

February 2008

And They Were There -- Reports of Meetings -- 27th Annual Charleston Conference

Ramune K. Kubilius

Northwestern University, r-kubilius@northwestern.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kubilius, Ramune K. (2008) "And They Were There -- Reports of Meetings -- 27th Annual Charleston Conference," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 20: Iss. 1, Article 32.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.2714>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

But, in assessing what is worth capturing and preserving for the long term, librarians are taking on a role that is less familiar to them than it is to editors at university presses whose primary job it is to help sort out the wheat from the chaff of scholarship and brand the best as worth the investment of funds to make it permanent in the form of publications. Some librarians are already writing about the virtues of combining the strengths of libraries and presses synergistically, building on a prominent theme from the *Ithaka Report*. My Penn State librarian colleague **Michael Furlough**, writing about “University Presses and Scholarly Communication: Potential for Collaboration” in *College & Research Library News* (January 2008), offers the following helpful analysis: “Libraries should care about the health of university presses because publishers and publishing-related services are crucial to libraries’ own future. Many librarians now help students and faculty use digital content and technologies in their research and teaching, and we are supporting them in elaborating new and transformative uses of these materials. Increasingly we support more parts of the entire process of scholarship, and, especially in newer media, we are expanding our services to the process of authoring and creation, and then linking that to the process of presentation and archiving. Libraries have invested significantly in technology platforms to manage, provide access to, and (in time) preserve large digital collections. But presentation means dissemination, not publishing of research, and librarians need to understand the scope of both to support scholarly communication more effectively. Our principles of selection — for the materials we buy or license — are based on service to our local faculty and students, not on the same editorial principles that guide publishers. We think of our clients as ‘users’ or ‘customers’ rather than as ‘producers’ and ‘authors,’ but the latter identities are more important to them in establishing their career path. Our attempts to collect their research in institutional repositories could perhaps be more successful if we think of their needs as scholars and producers of research, not just users of our reference and archiving services. Publishers and university presses may know little about how our faculty conduct research, but they know much better than we do how to cultivate their scholarship and bring it to light” (p. 33). **Furlough** goes on to note: “Both libraries and university presses are losing a large part of the authority they have held as arbiters of quality and channels for content access as those roles have migrated to other agents. The real opportunity in collaborations between presses and libraries lies in sharing risk and leveraging their wagers on the future of scholarship in the academy. By linking up the processes of scholarly creation with access and stewardship, libraries have an opportunity to truly attend to the entire life cycle of scholarship. The primary materials in our archives are the future datasets for humanists and social scientists, and our publishing colleagues can help us analyze our

markets, think through our own principles of content selection, and identify opportunities for added value, especially when it comes to identifying and selecting the stuff that **Google** isn’t planning to scan. It’s easy to talk about what scholarship of the future might look like: dynamic, networked, immediately accessible, and quality-controlled through computational systems as well as human assessment. But we don’t know all the small steps to get there, and we need more partners to help us do so — and not all of these partners should be found in our computing departments and IT organizations. Both of us [libraries and presses] are redefining ourselves, and we both need to refocus on all the core elements of scholarly creation and communication to understand the whole cycle more completely. We can’t do that independently in libraries, and university presses bring value and needed expertise to our profession’s attempt to assert new roles in relation to publishing” (pp. 34-35).

This is a spirit of collaboration I can fully endorse, and to the extent that this was the aim of the *ACRL Report*, I applaud its goals and hope its invitation to continue the dialogue will be accepted by members of the university press community. If I have any lingering worries, they arise from the *Report’s* recommendation (p. 14) to “study the potential cost savings of reducing the acquisition, processing and shelving of print books and journals to reallocate funding to digital content creation and preservation” in conjunction with this powerful reminder from **Clifford Lynch**, an advisor to the *Report’s* authors, who wrote recently in an article titled “A Matter of Mission: Information Technology and the Future of Higher Education” (in **Richard N. Katz**, ed., *The Tower and the Cloud*, 2008): “In the print era, primary

stewardship of the record of scholarship was very closely tied operationally and economically to the dissemination system (publishing); research libraries purchased this record, made it accessible, and preserved it. The system of research libraries, and the broader system of organizations that managed the base of evidence for scholarly work, represented a substantial



and sustained investment both by higher education and by society as a whole. The growth of new kinds of scholarly communication today, the move to e-research, the reliance of scholarly work on a tremendous proliferation of data sets (some of them enormous) and of accompanying software systems threaten to greatly increase the cost and complexity of the stewardship process and to at least partially decouple it from (traditional) publishing, meaning that

libraries need to reexamine and redefine their roles appropriately to address these new scholarly works and this new body of evidence for scholarship. Commitment to activities like data curation and management of faculty collections will increasingly characterize research libraries as much as the comprehensive collecting and preservation policies for published literature and personal papers. The cost of stewardship is, I believe, going to rise substantially.”

With the rise in cost will surely come even tougher decisions about how to allocate scarce resources. The recommendation of the *ACRL Report* to consider diverting funds away from print to digital collections cannot help but increase the insecurity of university presses, which have largely succeeded in transitioning from print to digital in journal publishing but have yet to figure out a way to do it successfully for monographs, though experiments are under way. 🌱

And They Were There

Reports of Meetings — 27th Annual Charleston Conference

Issues in Book and Serial Acquisition, “What Tangled Webs We Weave,” Francis Marion Hotel, Embassy Suites Historic District, and College of Charleston (Addlestone Library and Arnold Hall, Jewish Studies Center), Charleston, SC, November 7-10, 2007

Charleston Conference Reports compiled by: **Ramune K. Kubilius** (Collection Development / Special Projects Librarian, Northwestern University, Galter Health Sciences Library) <r-kubilius@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 second installment of reports, but we still have more! Watch for them in upcoming *ATG* issues. Also, visit the *Charleston Conference Website* for session handouts and discussions. The entire 2007 Charleston Conference Proceedings will be published by *Libraries Unlimited / Greenwood Publishing Group*, available in fall 2008. — **RKK**

continued on page 66

Lively Lunches — Thursday, November 8th, 2007

Business Intelligence: How to Understand What You Need to Know About Companies, Markets, and the Global Economy
— Presented by **Lawrence Maxted** (Collections Development Librarian, Gannon University)

Reported by: **Donna Daniels** (University of Arkansas, Mullins Library) <donnad@uark.edu>

As a Business Librarian, I was excited to see this session in the program. The presenter however, miscalculated the audience's knowledge of the subject. After **Maxted** turned the rest of the session into a discussion driven by the audience needs, it became a useful session. People really wanted to know about good selection tools, how to research local markets and China, discussion lists such as **BUSLIB-L** and licensing problems for resources that have primarily been marketed to the commercial sector not the academic market. People also wanted to know about training for librarians and students and how to promote specific expensive resources. Some of the specific resources mentioned were *Strauss's Handbook of Business Information*, **EIU**, **Mintel**, **Simmons**, **Mediamark**, **Lexis-Nexis Academic** and **Standard and Poors' NetAdvantage**.

Concurrent Sessions — Thursday, November 8th, 2007

Catalog Collectivism: XC and the Future of Library Search
— Presented by **Eric Lease Morgan** (Head of Digital Access and Information Architecture Department, University Libraries of Notre Dame), **Stanley Wilder** (Associate Dean, River Campus Libraries, University of Rochester)

Reported by: **Clara B. Potter** (Camden-Carroll Library, Morehead State University) <c.potter@morehead-st.edu>

Wilder of the **University of Rochester at Riverside** spoke about **XC**, a **Mellon**-funded project based at the **University of Rochester**. **XC**, which stands for **eXtensibleCatalog**, uses open source software in an attempt to develop a search system intended to "manage underlying metadata of information silos."

XC is not a catalog, but is a search system which uses indexed catalog data and other types of data to provide Web 2-style search results. **XC** could be compared to commercial products such as **Endeca**, **Primo**, or **WorldCat** local.

Phase I of the project has been completed, at a value of about \$2,860,000, with a little more than half of that being contributions from the **University of Rochester**, while **Mellon** and partner libraries made up the other half.

Project managers are looking for partners, including libraries and ILS vendors. They are currently working with **Notre Dame**, the group (a **Voyager** user) and have someone working with **BlackBoard**, the courseware company. They would like to have 100 partners, **Wilder** said.

Morgan of **Notre Dame** spoke of the search aspect of the **XC**. He pointed out that databases like a library catalog are good places to store and manipulate data, but you have to know the structure of the data to query a database. Indexes provide a better option for **SEARCH** since indexing can point to where the content is, rather than the searching having to specify search fields. This enhances the discovery process.

Now users want to not only search, but to do things with the results, such as tagging, reviewing, comparing, or adding to a personal list. In an academic setting, **Morgan** argues the new services we can provide

through search to our specific user population will distinguish libraries from commercial search providers and will support teaching, learning, and research.

Notre Dame's part of the partnership is to make their data available for harvesting, with patron authentication enabled. **XC** then harvests the data and makes it searchable. **Notre Dame** then tests the data and reports to **XC**.

Both presenters made a point that these open-source partnerships are very different from early efforts in libraries to "grow their own" **OPACs**, since a community of users is responsible for the development of open-source systems, the systems are standards-based, and users will be able to continually update and improve the software.

Transforming an Academic Business Collection to Create a Collaborative Learning Environment — Presented by **Marianne Ryan** (Associate Dean for Learning, Purdue University Libraries), **Tomalee Doan** (Head, Management & Economics Library, Purdue University)

Reported by: **Donna Daniels** (University of Arkansas, Mullins Library) <donnad@uark.edu>

A very informative presentation that described the process the librarians and staff went through to combine a number of branch libraries into one. There were planning meetings with the business school dean and department heads and library personnel. The users of the proposed space were asked for their input on what they wanted the space to be. The project was a massive undertaking that included evaluating all aspects of the library collection — reference, journals, print and electronic resources. A weeding project was undertaken. Parts of the collection were placed in either a light or dark archive, parts of the collection were converted to electronic access only. The library was completely reconfigured to meet the user's needs. This included the addition of a café, business financial center, and instructional learning lab and new furnishings. Staffing was also affected with the addition of a new associate head, two new librarians, and three graduate assistants.

Morning Sessions — Friday, November 9th, 2007

Media Publishing Giants: Can They Get Even Bigger?
— Presented by **Bill Hannay** (Schiff, Hardin & Waite Law Firm)

Reported by: **Karen Fischer** (University of Iowa Libraries) <karen-fischer@uiowa.edu>

Hannay gave an overview of the **Thomson-Reuters** proposed merger as an example of media giants and their market power. **Thomson**, in preparation for the **Reuters** deal, sold off **Thomson Learning**, thus enabling it "to pursue opportunities better aligned with its growth strategy and business model." Next **Hannay** explored the background of market power: "the ability profitably to maintain prices above competitive levels for a significant period of time sellers with market power also may lessen competition on dimensions other than price, such as product quality, service or innovation." **Hannay** then assessed the presence or absence of market power for **Thomson** by examining how "elastic" the demand is, meaning are libraries willing to pay virtually any price to acquire the product?

The **European Commission** is doing an in-depth investigation into the **Thomson-Reuters** deal. Initial findings show that the deal may impede effective competition (i.e., will **Thomson-Reuters** market power allow them to raise prices unilaterally?). In conclusion, **Hannay** does not know if the proposed merger will produce unilateral anticompetitive effects. He concluded his talk with the performance of a song about **Teddy Roosevelt** (who was president when anti-trust laws were created), called "*Bring Teddy Back*." (Each session attendee received the text of this talk.)

continued on page 67

Open Access: Good for Society, Bad for Libraries? — Presented by **Rick Anderson** (Associate Director for Scholarly Resources and Collections, University of Utah), **T. Scott Plutchak** (Director, Lister Hill Library of the Health Sciences, University of Alabama at Birmingham)

Reported by: **Elizabeth L. Winter** (Library and Information Center, Georgia Institute of Technology)
<elizabeth.winter@library.gatech.edu>

This proved less a debate and more a unified plea by the likeminded presenters to get librarians to rethink the work they do in order to remain relevant.

Anderson reminded us that traditional library functions won't be necessary for long and suggested three new roles for libraries in the growing open access environment: move from information broker to publisher, become the place users come for locally-created data, and create "virtual journals" for faculty (e.g., edited compilations of links to electronic material).

Plutchak agreed that libraries need new roles, while keeping our core values (as described by **Frances Groen** in *Access to Medical Knowledge*: access to information for all, promoting literacy, and preserving the accumulated wisdom of the past), intact. Libraries need to move from helping people use collections to helping people navigate the complicated information environment.

Anderson recommended **Morville's Ambient Findability** and reminded us that librarians can't assume that they will always be best equipped to help people navigate the information space — we need to prove this to our funding bodies. **Plutchak** concluded that librarians need to do the difficult political work to ensure that we are the ones to provide publishing and repository services (otherwise, someone else will step in and do this).

The OPAC is Dead. Long Live the OPAC! — Presented by **Jane Burke** (Vice President and General Manager, Serials Solutions)

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

Burke's thought-provoking comments reminded attendees that users no longer want (or need) to come to the big (library) buildings we built in the past. Collections are more volatile. It's all about users. **ProQuest's** study of student end-users (ads were placed on **Facebook**) revealed they are busy; their "lingua franca" is **Google**, a course system, plus perhaps a third interface. Integrated library systems expose users to administrative trivia before they can do what they want to do — search. We continue to be bifurcated. Success? Users find what they want. Discovery: content plus community plus technology. Desired: a single interface to find all information. There should be good faceting for post-result processing (graphical "related" and book covers). There are early entrants in: the commercial sector, open source, and ventures such as **Google Scholar** (**Google** is the elephant in the room — be aware of it, but not afraid). Quoting her mother, **Burke** commented that "change requires change." Live the spirit of the **Charleston Conference** with new levels of cooperation. Librarians: sell blatantly to users, abandon format mentality, give up bibliographic instruction. Publishers: rethink the value of metadata, "disaggregate," develop new standards. Accept that we can't do it all. Give print only the percentage of time it earns by circulation. It is time for "revolution," not "evolution." A quotable quote from the Q&A: "Don't go to **Victoria's Secret** to buy a hammer."



What Do Users Want? — Presented by **Ann Okerson**, Moderator (Associate University Librarian, Yale University), **Lucinda Covert-Vail** (Director of Public Services, New York University Libraries), **Cecily Marcus** (CLIR Postdoctoral Fellow, University of Minnesota Libraries), **James J. O'Donnell** (Professor of Classics and Provost, Georgetown University)

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

Moderator **Okerson** reminded attendees of the **Gary Tananbaum-led 2006 Charleston Conference** session, commented "libraries cannot deliver Web 2.0 content with 1.0 mindset." Are libraries (librarians) foxes or hedgehogs (from 2006 theme)? Penguins (from movie, "*Walk of the Penguins*") is a metaphor for library users. **Covert-Vail** highlighted findings of the "NYU 21st Century Library Project... Report of a Study of Faculty and Graduate Student Needs for Research and Teaching," released January 2007 (<http://library.nyu.edu/about/KPLReport.pdf>). A few points — "It's not just me, but me and my computer." The library is a neutral space (to establish cohorts, collaborate, have inter-disciplinary meetings) and users have high expectations. From project's "*Ideas and Inspiration Book*:" theme-based spaces ("Thought Centers") that can be temporarily set up for specific groups. **Marcus** described **University of Minnesota's** study, "Understanding Research Behaviors, Information Resource and Service Needs of Scientists," *September 2006-June 2007* (<http://www.lib.umn.edu/site/about.phtml>). Highlights: Methods learned in "traditional" contexts are not easily transferred to digital. "Primitives" (core behaviors): discovery, gathering, creation, sharing cycle. Challenges/needs: keep current; interdisciplinary and collaborative research; different vocabularies; decisions on where to publish, identifying collaborators; maintain credibility in core field, "know enough." Library selectors' role: 1) identify what's best; 2) determine critical mass. **Professor O'Donnell**: none of us are where we want to be. There needs to be: 1) More progression towards collaboration — is the technology robust enough? 2) Cumulation and refinement (in peer review, scholarly publishing) — authors don't want public criticism, but opportunity from a wider community of friends — to produce, gather, cumulate, refine research and findings. 3) Ways to grapple with the new: how do you footnote **YouTube**? **Google** is providing access, but not on the intellectual front. **Pedagogy** is a powerful place for reform (librarians can dance with instructors?). **O'Donnell** is optimistic. Somewhere at the end of a long march (walk), there will be "happy feet" (another penguin movie's title).

Lively Lunches — Friday, November 9th, 2007

How Wikipedia Really Works — Presented by **David Goodman** (previously Bibliographer and Research Librarian, Princeton University; now Administrator at Wikipedia)

Reported by: **Alana Lewis** (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina)

Goodman presented his first **Wikipedia** session of the day to a standing room only crowd. He presented the group with the background of **Wikipedia**, and proceeded to show us the inner workings of the site. The length of the lunch session provided a lot of time for discussion about the site. While some in the room seemed vehemently opposed to **Wikipedia** as a resource, **Goodman** encouraged the audience to sign on and identify ourselves as librarians in order to improve the page and help guide users to the information they need. He closed by stating it is not a replacement for scholarship and libraries, but a filter on the Internet. For more information, visit his **Wikipedia** user site where he has a special page for librarians who want to use **Wikipedia**: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/User:DGG>.

continued on page 68

The Human Factor?: Why Use a Consultant in Collection Assessment? — Presented by **Thomas W. Leonhardt** (Director, St. Edwards University Library), **Jack G. Montgomery** (Coordinator, Collection Services, Western Kentucky University Libraries)

Reported by: **Elizabeth Ann Blake** (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina)

Leonhardt and **Montgomery** discussed the advantages of using consultants to perform collection assessment and evaluation in academic libraries. According to **Montgomery**, there is a dearth current of literature on this topic in library and information science publications, so an in-depth discussion of consultants' role in collection development and acquisitions is well warranted. Both speakers discussed which qualities to look for when hiring consultants and emphasized that bringing a "neutral party" into the processes of acquisitions collection development can often help libraries in securing funding and can ultimately help the library live up to its mission in the best possible way. Both men stressed that administrators are often much more receptive to consultants' ideas, which often helps to fuel funding for acquisitions and collection development. Potential hires for consulting work should have a broad base of experience (preferably an "academic librarian generalist with a book collector's mentality), ask many questions and insist upon conducting interviews and sending surveys throughout the campus, plan to closely analyze the institution's and the library's mission, budget, and practices, and politics.

Weeding a Periodical Collection — Presented by **Tinker Massey** (Serials Librarian, Embry Riddle Aeronautical University)

Reported by: **Allison Read** (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina)

For a conference centered on 2.0, there were many attendees eager to learn about weeding a periodical collection in **Massey's Lively Lunch session**. It just goes to show that there is still a lot of paper in libraries! **Massey** explained in her presentation that libraries weed for space, preservation/conservation, and usage change. Schools change curriculum, periodicals are changed or discontinued, or the library chooses to go electronic. The library should assess its periodical collection. What is the condition of the periodicals? Is the library happy with the boxes or binders used for storage? Maybe the collection needs shifting, because of either growth or reduction. A library could acquire the title electronically or in microfilm and decide to discard the print version. The most important point **Massey** made was that each library should have a clear procedure for weeding its periodical collection. A brief discussion demonstrated that many libraries do not have such a procedure. Many of the same principles for weeding a monograph collection are present in weeding periodicals, such as a review of titles, holdings, formats, and changes in the school curricula, so both should be treated similarly. Finally, **Massey** told us to "Be Happy!" There is no point in despising such a necessary and inevitable task.

Consortial Conundrums: Purchasing E-Journals by Consortia — Presented by **Ann Okerson**, Moderator (Associate University Librarian, Collections and International Programs, Yale University), **Tim Bucknall** (Assistant Director, Jackson Library, UNC Greensboro), **Rick Burke** (Executive Director, Statewide California Electronic Library Consortium (SCELC), **John Cox** (Managing Director, John Cox Associates Ltd.), **Jeff Downing** (Associate Director & Manager of Electronic Information Resources, Amigos Library Services)

Reported by: **Heather S. Miller** (SUNY Albany)
<HMiller@uamail.albany.edu>

This panel carried forward into the consortial arena a discussion from the 2006 **Charleston Conference** on subscription agents' roles in the supply of electronic journals. Representatives of several consortia explained their differing approaches to purchasing e-journals for their members. **Downing** stated that agents cost more and create work for the consortium, but **AMIGOS** will do as the member library wishes. **Burke** recognized that libraries want to use agents for uniformity of processing, loading electronic invoices, transferring titles, maintenance of payment history and fund accounting. Shared list consolidation is an important agent role. Publishers do this poorly. Agents have better technology than publishers. **Burke** said that agents should redirect resources to servicing consortia. **Bucknall** noted that he likes to experiment and does work with agents, in some cases letting the agent actually negotiate deals. **Cox** noted that consortia have transformed the supply chain. Online publishing is a service business, fundamentally different from print. The functionality of the product is critical and pricing is fluid. The supplier must focus on performance, compatibility, customer service and technical support. He stated that traditional subscription agents have found this difficult to absorb and new intermediaries may be better suited to the task, but there is no single answer. **Okerson** pointed out that trying to figure out how to make subscription agents' services fit the e-world is a serious challenge that needs more discussion. It seems clear that issues remain and that subscription agents need to refine their offerings to consortia and to sell themselves.

Publisher Consolidation: Where Does It Leave Us? — Presented by **Janet Fisher**, Moderator (Senior Publishing Consultant, Publishers Communication Group, Inc.), **Diane Scott-Lichter** (Senior Director Publications, The Endocrine Society), **Margaret Landesman** (Head, Collection Development, University of Utah Libraries)

Reported by: **Clara B. Potter** (Camden-Carroll Library, Morehead State University) <c.potter@morehead-st.edu>

Fisher moderated a discussion between **Scott-Lichter**, representing a society publisher and **Landesman**, representing an academic library, before an audience nearly evenly split between librarians and publishers.

Scott-Lichter talked about challenges faced by small publishers and why they might be vulnerable to being consumed by large commercial publishers, just to remain viable. She spoke of limited staff with limited expertise, shrinking industry support, and consumer budgets not keeping pace with inflation. However, she emphasized that many small publishers such as **The Endocrine Society** where she works, are mission-driven, and the profit motive of commercial publishing does not mesh with their purpose of autonomous self-publishing.

Landesman spoke from the academic library perspective, that while libraries want to support small publishers, cancellations are usage driven, and interdisciplinary studies are now "trumping" the traditional discipline-oriented campus environment. Most small publishers represent a narrow discipline and are not heavily used. There is also a lot of competition on campus to support new needs and journals are often cut back as support for older programs.

Audience members and the panelists discussed possibilities of new business models for small publishers, including pay-per-view and linking to Institutional Repositories. **Diane** expressed her view that the subscription model as we know it won't survive.

Achieving Positive Outcomes Using the Librarian-Faculty Liaison Collection Development Model: Advantages and Challenges in Pursuing Research Level Status in Education — Presented by **Terrie Sypolt** (Reference Librarian, University of Central Florida), **Michael A. Arthur** (Head of Acquisitions & Collection Services, University of Central Florida)

Reported by: **Amanda DiFeterici** (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina)

continued on page 69

And They Were There
from page 68

This session outlined the benefits and consequences of using the librarian-faculty liaison

model at the **University of Central Florida Libraries**. As reference librarians take on extra duties in collection development, they are exposed to the curriculum of their program and foster relationships with faculty that can lead to increased library instruction and inclusion in planning and decision making. This task can be difficult when librarians are not allowed to devote time to CD away from reference responsibilities. Questions raised during this session addressed how to split time between collection development and other activities, how to communicate more effectively with faculty, and how to evaluate the work of faculty liaisons who work in CD but report to the Head of Reference.

Copyright 2.0: How Do We Manage Content When the User is in Control? — Presented by **Edward Colleran**, Moderator (Senior

Director, Rightsholder Relations, Copyright Clearance Center), **David Hoole** (Head of Brand Marketing and Content Licensing, Nature Publishing Group), **Cindi Trainor** (Coordinator, Research & Instructional Services Division, Eastern Kentucky University Libraries), **John McDonald** (Assistant Director for User Services and Technical Innovation, Libraries of Claremont College)

Reported by: **Mildred L. Jackson, Ph.D.** (The University of Alabama Libraries, Tuscaloosa, AL) <mljackson@ua.edu>

The issues surrounding copyright and libraries are even more complex with the plethora of social networking tools that have emerged. Not only must we be aware of copyright for traditional uses such as reserve and e-reserve, we must be aware of rights and privileges on sites like **Facebook**, **YouTube** and other popular social networking sites. These sites carry licenses, just like all of our other electronic resources, some with far more egregious conditions than those of journal publishers. This *Lively Lunch* explored these topics and more. What are the intellectual property rights policies on your campus? Do you own your work or does your university? How can we anticipate what our users are going to do? How do we develop tools to assist them and to let them know what their rights and privileges are with various resources? These are questions we need to answer about a variety of resources for our users and for our libraries.

Selectors Talking With Selectors — Presented by **Renee Bush** (Head, Collection Management Services Health Science Library, University at Buffalo), **Barbara Schader** (Assistant University Librarian, Collections & Scholarly Communication, Rivera Library, University of California, Riverside)

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

Drawing a relatively small but interested audience, the session began with moderator **Schader** sharing her experiences as a new administrator who, using “humor and chocolate” has begun implementing some changes in the hopes of improving team communication and make collection working groups more effective at her institution. Moderator **Bush** shared results of a survey she conducted about selector communication and experiences from convening a selectors’ summit (attended by 40 persons) at her institution. In reality the session title proved to be the “tip of the iceberg.” Attendees and moderators moved beyond “talking” among selectors, to communication and understanding needed across various departments, teams, and job responsibilities. In today’s team environments, different players are involved in selection and all that surrounds it. Each institution has its own “spin” on positions and committees that are involved in selection — liaisons, bibliographers, subject specialists, collection development networks, collection coordinators’ councils, task forces. Strategic planning (one participant mentioned “preferred futuring”), collection development policies, meeting agenda and minute sharing, consultative vs more closed personality styles, fun

events (for staff and faculty), open forums, matters of efficiencies and budget were also discussed. (Notes from the session discussions and other documents are posted on the conference site).

Concurrent Sessions — Friday, November 9th, 2007

Best Practices: Improving Librarian Administration Interfaces

— Presented by **Chris Beckett** (Vice President, Sales & Marketing, Atypion Systems, Inc.), **Theodore Fons** (Innovative Interfaces, Inc.), **Claire Ginn Winthrop** (Director, Library Services, Ingenta), **Dan Tonkery** (Vice President, Director, Business Development, EBSCO Information Services)

Reported by: **Amanda DiFeterici** (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina)

Publishers are now organizing libraries, with the rise in electronic content and the large number of different user interfaces. Librarians have little control over how their information is organized and presented; the panelists in this session discussed ways to reduce the learning curve for new or multiple interfaces as well as ways to streamline the process for subscribing to e-journals and databases. **Fons** introduced attendees to **Encore**, a system that integrates articles, images, and books into one portal that is currently being used by **Michigan State University** libraries. **Winthrop** promotes the standardization of a single institutional identifier number will allow libraries to “brand” themselves in aggregator databases so that users will know who paid for the information they access. To **Tonkery**, improvements to the process of acquiring access to e-journals, can take months under the current model. Using electronic subscriptions and XML feeds can speed the process and synchronize the systems of all parties involved.

Scholars Portal: The Canadian Experience — Presented by

Karen Marshall (Director, Library Technical Services, University of Western Ontario)

Reported by: **Sharon Dyas-Correia** (University of Toronto) <s.dyas.correia@utoronto.ca>

Marshall succinctly described the **OCUL** consortium of university libraries in Ontario, Canada. The consortium has created an exceptional shared **Scholars Portal** infrastructure that supports locally loaded and archived products. In addition to access to electronic collections purchased collectively, services are provided that enable institutions to use one single point of access to search across their databases and e-journal collections. A Web-based citation management product, an interlibrary loan/document delivery system and a SFX link resolver are also available. Other projects and services include an authentication tool, an electronic resource management system, an institutional repository, and an archive of government documents and materials for a data liberation initiative.

OCUL Scholars Portal is different from many other consortiums because participants control their destiny. The consortium has a serious commitment to archiving and a single search engine to search all resources. Services are supported and managed locally and participants have access to high quality IT regardless of school size and local staff. The consortium has a great negotiator and participants can pick and choose which products or projects to participate in. Users benefit because there is very little downtime for access or services. A major challenge for **Scholars Portal** is to find software capable of functioning for the volume of use. More information is available at www.scholarsportal.info. 🐼

*That’s all the conference reports we have room for in this issue, but we do have more reports from the 2007 Charleston Conference. Watch for them in upcoming issues of **Against the Grain**. You may also visit the **Charleston Conference Website** at www.katina.info/conference for additional details.*