’s Website. As libraries take baby steps toward developing shared monograph collection to avoid overduplication, they wonder how eBooks will fit into that model.

The day ended with both publishers and librarians agreeing they had much in common and discussing what they could do to remove any perceived barriers to working together and cooperating. Some of the librarians’ advice included:

1) Do not view institutional repositories as competitive — libraries are using them to help build their faculty’s brands, not to replace licensed content.
2) Worry less about building all-inclusive subject portals — they simply aren’t needed. Faculty in particular are searching for known items rather than browsing.
3) Use SERU for a set of shared principles for licensing.
4) Help libraries assess the return on investment for resources.


Reported by Greg Hardin (Reference Librarian, Texas Women’s University Libraries) <ghardin@mail.twu.edu>

Edited by Corrie Marsh <cmarsh12@gmail.com>

Over 2,000 librarians, systems professionals, Web managers, information managers, and information specialists attended the most recent Computers in Libraries Conference in Washington, DC. Major themes covered in sessions this year included eBooks trends, training and learning, innovative planning and measuring, the Internet in schools, user experience, collaboration, marketing, as well as content management and discovery systems.

Michelle Manaly in her keynote, Think Like a Digital Native, maintained that digital natives are all about public opinion and living their lives publicly. The main points she highlighted to keep in mind with digital natives are:

- It’s public opinion, not private lives.
- This generation is about knowledge sharing, not knowledge hoarding.
- This generation is interested in interactions, NOT transactions.

Marshall Breeding (pictured here), who has attended all of the 26 Computers in Libraries Conferences, shared a photo essay with stories and lessons from the many libraries he has visited around the world in his presentation, Learning from Inspirational Libraries.

Yale Law Library Access Services Librarian, Julian Aiken, provided perhaps the most entertaining presentation, Getting to the Eureka Moment. While he discussed utilizing Google’s 80/20 model, whereby employees spend 20% of their time on core projects and 20% on “innovation,” he had everyone in stitches as he treated the audience to what he called “brilliant but funny ideas from a Brit.”

The session Integrating iPads into Learning & Libraries presented by Naomi Eichenlaub, Laine Gabel, Dan Jakubek, Graham McCarthy from Ryerson University Library and Archives (Toronto) outlined a pilot project with four students who blogged their experience with their iPads integrated into their daily learning activities including library research. While the students offered many tips of how the iPads could effectively be used for library research, a very valuable question they came up with was “Is the iPad a consuming device or a production device?”

In dynamic speaker Rebecca Jones’ session, Thinking Strategically & Critically: Seeing Possibilities, she began by defining that strategic planning is about “seeing possibilities, seeing differently, and adjusting views.” Strategic planning need not be dreaded like a trip to the dentist, but instead if we go into the process thinking differently, questioning the status quo, being naturally curious, and having open conversations, it can an inspiring and energizing progression.

Going outside of the box, Jill Hurst-Wahl and Maurice Coleman’s session, Planning & Realizing the “Fourth Place,” explored the library as a space where all types of learning activities could occur, including activities that are noisy or messy. The Library as “Fourth Place” follows from Ray Oldenburg’s idea of the Great Good Place, which tells us that home is the “first place” in our lives, while work is our “second place,” and the “third place” could be a coffee shop or somewhere where we might just want to hang out. Great examples for noisy or messy library spaces ranged from bike kitchens for library users to collaboratively work on their bicycles, to the Northern Onondaga Public Library (NOLP), who has created a LibraryFarm where people can check out a garden plot and learn more about gardening. Many libraries may be at a loss for existing space for such activities, so why not look at using shipping containers as a sustainable option?

With presentations on so many wide-ranging topics there was definitely something for everyone at this year’s Computers in Libraries Conference. In addition to hearing the conference buzzwords of strategy and community, the two main informal topics of conversation amongst speakers and attendees alike were eBooks and budgets. Librarians will most certainly face challenges in the coming year concerning limited budgets and eBook limitations, but by creating strategic value for our user communities neither challenge will stand in our way.

The always entertaining and popular Tuesday night session moderated by D. Scott Brandt included the expert panel of Bill Spence, Aaron Schmidt, Amanda Etches-Johnson, Marshall Breeding, Sarah Houghton-Jan, and Stephen Abram who all gave their tongue-in-cheek take on Dead & Innovative Technologies. While bawdy jokes received many laughs, the panel definitely proved the axiom that there is truth in humor. Stephen Abram emphatically warned, “It’s too risky to NOT be different in this economy,” and Sara-Houghton-Jan passionately argued that DRM must die when she talked about The eBook User’s Bill of Rights. http://librarianinblack.net/librarianinblack/2011/02/ebookrights.html

---

Column Editor’s Note: Thank you to all of the 2010 Charleston Conference attendees who agreed to write short reports that highlighted sessions they attended. All attempts were made to provide a broad coverage of sessions, and notes are included in the reports to reflect changes in the session titles or presenters that were not printed in the conference’s final program. Slides and handouts from many 2010 Charleston Conference presentations can be continued on page 73

---

30th Annual Charleston Conference — Issues in Book and Serial Acquisition, “Anything Goes!”
Francis Marion Hotel, Embassy Suites Historic District, Holiday Inn Historic District, and Addlestone Library, College of Charleston, Charleston, SC, November 3-6, 2010

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

---
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found online at http://www.slideshare.net/event/2010-charleston-conference, and the Charleston Conference Proceedings will be published sometime in Fall 2011.

In this issue of Against the Grain you will find the third installment of 2010 conference reports. The first installment can be found in ATG v.23#1, February 2011, with the second installment in ATG v.23#2, April 2011. We continue to publish all of the reports received in upcoming print issues throughout the year. — RKK

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2010
CONCURRENT SESSION 2
(continued from previous installment)

Teaching Electronic Resource Management — Presented by Sheri Ross (St. Catherine University)

Reported by: Angela Rathmel (University of Kansas) <aroads@ku.edu>

Formerly a SUNY (Purchase College) e-resources librarian, Ross now teaches one of few LIS courses in e-resource management. Ross shared some of the challenges justifying this ‘topics course’, noting the necessity for both faculty and students to buy-in and understand the relevance of a library process still largely invisible to the user. Other challenges included the lack of a formal textbook and available lab space — vendors thus far have been unwilling to allow full administrative access to their systems.

Despite the challenges, Ross provided a thorough, well-structured outline of her eight-unit course, showing the theory, concepts, and practice relevant to each lesson. Discussion was opened for ideas on maturity of e-resource theories in LIS, how to work with vendors to provide better virtual lab space, and what place e-resources have in the LIS curriculum going forward. EDRMS, risk management, and information security, as well as DRM and data management, were seen as important issue to include.

The session was thought-provoking and well-presented to a diverse audience of acquisitions/e-resource librarians, teachers of e-resources, and those considering a profession in LIS education. The topic is also highly relevant to those training new or existing staff in e-resources.

Why Do Students Want to be in the Library if They Aren’t Using the Books? — Presented by Katie Clark (University of Rochester); Helen Anderson (University of Rochester)

Reported by: Brent Appling (SLIS Student University of South Carolina) <applingm@email.sc.edu>

This session presented the findings of a year-long ethnographic study of how students and faculty use the facility of the Carlson Science and Engineering Library at the University of Rochester. Clark and Anderson, librarians at the Carlson Library, observed through circulation statistics that, though the library was often busy, the students were not using the books, so they decided to observe the use of the library to find out why the library was being used despite the fact that the books were not being used. The presenters effectively showed each of the methods used, including observations, comment reply cards, and interviews, and how the data of each method was analyzed. Based on their analysis of their findings, Clark and Anderson believe that the students use the Carlson Library because students want to be in an environment with books even if they are not going to use them. This was a very interesting session that showed how traditional library space can be conducive to student academic efforts, even if the library resources are not being used by the students.

continued on page 74
**The Art of Building Collections: How to Build a Successful Partnership Between Publishers, Vendors, and Libraries** — Presented by Michael Arthur (University of Central Florida); Victor Lao (Springer Science + Business Media); Steve Sutton (YBP)

Reported by: Sara Herndon (SLIS Student University of South Carolina) <herndons@email.sc.edu>

The session was an illuminating insiders’ view into how all three entities rely upon each other for survival.

Speakers represented each entity: Arthur, Head of Acquisitions and Collection Development from the University of Central Florida; Sutton, Senior Manager of Digital Content Sales for the Eastern U.S. at YBP Library Services; and Lao, Academic Licensing Manager of the Southeastern U.S. at Springer. Each described his part of their professional relationship while developing UCF’s science collection, complete with practical tips for those in similar professions.

Sutton argued that if libraries cut out vendors, users will cut out libraries by going directly to publishers via the Internet or bookstores. This “live together or die together” theme tied together an otherwise technical discussion of how to make deals which will satisfy all parties. The presentation exceeded expectations with its interesting personal accounts of their working relationship.

**Consensus-Based Assessment for Reinvisioning a Reference Collection** — Presented by Michael A. Matos (American University); Patricia J. West (American University Library)

*Note: The presentation Power Point was entitled “To Weed or Not to Weed: Reference Collection Assessment through Consensus”*

Reported by: Chantal Wilson (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <chantalw@mailbox.sc.edu>

The presenters for this session were West, Head of Reference, and Matos, who served as the project manager of the reference weed. American University’s reference stacks are located on the main floor of the library and at the time took up approximately 50% of the public space. Due to an increased demand for open floor space to be used for computers and study areas and underutilization of the print reference collection, the administration decided to undertake a reference weeding project. The reference collection had not been weeded in about 10 years. During the collection review process it would be decided whether items were retained in reference or moved to the general stacks, to offsite storage, or discarded. In an effort to be inclusive, open meetings were conducted and all library staff was given an opportunity to review items or take part in the process. The golden rule for this project was that a title would be discarded only if the opinion was unanimous. As a result of the weeding project the reference collection was decreased by 60%, librarians became much more familiar with the collection, and a new reference collection plan was implemented. Audience questions and comments were welcomed.

**Wherefore Art Thou, RoMEO? — A Review of Open Access/ Public Access Definitions and Policies** — Presented by Betty Landesman (NIH Library); Bob Schatz (BioMed Central)

Reported by: Steven A. Knowlton (University of Memphis, Ned R. McWherter Library) <sknowlton@memphis.edu>

The purpose of this session was to acquaint attendees with the history and purposes of open-access journal publishing, as well as the different levels of OA certification that publishers may attain. OA has its origins (with many of the journals indexed) in PubMed; although other efforts preceded it, the 2005 mandate from NIH that articles funded by NIH grants must be OA led to many sources becoming available. However, there is an embargo on many PubMed articles.

OA has overcome skepticism about its quality and has seen an exponential increase in submissions as well as the number of titles offered in OA (from 60 titles in 2000 to 5514 today.) Researchers are citing OA articles in increasing number as well.

Publishers who offer OA services may comply with various standards. British publishers apply Rights Metadata for Open Archiving (RoMEO), which has levels including Green, Blue, Yellow, and White, each of which expresses a different level of rights that the author retains. In the U.S., Green and Gold are descriptors applied to OA rights schemes.

OA has a promising future because of budget pressures in libraries, the likelihood of more government mandates for OA publishing from federally-funded research, and a distributed preservation model.

**THURSDAY PLENARY SESSIONS**

**The Tower and the Free Web—the Role of Reference** — Presented by John Dove (President, Credo Reference); Phoebie Ayers (Wikimedia Foundation / University of California at Davis); Casper Grathwohl (Vice President and Online and Reference Publisher, Oxford University Press); Jason B. Phillips (Librarian for Sociology, Psychology, Gender and Sexuality Studies and American Studies, New York University); Michael Sweet (CEO, Credo Reference)

Reported by: Som Linthicum (MLIS student at the University of South Carolina) <s.linthicum@yahoo.com>

This large plenary session explored the changing – and, some might argue, vanishing — role of reference in a Web-dominated information universe. By forging creative partnerships among publishers, aggregators, and librarians, the speakers hoped to identify opportunities to re-assert the role of an interpretive guide in the process of resource evaluation in order to overcome the onslaught of indiscriminate information overload often experienced by online researchers. Among the possibilities discussed were the embedding of authoritatively vetted hyperlinks within Wikipedia and other collaborative, but unmediated, information vehicles; the creation of proprietarial alternatives to Wikipedia with greater authority controls; and the development of online reference services that redirect and reconnect Web-based research queries to library resource providers. Speakers emphasized that any such vehicle would need to be discoverable, contextualized, and seamlessly integrated with other relevant resources. The session concluded with a call for innovation, collaboration, and integration among libraries, vendors, and aggregators.

**HAPPY HOUR**

**THURSDAY CONCURRENT SESSION 3**

**Where are the GLBT Books for Children?** — Presented by Barbara Fiehn (Western Kentucky University); Tadayuki Suzuki (Western Kentucky University)

Reported by: Pamela Hoppock (SLIS student, University of South Carolina) <phoppock@yahoo.com>

This presentation was on-target for being as advertised. The enthusiastic speakers first addressed why GLBT books are important, including:

1) an estimated 40,000 children are being raised by same-sex parents (This number is probably low, considering many people fear “coming out.”)
2) many children do not feel supported by family, teachers, or community members
3) people should be able to see themselves in the books they read.

continued on page 75
The speakers continued on with a book talk in two parts. The first part presented seven books considered to be GLBT friendly, meaning characters are not identified as GLBT, but could be. The second part presented six books with GLBT characters, including a Stonewall Honor book. The speakers discussed selection issues, including difficulties faced by school librarians and the difficulty of finding reviews for GLBT children’s books. The presentation concluded with a brief discussion of community issues including the fear that some teachers and parents have about reading GLBT books to children. The last take-away point was that dialogue is important and that challenges are an opening for dialogue.

Open Textbook Models: The View from the Library — Presented by Greg Raschke (NCSU Libraries); Jeff Shelstad (Flat World Knowledge); Marilyn Billings (University of Massachusetts – Amherst)

Reported by: Desmond Maley (J.N. Desmarais Library, Laurentian University) <dmaley@laurentian.ca>

American college students pay on average $850 each year for their textbooks. The $10B-a-year industry is dominated by Cengage, Pearson, and McGraw Hill, with nearly 80 percent of the market. Affordability is a major issue and is often cited as one of the reasons why students leave college. Shelstad discussed the business model of Flat World Knowledge, which publishes its textbooks under a Creative Commons license while selling supplemental materials. Raschke discussed the North Carolina State University experience, where the provost had received complaints regarding the textbook costs. In cooperation with the bookstore, the library purchased one reserve copy of all the textbooks used at NCSU at an initial cost of $100,000. This went down substantially in the second year. The program has been a success, with heavy usage. The library has no bargaining power in the textbook industry, but it can be a “best supporting actor” by providing textbooks in this way; it is also the practice in the U.K. Billings described the work on Open Educational Resources (OER) at University of Massachusetts, Amherst, which had Open Access Weeks in 2009 and 2010. The OER guide is available at: http://guides.library.umass.edu/oer

Developing an E-Book Acquisition Strategy that Works — Presented by Angela Carreno (New York University); Matt Barnes (Vice President of Academic Sales, ebrary); Bill Malterich (New York University)

Note: Angela Carreno (New York University) did not speak at this session; Matt Nauman (Academic E-Content Product Manager, YBP Library Services) joined the panel.

Reported by: Andrée Rathemacher (University of Rhode Island) <andree@uri.edu>

Barnes reported that a majority of respondents to a recent ebrary survey use eBooks at least sometimes, which demonstrates an imperative for libraries to integrate eBooks into their collection development strategies. The reality of eBooks is messy. There are many options and much confusion. The danger to libraries is that their eBook acquisition strategy will be driven by the market instead of being informed by the market. NYU provides a real-world example of what can be accomplished when a library approaches the acquisition of eBooks with a plan.

Malterich explained that librarians at NYU started investigating eBooks two-and-a-half years ago and arrived at a number of requirements for eBook purchases. These included a unified experience for eBook users enabling full-text searching across all content; that content be hosted on publisher sites in addition to the unified platform; the ability to integrate eBooks into their approval plan for print books, including assigning fund codes to books based on content; the ability to purchase eBooks at the title level as well as in packages; and a single source for customizable MARC records.

NYU realized that working with three parties would be necessary: publishers, an aggregator (ebrary), and their approval plan vendor (YBP). NYU purchased its own platform from ebrary, which ebrary manages. NYU is able to upload all purchased eBook content to the platform, even content not purchased through ebrary. ebrary has assisted with negotiating the purchase of eBook packages. NYU librarians use YBP’s selection tools for purchasing eBooks and print books and are therefore able to identify previously-purchased titles in either format, avoiding unintentional duplication. YBP handles invoicing for both purchases regardless of format.

Nauman noted that YBP is a vendor for eBooks from multiple aggregators and publishers. They sell eBooks singly and in packages and offer options for patron-driven acquisitions (PDA) and purchases by consortia. YBP recognizes that eBooks are evolving, and flexibility is key. YBP is willing to make adjustments as the eBook marketplace and technologies mature.

You’re Not Licensing Streaming Video? Why Not?! — Presented by Doug Farrelly (Arizona State University); Stephen Rhind-Tutt (Alexander Street Press)

Reported by: Leslie Williams (University of Colorado, Anschutz Medical Campus, Health Sciences Library) <leslie.williams@ucdenver.edu>

Farrelly and Rhind-Tutt delivered an intriguing presentation on streaming video as a rapidly-emerging trend. Rhind-Tutt delivered a brief historical overview of moving media and a look into the future. By 2013, 90% of the traffic on the Web is expected to be video traffic. Rhind-Tutt discussed several issues vendors are currently facing. Vendors are transforming video databases into value-added products like journal databases, making them easily searchable with the ability to link to course management software. Vendors are also interested in integrating video content into discovery tools.

Farrelly covered key considerations of acquiring and managing streaming video from a librarian’s perspective. There are four dominant licensing approaches to streaming video including subscriptions, term licenses, in-perpetuity licenses, and pay-per-view. The term license is the most commonly offered. However, libraries prefer the in-perpetuity license and the climate is shifting to meet customer demand.

Pricing models vary. They include FTE-based, institution type-based, consortial pricing, subscription, and patron-driven. Arizona State University attempted a patron-driven model but found it wasn’t scalable.

Other factors play a critical role in managing streaming video. Either the vendor or the library generates the file source. The file source requires hosting which could be provided by the vendor, by the library, or outsourced. Additionally, multiple file formats exists including .mpg, Windows media, and more.

Adrift in a Sea of Metadata: How to set sail all ahead full! — Presented by Nicole Pelsinsky (Serials Solutions); Maria Stanton (Serials Solutions); Aaron Wood (Alexander Street Press)

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

Pelsinsky pondered how big is the “sea,” which includes descriptors, knowledge bases, and provider content. It is desirable to take advantage of the best in metadata and content, capitalizing on unique metadata, with unbiased access to content. Celebrate the uniqueness of local data (i.e., catalogs and IRs) and acknowledge that librarians are instrumental in making sense of the vast sets of knowledge that exist. Stanton talked about the scope of the management problem — is it a sea or rapids? The holdings are now global (4 billion eBook holdings)
The presenters discussed the evolution of electronic journals over the past twenty years and the acceptance and use by library patrons. Librarians found themselves faced with questions about the interest in electronic journals, usefulness, and the meaning of full text. In the 2000s, it became apparent that the electronic journals format had grown in both acceptance and demand by library patrons. Librarians had also become more confident that full-text journals were truly full-content. Librarians then found themselves faced with the question about whether their budgets could continue to support maintaining both the print and electronic formats for journal titles and archival access in the future. The speakers discussed the results from a survey which queried librarians about decisions and factors related to the retention or cancellation of the print format for journal titles at their libraries. A question-and-answer session followed the presentation.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2010

Breakfast Discussion (Sponsored by: ebrary) — Presented by Hope Barton (University of Iowa); Christopher Warnock (ebrary); Michael Walmsley (YBP Library Services)

Notes: This session was based largely on the Thursday Lively Lunch session, “Give ‘Em What They Want: Patron-Drive Collection Development.” Matt Barnes (ebrary), spoke in place of Christopher Warnock. Thurs. Lively Lunch presenter, Karen Fischer (University of Iowa), joined this session’s presenters.

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

This morning session, like one of the Thursday Lively Lunches, was vendor-sponsored. Still, for those unable to attend the Thursday Lively Lunch presentation by Barton and Fisher, with Michael Wright of U ofIA and Kathleen Clatannot of YBP, this was an opportunity to hear about U ofIA’s PDA experience. Per Barnes, goals included building on publisher relationships, integrating digital and print fulfillment, leveraging workflow. Walmsley discussed values and merits. No two PDA programs are alike — print, electronic, hybrid, or in a consortial environment. Barton provided background — the initial conversation began in summer 2009, with the trial moving from one month, to six months, to one year. She described the stages leading to full production, as well as the cost picture. Fischer shared data on findings — average use per title (by publisher), comparisons of print and online usage of (the same) titles. The session was billed in the conference program as “breakfast and a roundtable discussion.” Although attendees sat at many round tables and enjoyed a (vendor-sponsored) buffet breakfast, it was not so much a discussion as a series of presentations about one library’s pilot experience with PDA and the vendor partners that helped make it possible. Conclusions? PDA will affect future collection management practices, trust the patron, and PDA does NOT lead to buying a skewed collection as first feared.

FRIDAY PLENARY SESSIONS

Full-Spectrum Stewardship of the Record of Scholarly and Scientific Research — Presented by Brian Schottlaender (University of California, San Diego)

Reported by: Margaret M. Kain (University of Alabama at Birmingham, Mervyn H. Sterne Library) <pkain@uab.edu>

Schottlaender began his exciting presentation by examining the scholarly record. Twenty years after this term first appeared in library literature, the original definition still applies. The corpus of scholarly publishing with perpetual access was stewarded by Libraries. Access and perpetual access changed with the development of projects by trusted third parties, such as PORTICO. Ithaca changed what types of resources would be archived by including data resources. These changes have had an impact on the definition of the scholarly record. Prior to the Ithaca development, some of the materials maintained were archived in less stable environments. Researchers recently added scholarly inquiry, such as blogs, wikis, and open notebooks to the records that should be maintained. The question becomes whose responsibility is it to steward the record and infrastructure of these resources. Schottlaender noted that librarians and trusted third parties talk to one another but not to others in the community. The dilemma is how to sell successful stewardship to Universities and the administration. He emphasized that all of the stakeholders must be engaged for this to be accomplished. Librarians should develop a more expansive view of stakeholders, the scope of the infrastructure, with more interoperation and attention paid to all areas.


Reported by: Deb Thomas (University of Tennessee) <deb-thomas@utk.edu>

Participants discussed the changes in and challenges of scholarly publishing. For example: what are the issues in the way journals provide supplementary data? (Plutchak: The distinction between article and data can be fuzzy; it’s not impossible to have data with a supplementary article. Anderson: Publishers don’t do data well — they can’t verify data and don’t have the bandwidth to handle it. Chi: Maybe data should be vetted in a bottom-up process by institutions or disciplines? Scholarly societies need to provide guidance.) How is scholarly publishing changing? (Chi — publication at the article level — don’t wait until x number of articles are collected. Books should be alive, and they’re dead until publication. Anderson: Blogs are alive, self-publishing is flourishing, and lack of interaction between authors and readers is anachronistic. Plutchak: Differences between books and journals are fading. Everything is a serial, and everything is a database.) What kinds of people are needed in scholarly publishing? (Chi: People with subject expertise who know technology and who can envision secondary uses for primary content. Anderson: People in all aspects of publishing — editorial and business — for whom technology is second nature. Plutchak: — People who can rethink the scholarly publishing model because any publisher who depends on growth from the academic library market is in trouble.

No solutions were reached, but the discussion was lively and thought-provoking, and a real dialogue developed between panelists.

continued on page 77
This plenary session discussed two experiences in navigating the transition to electronic-only content, from the perspective of a content provider and a librarian. **Schonfeld** began by presenting findings from the 2009 Ithaka S+R Faculty Survey ([http://www.ithaka.org/ithaka-s-r/research/faculty-surveys-2000-2009/Faculty%20Study%202009.pdf](http://www.ithaka.org/ithaka-s-r/research/faculty-surveys-2000-2009/Faculty%20Study%202009.pdf)), which questions faculty readiness to move to a fully electronic library. Schonfeld predicts that we will evolve more slowly than other end-users and that the librarian will assume an even more vital role in the world of electronic content for this reason. Schonfeld went on to present measures that Ithaka S+R has taken to provide content preservation options and the challenges encountered in catering to a diverse community of libraries.

**Woodson** presented the experience of the John Hopkins Welch Medical Library in moving towards becoming an entirely digital space. Woodson walked the audience through the history of this transition, beginning in 2000 with a user study that was conducted to better utilize the library's space and ending with the library's recent charge of reducing 80% of print holdings by 2012. Woodson offered insight into the many challenges and rewards experienced by the library throughout this process, including the move from providing content to providing services, changes in staffing, and the overarching question of what a library space is and how it can be most effectively utilized in the electronic world.