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 Kindle 2: Excuse my brother. He’s gone back to library school—at University of Arizona…we want to be right by our publishers and right by our customers…we…

@Brunning: Will you work with libraries?

 Kindle 2: One book per device is how we roll until the time when we can arrange other terms set by the market place…

@Brunning: Which means…?

 Kindle 2: It means whatever you want it to mean…

@Brunning: Moving along…markets will be markets…but hey, congrats Kindle 1.1 for a career move…taking the MARC class?

 Kindle 1.1: You bet your open access…can’t read if you can’t find (or search?).

Disclaimer

Dennis Brunning (@Brunning) is long on Amazon, Apple, and libraries none of which should mean much. He is an avid reader of books, books on Kindle, and books on Sony E Reader. There may be a Be Book somewhere on his laptop. He keeps books under the bed which he hopes will be available on the Kindle. He is a librarian and therefore doesn’t have much money which his Kindle addiction is not helping.

Two years of Kindling have taught him much the least of which are the following:

• Do not read in bathtub.
• Do not drop on Saltillo tile.
• Limit visits to Kindle Store, on device or on Web, to 1x monthly.
• Do not count on photographs, illustrations, figures to be available.
• Limit expectations to free reading.
• Sample feature, usually the first chapter or close to it is great, especially to avoid crap.
• Order Kindle 2 now unless you want to get in line for Kindle 3. 🎨

And They Were There

Reports of Meetings — 14th National ACRL Conference and more from the 2008 Charleston Conference

Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL)

Reported by Bob Holley (Wayne State University) <aa3805@wayne.edu>

The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) held its 14th National Conference on March 12-15 in Seattle, Washington. This conference was similar in format to the Charleston Conference. It focused on subject content without the committee meetings that take up so much time at ALA Annual Conferences and the Midwinter Meetings. The conference offered keynote speakers, invited presentations, refereed papers and panels, workshops, poster sessions, table discussions, and a Cyber ZED Shed for technology demonstrations plus social activities such as the exhibits opening and an all conference...continued on page 70
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reception at the Experience Music Project/Science Fiction Museum and Hall of Fame. Preliminary registration was 3,036 according to Library Journal. The 225 vendors accounted for 900+ exhibitors for a total count of almost 4,000 attendees.

As perhaps the only person in the world who has attended all fourteen conferences since 1979 in Boston, I have seen this conference acquire a focus on topics of interest to public service librarians. Mary Ellen Davis, ACRL Executive Director, told me that the ACRL does not keep demographic statistics on attendees. I would nonetheless stake a large bet that the attendees are younger, earlier in their careers, and more likely to be academic librarians in four year and community colleges than would be true at the two ALA annual meetings. As an indication of this, over one-third of the registrants (1,150 out of 3,036) were first time attendees. While some librarians and deans/directors from the largest research libraries attended, they have much less influence than at the Charleston Conference.

I systematically examined the conference schedule to find sessions of interest to ATG readers. I was surprised to find some promising titles whose descriptions then showed a focus on other areas. For example, a panel session titled, “Subject Librarian 2.0: Emerging Trends and Future Challenges for the Liaison Librarian,” included the following description: “Topics include interdisciplinary research, technology, scholarly communication, instruction and curriculum design, e-science and more.” Collection development apparently is no longer a major responsibility for subject librarians. In summary for all session formats, collection development had the highest number with seventeen. Within this group, the emphasis was on collection formats with seven papers: serials (3), eBooks, graphic novels, grey literature, and media. Collection building had four papers with two each on cooperative collection development and patron driven purchasing. Three were on preservation broadly defined with the subjects of last copy identification, weeding, and off-site storage. Collection analysis, subject specialists, and a general question about whether the academic collection is worth saving accounted for the final three. I classified nine papers as dealing with scholarly communication. Three dealt with open access; three with institutional repositories, two with general issues, and one with academic library publishing. Finally, I put four papers into the category of digital issues of which only one had a specific focus — map collections. I was surprised at the lack of attention to publishing and the creation of scholarly knowledge.

Overall, the dominant topic was outreach to faculty and students with a strong focus on information literacy. “Information literacy” appeared in the titles of thirty-one sessions from a keyword search on the conference schedule. Reference came somewhat behind with fifteen sessions including one with the title “But We’re not Dead Yet.”

The exhibits attracted “over 225 vendors” who were much the same as those who come to ALA conferences to sell to academic libraries though specialized markets such as foreign language jobbers were less well represented. To help build traffic for the exhibitors, ACRL used free food and also required walking through the exhibits to get to the poster sessions.

Overall, the ACRL National Conference provided the opportunity to get away for four days to concentrate on professional topics. Even with the invited papers and the keynote speakers, who were “celebrities” chosen for their entertainment value in areas of non-library concerns. I found this to be an inward looking conference by librarians for librarians. We heard how great and innovative we are and spent the time patting ourselves on the backs. Perhaps hearing about a few failures and getting perspectives from the outside world, a strength of the Charleston Conference, might be more useful in the long run.

---


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

While discussing current practices, Wathen said the traditional workflow focus is too much on local perspectives, the item and perfect cataloging — if the focus should be on sharing, the user and findability. For the other panelists, inefficiencies revolved around the matching and integration of metadata from external sources using MARC and, to an increasing extent, ONIX. Although ONIX has mechanisms for FRBR, usage still is inconsistent with metadata only semi-FRBRized. Molyneux sees too much waste when compensating for the different bibliographic standards across libraries, and resistance to taking a less localized view. Redman is investing in text matching systems in addition to manual data scrubbing, but believes that the need to re-create data takes away from the ability to add value across the supply chain.

For the future, Wathen and Redman emphasized the need to contextualize metadata instead of getting more specific, with context leading to trust down the supply chain and purpose and usefulness coming back. Most publishers have a financial incentive to do this, such as the pressure from retailers to supply an accurate ONIX file. Nardini suggested that metadata practices be more standardized and easier to use, and that the bar be set at “good enough” because publishers can’t create metadata to library standards. Molyneux mentioned as a success factor the Working Group recommendations for library schools to focus more on library data and systems.

This lively discussion on new business models took the group over the allotted time, with no chance for summary statements. Group consensus was that to create and share bibliographic data efficiently, the community needs to look at ways for the appropriate people to create intellectual work and push upstream, such as catalogers creating bibliographic data at the time of publication, and then keep the data moving down the supply chain with mechanisms like registries for ISTC and authors.
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