December 2007

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. (2007) "And They Were There -- Reports of Meetings -- 27th Annual Charleston Conference," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 19: Iss. 6, Article 24.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.5337>

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.

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. Check for more reports 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**

Preconferences — Wednesday, November 7th, 2007

Navigating the eBook Landscape (Part 1) — Presented by **Audrey Powers** (Librarian/Research Services & Collections, University of South Florida), **Linda Gagnon** (Sr. Vice President of eContent Integration & Business, Yankee Book Publishing), **Jay Henry** (Manager of Online Products & Director of Business Development, Blackwell / ECHO), **James Gray** (CEO & President of Ingram Digital Group, MyiLibrary), **Danny Overstreet** (Library Services Consultant, Southeast Region, NetLibrary), **Kari Paulson** (President, EBL, Ebook Library, EBL)

Reported by: **J. Michael Lindsay** (Biomedical Library, University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL) <jmlindsay@bbl.usouthal.edu>

Given the multitude of pricing models, access models, and sources for electronic books, there are many variables that librarians must consider in selecting these resources. The morning session of this pre-conference focused on providing fact based comparisons and demonstrations from a variety of vendors of electronic books. New trends discussed included

From the University Presses from page 52

ments on the report's detailed recommendations, I don't hold out great hope for much progress to ensue from this initiative. (There are so far on the wiki site accompanying the report just two pro forma comments, which doesn't augur well for a true engagement of many other parties in this effort.)

There has got to be a better way to move forward in a truly collaborative way. I keep thinking myself of how fruitful the two meetings co-sponsored in the late 1990s by the **ACLS**, **ARL**, and **AAUP** were in promoting discussion of the future of scholarly communication: “**The Specialized Scholarly Monograph in Crisis, Or How Can I Get Tenure If You Won't Publish My Book**” (September 11-12, 1997) and “**New Challenges for Scholarly Communication in the Digital Era: Changing Roles and Expectations in the Academic Community**” (March 26-27, 1999). The latter conference was also co-sponsored by the other **AAUP (University Professors)** and **CNI** as well. The effort was made in planning both these events to ensure that librarians alone, or publishers alone, or administrators alone were not setting the agenda with the faculty as silent partner on the sidelines. All of these groups were well represented at these meetings. We need to revive that approach if we are to have any chance of forging a consensus that will enable the academic community to make real progress in meeting the challenges that lie ahead. 🌱

perpetual access models. While these allow libraries to avoid annual subscriptions to books, there is generally a maintenance fee involved. File format is another important issue; some eBooks require reader programs to function correctly. Other important considerations include the inclusion of **MARC** records for electronic books and restrictions on use of content: can users copy and paste content or download it? User access can vary from username/password access, to access limited by number of simultaneous users to full **IP** authentication. After providing a basic map of the current eBook terrain, this session provided a glimpse into the future. eBooks of the future can provide not only text and images, but audio and video content, with interactive capabilities. Print on demand features will allow users to request books be printed when needed. Controversially, collection development in the future will be pushed down to the user level; allowing library users to select materials as needed.

Serials Resource Management — Presented by **Buzzy Basch** (President, Basch Subscriptions)

Reported by: **J. Michael Lindsay** (Biomedical Library, University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL) <jmlindsay@bbl.usouthal.edu>

Managing serials in the modern environment is complicated by numerous factors. This afternoon session focused on describing this environment from many perspectives, and detailing approaches for managing serials in an environment of constant change. A problem that libraries face is demand from users for non-owned journals. One library uses a rapid **ILL** service to deliver needed articles with a 24 hour turnaround time. Consolidation and price increases in the publishing industry have prompted libraries to form consortia, helping to control prices for members. One presenter put the number of large publishers at 2,000, while smaller society and independent publishers number from between 30,000 to 50,000. A subscription agent representative detailed his point of view that consortia focus not on judging quality resources, but on controlling prices. Further, the use of consortia has had a massive effect on use, making journals available that might not have been noticed under other arrangements. Another speaker detailed how free and open access journals can be a great asset, but are often not listed in library journal lists, and many of the best are not even listed in major indexes, such as the *Directory of Open Access Journals*. Consortia level use analysis was another important technique detailed in this session.

Navigating the eBook Landscape (Part 2) — Presented by **Audrey Powers** (Librarian/Research Services & Collections, University of South Florida), Referex: **Eugene Quigley** (Elsevier, Regional Sales Director), Safari Tech Books: **Todd Fegan** (ProQuest, Vice President of Publishing), SpringerLink: **Cynthia Cleto** (Global Manager for eBooks), Credo Reference: **Jeffrey LaPlante** (Senior Vice President and Co-Founder), Knovel: **Sasha Gurke** (Sr. Vice President and Co-Founder)

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

“Navigating the landscape” was a fitting description for the afternoon

continued on page 54

And They Were There from page 53

“race” through (part of) the current eBook marketplace. Organizer **Powers** rightly “crystal balled” the popularity of this preconference (and this topic) at the 2007 **Charleston Conference**. In a neutral, non-competitive way, but in great detail, presenters described their companies’ products, business models, enhancement plans. Presenters included a product co-founder and a founder. Licensing/acquisition choices differ: suite, pick & choose, assigned points per title, purchase, subscribe, acquire: directly, through book agents or third parties. Subject niches vary: **STM**, business, engineering, reference works. Portals, gateways, aggregators, technical requirements (or not), **MARC** record availability, oh my! Points of pride — examples: **Springer (STM)**: currently the most eBooks. **Credo Reference**: licensed by news media organizations for fact-checking. **Knovel**: 50 publishing partners with content to “Knovelize.” Q&A snippets: eBooks can drive print sales. Online textbooks “cannibalize” the print. DRM (digital rights management) is a concern to publishers. Different aggregators may have different rights. One third-party eBook provider: there is a need for consistency across books’ publishers regarding: “fair use.” One of the presenters: eBooks are in a “moving swirl.” Listeners might have wished for a handy grid to compare & contrast the products — content, features, functions, content, etc..., but that would become dated quickly.

Plenary Sessions — Thursday, November 8th, 2007

Scholarly Literature as an Object of Computation: Implications for Libraries, Publishers, Authors — Presented by **Clifford Lynch** (Executive Director, Coalition for Networked Information)

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

Lynch stated that as scholarly literature becomes digital, it will be used differently, with scholars building up their own “libraries” and “computing on the literature” as opposed to computing on metadata. Because our journal licenses prohibit this, there are serious legal and licensing issues to overcome. Some questions: Where should the corpus be housed and how is it mined? Realistically, this will be done locally. Open access removes many of the difficult legal issues for which there is little applicable case law. The nature of the literature will change when people structure it with computation in mind. Discipline specific mark-ups will be needed in order to facilitate computation by unambiguously identifying names and objects. In answer to a question, **Lynch** said that libraries need to be aware that this is happening, talk with faculty and students, have discussions regarding licenses, recognize that computation is likely when special collections are digitized and keep it in mind when designing and constructing new electronic resources.

Thoughts on Unweaving the Web — Presented by **Deborah E. Wiley** (Senior Vice President, Corporate Communications, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.)

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

Wiley suggested that scenario planning, which has proven useful for the company, might be used by libraries. It attempts to explore all possible futures. In **Wiley’s** case, in 1994 two axes were used, the speed of

development of technology and the degree of intermediation by publishers, resulting in four scenarios. Plans were developed for all. The reality was more blended, but the company was prepared. **Wiley** pointed out that the company is changing from product-centric to customer-centric, reflecting some of the changes also affecting libraries. While one cannot chart the future, one can prepare and with luck survive it.

I Hear The Train A Coming — LIVE — Presented by **Greg Tananbaum** (Consultant), **James Mullins** (Dean of Libraries, Purdue University), **Ian Russell** (Chief Executive, Association of Learned & Professional Society Publishers)

Reported by: **Jonathan H. Harwell** (Zach S. Henderson Library, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA)
<jharwell@georgiasouthern.edu>

Tananbaum, consultant and writer of the *Against the Grain* column by the same title, recently led a roundtable discussion among a group of professionals, regarding transformative issues in scholarly communication to emerge in the near future. Their responses to the idea of “the single biggest game changer” on the horizon included the development of sustainable business models which balance revenue, accessibility, and delivery; the continuing rise of social networks; and the emergence of China and other regions as producers/consumers of content. A common response on “the most over-discussed scholarly communication issue” was “open access.” Traditional scholarly publishing still matters, and is tied to the issue of efficient acquisition of information; but, says **Tananbaum**, “traditional” is not equal to “static.” When asked to describe the future of scholarly communication in one word, three responded with “dynamic.”

Russell, asserted that the emerging “game changers” include informal scholarly communication (**Web 2.0**, etc.); integration of data into the primary literature; preservation/curation of digital material; governmental intervention (likely via unfunded mandates); and continuing and increasing need for sources of authority. Regarding the biggest game changer, China’s growing economy, its funding of research and development (but not journal subscriptions), and its investment in infrastructure are building into a scientific revolution; cf. <http://www.jcb.org/cgi/reprint/176/4/376> China’s salaries are improving; the new non-Confucian way of teaching encourages discussion; university enrollment (now over 20 million) is increasing rapidly, with the best students going into science/technology fields; English is now required in Chinese high schools (as of 2005, 110 million Chinese were learning English, whereas 50,000 Americans were learning Chinese). “The train’s a-coming,” says **Russell**, “and it’s a Chinese train.”

Mullins, sees this research problem as involving three formats: the data, the book, and the journal. Also related are three functions: sowing, harvesting, and storing. The harvesting of information has evolved from being labor intensive, to mechanized, to modernized — which is more effective and requires less labor. Storage of information has also changed, from an individual and local effort to a shared and efficient process. The book has gone from single manuscripts to shared print collections, then to mass production. Storage continues to evolve, with inventions such as the \$20,000 **Espresso Book Machine** produced by **On Demand Books**; cf. <http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA6469274.html> and the shared digital repository. NSF initiatives include **Christopher Greer’s** conceptual diagram of the **I-Center**, with 6 components: archival sciences, computer science, computational & information sciences, cyber infrastructure, domain science, and library/information sciences; the book *Long-Lived Digital Data Collections* <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2005/nsb0540/>; **NanoHUB** (Purdue’s nanotech portal); and an RFP on sustainable digital data preservation and access network partners (<http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/2007/nsf07601/nsf07601.htm>).

Mullins pointed out that librarians have an opportunity to become more central. At his institution, the science/technology faculty once saw librarians as “good for paying the database bills.” Since he talked with them about the librarians’ role in organizing information, 20 librarians are now collaborating with faculty on organizing data for grants. The faculty now say, “We need more librarians!”

continued on page 55

Expand Your Library Beyond the Bookshelves

The R2 Library offers a unique business model for digital content enabling you to select and purchase only the resources you need through a topic-based, navigable, highly searchable database. Build your digital collections one resource at a time, as you want it when you want it!

Visit www.r2library.com today to learn more about the R2 Library and to sign up for a FREE 30- day trial.

A world of health sciences information at your fingertips

511 Feheley Drive King of Prussia, PA 19406
www.rittenhouse.com 800.345.6425

And They Were There from page 54

The Future of Electronic Publishing — A View from the Top

— Presented by **Rolf Janke** (Moderator, Vice President and Publisher, SAGE Publications), **Blaise Simqu** (CEO and President, SAGE Publications), **Stephen Rhind-Tutt** (President, Alexander Street Press), **John Barnes** (Senior VP, Strategic Business Development, Gale), **Laura Brown** (Former President, Oxford University Press)

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

Moderator **Janke's** observation was that the four publisher executives, seated onstage in pseudo-boardroom chairs, had over 100 years of collective experience. **OA, Google...** What scares them? What are some threats? Opportunities? **Barnes:** the users' view is the strategic theme. Actionable things: 1) Migration (a wave that began with serials, now large monographs) — move, get to users; 2) "Attention economy" — discoverability; 3) We've got them, now what do we do with them? Bring out the new wave of products. It's in our own interest to reintroduce users to libraries. **Brown,** "the university is the center of the ecosystem". Old content made new (books, journals—twin pillars different directions), new content (short aggregated linked to data sets), many players. **Rhind-Tutt** posed questions to gauge optimism. His environment? **Darwinian.** If he's to survive, he's got to avoid the big guys. Have content and improve it. **Simqu's** three guiding principles: 1) Be a good steward for **SAGE**; 2) Higher education is a growth industry; 3) **SAGE** is not (only) a publisher of books and journals, even digital — its true role: create excellent, relevant content. The librarian's role? Educator, resource for students, creator of an environment where learn-

ing is possible. His hero? **Valparaiso University's Rick AmRhein** (**C. Conkey, WSJ**, 10/21/06: "Books beckon but stacks of books aren't part of the pitch") who thinks of libraries as social centers.

Lively Lunches — Thursday, November 8th, 2007

Building a Liaisons' Portal — Presented by **Faye Christenberry** (English Studies Librarian, University of Washington), **Anne Davis** (Collection Development Coordinator & Anthropology Librarian, University of Washington)

Reported by: **Jonathan H. Harwell** (Zach S. Henderson Library, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA)
 <jharwell@georgiasouthern.edu>

Using the open-source software **Plone**, a Web-based content management software which includes calendar and RSS functions, the **University of Washington Libraries** (21 within the system) created a portal (StaffWeb: <https://staffweb.lib.washington.edu/>) for their subject librarians. Its purposes include use in training, as well as improving communication among **Collection Management Services, Monographic Services, Serials Services**, and subject librarians.

Challenges have included motivating other staff to create and update content; out-of-date policies and procedures; and consistent terminology for the portal, as the subject librarians are also called selectors or liaisons. Among the benefits are having a central location for all information needed by the subject librarians (policies/procedures, contacts, competencies, training events, news, timely projects, etc.); a secure tool for communication among librarians; recognition of the need for new policies; opportunities to involve individuals who normally don't have a chance to provide input into training; and the ability to download events into calendar (for training workshops, spending deadlines, etc.) and RSS

continued on page 56

And They Were There from page 55

feeds. Other helpful uses are a folder of recommended readings, as well as a folder for project news, such as serials cancellation reviews.

eBook Business Models: Which One is for Me? — Presented by **Andrew Albanese** (Moderator, Editor, Library Journal Academic Newswire), **Jon Clayborne** (Senior Product Sales Manager, A&G Americas, Science & Technology Books Online, Elsevier), **Richard Bennett** (Director Licensing, Americas, Springer), **Suzanne Kemperman** (Director of Publisher Relations, NetLibrary), **Chris Warnock** (ebrary)

Reported by: **Robin Champieux** (Blackwell Book Services)
<robin.champieux@blackwell.com>

The session was dedicated to discussing and comparing the various eBook business models now offered by aggregators and publishers. Interesting exchanges addressed the market expectations and rights management factors influencing models and business decisions, future initiatives and expectations, and provoking questions and statements about the nature of eBooks.

Following a brief overview of the participating aggregators and publishers' eBook model histories over the last seven years, the group discussed and compared owning versus licensing-based models. **Chris Warnock** of ebrary put forward an interesting argument that current ownership models do not adequately speak to the pair and conflicting realities of shrinking library budgets and the need to provide increasing larger masses of information material. Melded subscription and ownership models, **Warnock** argues, allow libraries to use the former to make better decisions about the latter.

Comments and discussion surrounding the nature of eBooks and the future of eBook models included several themes, including **Digital Rights Management** trends, scalability and revenue, and changing definitions of content. **Bennett** commented that one of the questions that we need to ask is "How do you make an eBook more than a book?" and that the resulting challenges relate to "findability" and developing the systems and metadata that point people to content.

The 7th Annual Health Sciences Lively Lunch: Issues and Trends in Society and Scholarly Publishing — Presented by **Elizabeth Lorbeer** (Moderator, Associate Director for Content Management, Univ. of Alabama at Birmingham), **Meg White** (Moderator, Executive Director of Technology Services, Rittenhouse Book Distributors), **Tom Richardson** (Director of Institution Sales and Services, New England Journal of Medicine), **Bruce Polsky** (Chief Executive Officer, AAN Press), **Kathey Alexander** (Consultant in Professional and Scholarly Publishing), **Lisa Dittrich** (Director of Publications, American Society of Bone and Mineral Research)

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

Moderators **Lorbeer** and **White** greeted approximately 40 attendees — publishers, vendors and librarians. **Ramune Kubilius** (Northwestern University) highlighted her lively lunch annual handout (posted to conference server), reviewing previous year's health sciences publishing industry news. Panelists addressed moderators' questions regarding: 1) **Am. Assoc. of Publishers' PRISM** (<http://www.prismcoalition.org/index.htm>) and **OA**; 2) Society publishers' archiving responsibilities; 3) Some commercial publishers' business model shift to free journal content with paid ads; 4) Crystal ball: society publishing in 10 years?; 5) Wishes for society publishing changes; what librarians should know. One (size) perspective didn't fit all: three panelists work for biomedical societies, one consults for smaller societies. Highlights

— The **Government** funds research, but not the peer review process. Societies' members shape what is selected for publication, peer review (**Polsky**). Most (smaller health) societies seem to be uneducated in the publishing enterprise (**Alexander**). "I'm not a good student of other societies' publishing practices." (**Polsky**). Society publishers don't like to be told where to archive (**Richardson**). Publishers are responsible for archiving (**Dittrich, Alexander, Richardson**). Societies want safe secure files, besides with the publisher (**Polsky**). Advertisers don't see all society journals the same way (**Dittrich**). Society journals don't want to be perceived as totally ad driven (**Richardson**). Brands: important to societies; carefully pick publisher partners (**Alexander**). Online linking opportunities — videos, clinical decision features, electronic medical records (**Richardson**). Q&A discussion: "version" issues — "peer reviewed" vs "raw without corrections", society control, etc...

So We Bought Your Electronic Book, Now What Can We Do With It? — Presented by **Chuck Hamaker** (Assoc. University Librarian, Collections and Technical Services, UNC Charlotte), **Linda Beebe** (Senior Director, PsycINFO, American Psychological Association)

Reported by: **Caryl Ward** (Binghamton University Libraries)
<cward@binghamton.edu>

This well attended **Lively Lunch** provided librarians the opportunity to share their perspectives on what it takes to maintain and deliver eBooks. **Beebe** jumpstarted the session by asking librarians for their feedback on the recent PDF update *APA Style Guide to Electronic References*. Attendees pointed out that this format has created difficulties for libraries, especially those lacking a dedicated systems staff and those that have made it freely available to library users by posting it on a Website. This is a violation of the license agreement, but librarians argued that users have expectations that certain materials should be available to their laptops just as multiple copies used to be provided in labs. **APA** has just begun distributing this document and **Beebe** agreed that it was important to get information from users and librarians concerning the format, price, and delivery.

A spirited discussion followed about: Retention of electronic information; the need to deliver content to users while honoring license agreements; the process of negotiating and signing licenses; staffing needs for electronic purchases; and whether students and faculty are purchasing PDF material on their own.

Am I From the Stone Age if I Talk About Inventory?: Statistical Analysis of Inventory Data from a Medium Size Academic Library — Presented by **Jan S. Sung** (Assistant Professor, Eastern Illinois University), **Nackil Sung** (Head, Library Technology Services, Eastern Illinois University)

Reported by: **Jason Reed** (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina)

Inventory and statistics: two words that make most librarians break out into a cold sweat. **Jan** and **Nackil Sung** presented **Booth Library's** inventory program, which was developed locally (by **Nackil** himself) and used to enhance the access to materials to the public. The presenters showed how important keeping an accurate inventory to managing the stacks, keeping up with misplaced items, and materials without active circulating status.

Using statistical analysis, **Jan** then showed us the benefit of the project. Some interesting facts that were discovered were book size, the bigger the book, the longer it takes to inventory and the distance a book was misshelved. Benefits included cost-effectiveness and organization of the collection. This inventory project was successful and the session even persuaded some of the librarians in attendance to strongly consider an inventory program at their libraries. The concerns of the audience included time factors/constraints and labor costs but the data

continued on page 57

And They Were There from page 56

presented showed that inventory was a worthy cause. For first time presenters **Jan** and **Nackil** did a great job and hope they will be heard at future conferences.

Concurrent Sessions — Thursday, November 8th, 2007

Authoritative? What's That? And Who Says? — Presented by
Leigh Dodds (Chief Technology Officer, Ingenta),
Laura B. Cohen (Web Support Librarian, University at
Albany, SUNY)

Reported by: **Angela Kleinschmidt** (SLIS Student,
University of South Carolina)

The speakers discussed the wide spectrum of authority in published articles available today. **Dodds** spoke of the difference in the peer-reviewed and **Web 2.0** models of publishing — the main distinction being at what point in the process publication happens. He also discussed the need for scholars to market the peer-review process as a measure of authenticity. **Cohen** primarily spoke of social scholarship, or the use of networked social tools to publish and interact with scholarly output. Social scholarship implies scholarship as a more participatory venture, where scholars have an opportunity to do “soft peer review” by commenting or annotating an article.

The audience had questions about the idea of social scholarship, expressing concerns over who gets the credit for research developed collaboratively. Another attendee suggested that scholars have a reticence to comment and discuss articles online, and wondered whether this would change as the population gets more comfortable with the technology and the changes in the nature of the Web. The speakers felt that people would become more interested in social scholarship as they became more familiar with **Web 2.0**.

Is Against the Grain Finally Going Online? — Presented by
Cris Ferguson (Electronic Resources/Serials Librarian,
Furman University), **David Lyle** (Technical Consultant, Black-
baud), **Kristen DeVoe** (Electronic Resources Librarian, College
of Charleston Library), **John Cox** (Managing Director, John Cox
Associates Ltd), **Katina Strauch** (Head of Collection
Development, College of Charleston Library)

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

The informal session was attended by a small group of persons, mostly those in some way connected with the *Against the Grain*. Prior to the **Charleston Conference**, the core editorial group brainstormed and prepared a preliminary Website. The aims of the online **ATG** appear to be: to present a public online face of **ATG** (“use the brand to build a complementary but different presence”), which permits collaboration (with item tagging capabilities) and takes advantage of the opportunities to post fast-breaking and ever-changing news, such as an online (vetted) version of the popular column, “*Rumors*” written by **Katina Strauch**. Other features of the site might be: comments on articles (maybe based on the table of contents, with “thumbs up/thumbs down” notations for articles being commented), a job bank, ads (only if advertised in the print), library and publishing terminology, a copyright section, an “eBook” section (with chapters written by different authors). Session attendees spent a few moments suggesting titles for the entity (“*Against the Grain Real Time*” anyone?). Management issues still to be determined: how to provide some free content while permitting subscribers “value added” access (user name/password) and at the same time, incorporating some type of access for institutional subscribers.

WorldCat Collection Analysis: Evaluating the ILL Enhancements as a Resource to Guide Strategic Collection Decisions —
Presented by **Hilary M. Davis** (Collection Manager for Physical
Sciences, Engineering and Data Analysis, North Carolina State
University Libraries), **Annette P. Day** (Associate Head of Collec-
tion Management, North Carolina State University Libraries)

Reported by: **Jonathan H. Harwell** (Zach S. Henderson
Library, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA)
<jharwell@georgiasouthern.edu>

Davis and **Day** shared their research on the interlibrary loan enhancements in *WorldCat Collection Analysis*, and the usefulness of this data at NCSU. They analyzed 3.5 years of data, the maximum yet available in *WCA*. They found that their most-borrowed subject was health (over 20,000 transactions), followed by engineering and language/literature (~7500 each). Demand for specific subjects has been consistent from year to year. 95% of the health borrowing was for serials. The age (publication date) of all items borrowed was also analyzed; however, it should be noted that *WCA*'s data considers only the beginning date of publication for serials, not the date of the article borrowed.

Titles in the highest demand were *Spine* (122) and *Deviant Behavior* (116). Specific transaction data is not retrievable for books, as *WCA* gives only ranges (e.g., >10 times). Also, such title-level data is loaded annually in *WCA*, but monthly in *ILLiad*. While such local granularity is more visible in *ILLiad*, *WCA* gives the “big picture” quickly and easily (which is difficult in *ILLiad*).

Via this study, NCSU recognized the needs to build the health collection, to strengthen the serials collection, to add backfiles, and to focus upon building collections beyond items which are available within **TRLN (Triangle Research Libraries Network)**. Weaknesses in the data included “false gaps,” based upon the inconsistency of the subject categories provided by *WCA* (e.g., seven separate categories directly related to health/medicine). Also, some patrons bypass *ILL*, obtaining items via friends, research trips, or purchases. Other factors in interpreting the data include the historical context of the collection, e.g., understanding anomalies in the funding history; and the dynamics of the information landscape (older books are more apt to be out of print).

Possible enhancements identified during the session include making the *WCA* output more complex and flexible, as well as adding a title search feature for transaction-level data, which would be useful for reviewing new subscription requests.

The Rollercoaster Ride of Ebooks: What Have We Learned; Where Do We Go From Here? (Part 1) — Presented by
Elizabeth E. Kirk (Associate Librarian for Information Resources,
Dartmouth College), **Mildred L. Jackson** (Associate Dean
for Collections, University of Alabama), **Denise Koufogiannakis**
(Collections and Acquisitions Coordinator, University of Alberta,
Canada), **Tony Horava** (Collection and Information Resources
Coordinator, University of Ottawa, Canada)

Reported by: **Janet L. Flowers** (University Library, University
of North Carolina at Chapel Hill) <jflowers@email.unc.edu>

Koufogiannakis spoke from the perspective of a library that has over 400,000 eBooks cataloged and spend ca. \$1.6 million per year on eBooks. She described the four major ways that eBooks can be acquired: subscriptions, bulk, titles, and pay per view. She also addressed the three major sources from which to purchase eBooks: book suppliers, direct to publishers, and e-only suppliers, such as **ebrary**. She next moved into how to choose what to buy, describing four methods: title-by-title, whole packages, user based (deciding based upon usage data from trials or subscriptions.), or user driven (patron-initiated acquisitions).

Koufogiannakis then raised the important question of what are we

continued on page 58

And They Were There from page 57

getting when we buy eBooks: access and the ability to do something with the content. She noted that subscription is an efficient way to find out the level of interest in the material before buying. She advised the audience to talk more about eBooks among ourselves, tell vendors and publishers what we want and to streamline the processes related to eBooks acquisitions.

Kirk described their “consolidate and conquer” project for English-language materials. One goal was to normalize the acquisition of eBooks as part of this effort. In June 2007, **Dartmouth** sent an RFP to **Coutts**, **Blackwells**, and **YBP**. They found the following similarities among the three vendors: all can provide frontlists from publishers, all can allow an eBook preferred format through their database, and all give no discounts on individual eBook titles.

There were, however, significant differences in what she described as the rules of engagement with the eBooks market. These differences ranged from 100% brokered to a mixed model. **Kirk** defined the choices for **Dartmouth** as follows: known platform; cautious engagement with familiar platforms; and speeding train. They chose **Coutts** as their consolidated vendor.

Is Reference Dead? Is Collecting Dead? — Presented by **Stephen Rhind-Tutt** (President, Alexander Street Press)

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

Rhind-Tutt stated that reference has never been more alive. He feels that the true home for reference is electronic and that the Web is essentially a referential medium. Likewise, collecting is very much alive in that Websites are collections. However, boundary lines blur online and the more blurring that occurs, the more humans are needed to sort it out. He pointed to librarians’ strengths in indexing and organizing as critical to making Web-based reference most useful to researchers. He showed results of searches using both print and electronic reference sources, and his evaluative data backed his assertion that the two could co-exist. He feels that the subject-specificity of print sources often makes them superior to more general Internet sources, but he pointed to **Knovel** as a good model for discipline-specific Internet reference.

He believes that free Internet reference sites remove the burden of pedestrian questions from librarians and free them to address higher level tasks and richer, deeper questions. Sites like **Google** and **Wikipedia** cannot be beat in terms of price, size, usage, or currency, but can be beat in terms of authority and selection. **Rhind-Tutt** sees today’s reference climate as an opportunity for professionals to focus on where they really add value. His belief that all electronic products are reference led him to conclude that current conditions point to progress in, and not the death of, reference and collecting. His well-attended presentation was thoughtful, organized, and optimistic.

Slides of the presentation are available online at <http://www.astreetpress.com/articles/index.htm>.

Electronic Resources Management: The Future of Library Technical Services and other Ideas on How to Dismantle an Atomic Bomb — Presented by **Robert McDonald** (Director, Strategic Data Alliances, San Diego Supercomputer Center, UC San Diego), **Rachel Frick** (Senior Program Officer, National Leadership Grants, Institute of Museum and Library Services)

Reported by: **Rachel A. Erb** (Dr. C.C. and Mabel L. Criss Library, University of Nebraska — Omaha)
<rerb@mail.unomaha.edu>

An imminent sea-change in the organization of technical services was the overarching theme of this presentation. The presenters emphasized

that leaders must have the ability to manage and create an environment conducive to change. In general, many of us have witnessed the reorganization of technical services departments; the presenters also included a speculative organizational chart of the future. They glossed over the relevance, or perhaps lack thereof, of catalogers. As a former cataloger and as someone who cannot seem to escape the occasional gravitational pull of cataloging, I would have been really interested to hear to what extent they think cataloging will play a role in the library of the future. The presenters offered some compelling ideas, but audience participation would have enriched the session. Unfortunately, the constraints of time prevented possible meaningful exchanges.

eBooks and Cooperative Collection Development — Presented by **Julia Gammon** (Head, Acquisitions Dept. University Libraries & Interim Marketing Manager, University of Akron Press), **James Galbraith** (Head, Collection Development Dept, University of California Irvine), **Steve Forrest** (for scheduled speaker **Carolyn Morris**), (Coutts Information Services)

Reported by: **Caryl Ward** (Binghamton University Libraries)
<cward@binghamton.edu>

This session presented three scenarios for eBook purchasing and was filled to capacity. Librarians clearly want and need to know more about sharing eBooks. **Galbraith** first spoke about purchases at **UC Irvine** and collaboration within the UC system. A committee provides leadership on eBook guidelines and licensing. Changes were required in collection development policies and the acquisitions process, including new vendors and approval plans. **Jim** suggested that every eBook license should contain provisions for **ILL**, and **ILL** technology should be built into each eBook platform.

Gammon shared details on **OhioLINK**’s project to bring 25,000 eBooks to its 600,000 users. She explained that eBook purchasing in a consortium requires a different model than shared print books. Issues to be considered include archiving, printing, and simultaneous users.

Forrest provided the vendor perspective by outlining **Coutts**’ efforts to bring **My iLibrary** to users. One model includes the “rent a view” option at \$25 for a thirty day period. Consortiums will have an advantage in negotiating eBook contracts. **Steve** commented on the significant buying power of a group.

Mad, Bad and Dangerous to Know: How Technology and Competition Energized Publishers to Serve a New Generation of Users — Presented by **Simon Beale** (Senior Vice President, Global Sales, ProQuest)

Reported by: **Blair Hinson** (SLIS Student,
University of South Carolina)

Publishers like **ProQuest** need to do a better job of promoting the concept of value in their product even as they innovate and change. In the transition from print to electronic sources, many publishers assumed that “if you build it, they will come,” like single, proprietary platforms. Librarians want to access information from multiple platforms, so the idea that they would come to a single platform simply because it came from a trusted publisher was “mad.”

In the electronic age, users desire (and many librarians advocate) free, open-access information. But free doesn’t always mean better. Vetting remains a publisher’s key role. Publishers also need to do a better job of promoting the “value” of their products and their “brand” or seal of quality. Profit is not “bad,” in fact it can spur competition that creates better sources and better access to reliable information.

What is “dangerous to know” is that change is always with us. But does content radically change with publishers? It should remain constant. In this age of mergers and acquisitions, publishers have to work to assure providers (librarians) and users that while the publishers might change, content is still king.

continued on page 59

And They Were There from page 58

With more choices out there, the user is in the driver's seat, so the content and the key products users rely on must be kept continuous, up to date, and user-friendly. Librarians and publishers are going to have to work together to provide reliable, vetted information.

Are They Being Indexed? Tracking the Indexing and Abstracting of Open Access Journals — Presented by **Elaine Yontz** (Professor, Valdosta State University MLIS Program), **Jack Fisher** (Acquisitions Librarian, Valdosta State University)

Reported by: **Paul G. Haschak** (University of S. Alabama, Mobile, AL)
<PHaschak@usouthal.edu>

"The purposes of this project are to design a model for tracking the inclusion of open access journals in recognized indexing and abstracting services and to test the model."

The researchers used the *Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)*, a collection of "free, full text, quality controlled scientific and scholarly journals," to identify 78 journal titles under the subject "Library and Information Science." Eliminating former titles due to name changes, 76 titles were checked for inclusion in six indexing and abstracting services: **LibLit**, **LISA**, **LISTA**, **ISTA**, **T&I**, and **SocSCI**. **Ulrich's**, the home pages of the journals, and lists from the indexing/abstracting services were consulted to determine inclusion or exclusion.

40 journals (52.63%) were not indexed at all. Nine titles were included in one of the indexes; 14 titles were included in two of the indexes; four titles were included in three of the indexes; seven titles were included in four of the indexes; and two titles were included in five of the six indexes.

The researchers concluded that "this is a good model" and can be used for other subjects. They recognize that they will need to consult with a subject specialist to identify the important indexes of other fields.

Liaison Responsibilities in Collection Management — Presented by **Sarah Jeong** (Research & Instruction Librarian-Sciences, Wake Forest University), **Peggy Ridlen** (Assistant Professor and Reference/Instruction Librarian, Fontbonne University), **Elisabeth Leonard** (President, Library Solutions)

Reported by: **Jonathan H. Harwell** (Zach S. Henderson Library, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA)
<jharwell@georgiasouthern.edu>

The presenters shared the results of a national survey on library liaison responsibilities, with over 700 responses. 58% work in reference/research services, followed by 19% in collection development; however, individuals from throughout the departmental structure responded as liaisons. 67.4% are in public institutions; 49.5% have enrollments of at least 10,000 FTE. Based upon the previous **Carnegie** system, 47% are in doctoral/research I/II institutions. Chosen from a list, the most

360 Counter assessment tools make it easy to optimize the value of e-resources

- Compare results between different providers
- Generate customized reports
- Share report with stakeholders
- Make more informed acquisition decisions
- Optimize usage and value of your electronic collection
- Archive results for historical perspective

SERIALS SOLUTIONS™

360COUNTER

Helping your library make better decisions

360

Serials Solutions 360
E-Resource Access and
Management Services

SerialsSolutions®

1-866-737-4257
360@serialssolutions.com
www.serialssolutions.com/C2

© 2007 Serials Solutions. All rights reserved. Serials Solutions is a trademark of Serials Solutions.

common responsibility among these liaisons is to "identify user needs, evaluate existing collections, remove extraneous materials, and locate resources that will enhance collections" (94%). A few are responsible for "publishing in user group area (rather than librarianship)" (9%). Of those in reference/research, 89% deliver subject-specific instruction. The most common percentages of time devoted to liaison work are 11-20% (25% of responses) and 21-30% (27% of responses). 82% feel that administrators value their liaison activities; 5% disagree. 76% say the faculty value this work; 4.8% do not.

They also expressed a need for professional development, on topics such as engaging faculty in collection development; guidelines for liaison work in specific subjects; introductory liaison training; interdisciplinary liaisons; collection analysis and assessment; presenting budget limitations to liaisons; and communicating about serial cancellations. Needs for training and standards were identified. Survey results are available from **Elisabeth Leonard** at <elisabeth@elisabethleonard.com>.

continued on page 60

And They Were There from page 59

The following advice for liaisons was shared: make the first step; build the relationship; be open-minded in approach; utilize several avenues of communication; learn to handle requests and feedback; and take cues from peers. The presenters cited **Macaluso's** helpful article "The Library Liaison Toolkit" (*The Reference Librarian*; no. 89/90, 2005, pp. 163-177), following **Stahl** ("What I want in a librarian." *Reference & User Services Quarterly*; vol. 37, no. 2, 1997, pp. 133-135). They concluded that liaison work reinforces team building, open discussion, camaraderie, and life-long relationships, and that this work is vital for the library.

Various approaches were shared from the audience, including **Georgia Southern University** and **Boise State University**, where library liaisons communicate with non-academic entities across campus in addition to subject specialist activities.

The Rollercoaster Ride of eBooks: What have we Learned; Where Do we Go From Here? (Part 2) — Presented by

Elizabeth E. Kirk (Associate Librarian for Information Resources, Dartmouth College), **Mildred L. Jackson** (Associate Dean for Collections, University of Alabama), **Denise Koufogiannakis** (Collections and Acquisitions Coordinator, University of Alberta, Canada), **Tony Horava** (Collection and Information Resources Coordinator, University of Ottawa, Canada)

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

In this session two collection development librarians provided interesting ideas and thoughtful insights for incorporating eBooks into collection development and acquisitions workflows.

Jackson discussed using free resources as tools for collection development and indicated that after over a decade of scanning and digitizing, thousands of texts are available for free. **Jackson** indicated that the Web and especially **Google Book Search**, **Amazon**, and items available through the **Open Content Alliance** can be extremely useful for selection, item preview, mining for free content and full text, verifying information or citations, immediate fulfillment of requests, retrospective collection development, discovering other library holdings and building faculty author collections.

Horava discussed the quest for an eBook platform within the **OCUL** consortium of university libraries in Ontario, Canada. He discussed current challenges and the objective of finding a single retrieval and delivery platform for licensed and locally digitized eBooks. Requirements included support for loading, archiving, and searching of eBooks in a wide variety of formats, support for all major browsers, support for users with disabilities, local branding capability, ability to allow patrons to save their settings, and support to incorporate files and metadata into local systems. **Horava** described the **RFP** process and next steps including choosing a platform, implementation, integration with other tools, determining future services and evaluating impacts on book use.

The National eBooks Observatory Project: A National Experiment About the Impact of e-Books on Student Learning and Publishing Sales — Presented by

Lorraine Estelle (CEO, JISC Collections), **Hazel Woodward** (University Librarian, Cranfield University)

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

Estelle, the CEO of **JISC Collections** (a joint national consortium for all universities in the UK) and **Woodward** spoke about the National eBooks observatory project, a national experiment about the impact of eBooks on student learning and publishing sales. Ultimately, the vision

for eBooks in the UK educational system is that the eBooks will be easily discoverable and content can be fully integrated into educational environments, that the licensing and business models will support a diversity of needs, and that the educational community will have access to high quality eBook content that is highly relevant to learning, research, and teaching. According to the speakers, much has held UK educational systems from successfully integrating eBooks into their collections. Among the setbacks are ignorance of what eBooks are available, library staff and publishers not understanding one another's needs, available eBooks not being up-to-date or relevant to users, inappropriate pricing models, and too little choice of titles. **JISC's** role was (and is) to find attractive purchasing models, good buys for the sector, and buying appropriate resources for research and teaching (that could not be afforded, otherwise). The **JISC** study aims to license a collection of eBooks that will be relevant to courses being taught (like textbooks) so that they can be free to students for a period of two years, to evaluate the use of those materials, and to convey the knowledge gained through the study to the publishers, academic institutions involved in order to "stimulate an eBooks market that has appropriate business and licensing models."

Marketing Your Collection — Presented by **Karen Hawkins** (Director of Publication and Information Marketing, IEEE Publishing and Information), **Ruth Wolfish** (Client Services Manager, IEEE Publishing and Information), **Barbara DeFelice** (Director, Digital Resources, Dartmouth College)

Reported by: **Rebecca Kemp** (W.M. Randall Library, University of North Carolina Wilmington, Wilmington, NC)
<kempr@uncw.edu>

Wolfish suggested calling an e-resource orientation session "60 Minutes of Tips and Tricks," in order to let faculty and students know that there is a time limit on the session, and that they are attending to gain an edge on searching. **DeFelice** then described **Dartmouth College's** very successful e-resources fair, held January 10, 2007. The library's promotion included a winter-time theme.

Dartmouth College invited vendors to demonstrate their products and to donate raffle prizes. The library provided food and drinks, and participants visited each resource's table in order to be entered into the raffle. Finally, **Hawkins** of **IEEE** recommended best practices for library promotional materials, such as trying to get faculty support and endorsement, creative event designs that tie in aspects of popular

culture, and advertising events on **MySpace** and **Facebook**. The session was a good example of collaboration between libraries and vendors to promote the use of e-resources.

The "Google Effect" at JSTOR: Early Lessons Learned from Enhanced 'Discovery' via Search Engines — Presented by

Bruce Heterick (Director, Library Relations, JSTOR | ARTstor | Portico | Aluka)

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

JSTOR allowed **Google** to begin crawling their archive in early 2006, and began assigning user identification to discover how people were discovering articles in **JSTOR**. **Heterick** discussed a variety of consequences that developed as a result of this decision. Discovery of articles has increased, and significant new attention has been brought to journals in disciplines that were little used previously. Problems have arisen, including a high percentage of people using **Google** who don't have access to **JSTOR**; increased infrastructure costs due to more traffic; and a 500% increase in user inquiries from unaffiliated users. **JSTOR** is looking at possible solutions to some of these unexpected

continued on page 61

And They Were There from page 60

consequences, including the possibility of individual access to either an article or to the database for a certain period of time.

Global Utilization of RFID Technologies: The World Beyond the Library — Presented by **Corrie Marsh** (Associate Director, Hong Kong University of Science & Technology Library)

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

Marsh explained how **RFID** works to transmit data in real time, and she passed around a variety of **RFID** tags. She described library use of **RFID** including modern systems using robotic arms and **RFID** tags to retrieve and shelve materials from closed stacks. She asserted that a main objective for widespread adoption of **RFID** systems in libraries is to enhance global **ILL**. Most interesting, however, were examples of **RFID** use beyond the library in various applications worldwide such as transportation, manufacturing, and health care. She described contactless systems in Asian countries where “smart cards” are used almost ubiquitously to pay for goods and services. She gave examples of the four categories of **RFID** systems: electronic article surveillance (retail goods), portable data capture (airline baggage, postal systems), positioning systems (manufacturing, transportation logistics), and networked systems (animal tracking). A video clip showed Texan students using **RFID** tags to check in and off the school bus with data transmitted to a central office tracking their safe transport.

Different frequencies used in different parts of the world complicate global applications, and standards alignment is complex. New manufacturing techniques using plastic circuitry and conductive inks though, allow cheaper mass production of flat tags that can be easily integrated into products. **Marsh** predicted increasing use of **RFID** systems in libraries and other worldwide applications. Her presentation sparked the audience, many of whom stayed to ask more questions about this fascinating technology.

For more information about **RFID**, **Marsh** recommended <http://www.txcdk.org/rfid>.

Peer Review: Time for a Change or Stay the Course? — Presented by **Anthony Watkinson** (Moderator, Senior Lecturer, Centre for Publishing, University College London), **Ramune K. Kubilius** (Moderator, Collection Development/Special Projects Librarian, Galter Health Sciences Library, Northwestern University), **Irving E. Rockwood** (Editor & Publisher, CHOICE), **David Hoole** (Head of Brand Marketing and Content Licensing, Nature Publishing Group)

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

Watkinson introduced this panel session by noting changes brought to editors’ involvement with peer review by online manuscript submission and review systems. He also distinguished the “wisdom of crowds” from peer review, which, by definition, is done by one’s peers. He recommended **Irene Hames’** *Peer Review and Manuscript Management in Scientific Journals* as the definitive work on peer review.

Rockwood provided a history of peer review and discussed what peer review is and isn’t. Of interest were the times when peer review makes the news, as in the case of the **Woo Suk Hwang** cloning data debacle, but **Rockwood** noted that these are generally cases of fraud, not failures of peer review. Peer review is designed to detect problems with information that might undermine the conclusions of an article — not to determine whether an article’s claims are fraudulent.

Hoole then discussed the peer review debate on **Nature’s** Website and summarized **NPG’s** review process, pointing out that their experiment

with posting pre-prints online for open review comments yielded very few useful comments. Finally, discussion followed on the processes for selecting peer reviewers and preparing them for success.

Deep Indexing of Embedded Article Information — Presented by **Helle Lauridsen** (Technology Manager Europe, Proquest), **Anne Langley** (Coordinator of Public Services Assessment and Chemistry Librarian, Duke University)

Reported by: **Rholanda Thomas** (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina)

Langley explained the history of chemical indexing and provided some deep indexing resources for chemists. **Beilstein/Gmelin** and **Chemical Abstracts** were two of the resources she mentioned. Registry numbers, the three sets of numbers for compounds, began in **Chemical Abstracts**. Now easier to use due to digitization and availability via **Crossfire** software, **Beilstein/Gmelin** is now easier to use. She concluded with demonstrations of **Beilstein/Gmelin** software as well as **Chemical Abstracts**. **Lauridsen** discussed and demonstrated **CSA Illustrata**. **CSA** made a prototype database in 2005 of 325,000 objects. She discussed feedback from users and the future of the product.

An attendee asked if botanists could use **CSA Illustrata** and the response was yes. In fact, the natural sciences are covered but the dominant subject is Biology. “Partly human and partly machine” was the answer to the question of how much indexing in **Chemical Abstracts** was completed by humans or machines.

Getting Beyond the Data Gathering: An Automated Workflow for Usage Data Integration and Analyses for Collection Decision Making — Presented by **Tina Feick** (Vice President, Swets), **Patricia Brennan** (Product Development Manager, Thomson Scientific), **James Mouw** (Assistant Director for Technical and Electronic Services, University of Chicago)

Reported by: **Rebecca Kemp** (W.M. Randall Library, University of North Carolina Wilmington, Wilmington, NC)
<kempr@uncw.edu>

Mouw began by describing all of the different types of information that serials managers need to answer the questions “what do we get,” “how good is it,” “what do patrons use” and “where do patrons publish?” This information is drawn from various sources, including the integrated library system, **Thomson-ISI’s** products on the **Web of Knowledge** platform, and usage statistics from various vendors. **Feick** then described the **Scholarly Stats** service, which retrieves **COUNTER**-compliant usage statistics from different vendors and makes these statistics available to subscribing institutions. The **Standardized Usage Statistics Harvesting Initiative (SUSHI)** makes it possible to import these **COUNTER** statistics automatically from **Scholarly Stats** into electronic resource management modules. **Brennan** of **Thomson Scientific** then demonstrated the product **Journal Use Reports**, which reports journal impact factor, institutional publication activity, usage information, and other information specific to an individual journal title, all on one screen.

Would You Like Back Issues With That? Issues and Controversies in Archival E-Journal Access — Presented by **Rick Anderson** (Assoc. Dir. for Scholarly Resources and Collections, University of Utah), **Jenifer Holman** (Acquisitions Librarian, University of Wisconsin-La Crosse), **Beverly Geer** (Library/Consortia Sales Manager, SAGE Publications)

Reported by: **Allyson A. Zellner** (EBSCO Industries, Inc.)
<azellner@ebSCO.com>

Anderson, Holman and **Geer** hosted this well-attended discussion
continued on page 62

And They Were There
from page 61

on archival access models. **Anderson** observed that librarians desired persistent access to e-journal content to which they subscribed just as would be available with a print copy. However, in such a situation publishers would have to pay the maintenance for offering persistent access. Librarians offered to download and store the digital materials themselves but publishers disagreed. Now publishers are much like a library in that they hold the permanent archive on their end while libraries are asked to pay for perpetual access. **Anderson** agreed that libraries should be expected to pay a reasonable fee for this service as it isn't free for a publisher to maintain. But what is reasonable? He asserted that one need not concentrate on the amount of publishers' profit, a political issue, rather one should look at the cost/benefit analysis of what is best for the user and for scholarly communication. **Holman** offered the good, the bad, and the ugly examples of publishers' access models. She definitely prefers a growing model over a rolling one and said she is willing to pay for it. She noted reports offered by agents can be valuable in determining the type of access model to which one currently subscribes. **Portico** was also mentioned as "life insurance for electronic journals." Lastly, **Geer** gave some basic concepts about archives and then provided the publishers' standpoint. Publishers now must archive as they have a commitment to customers and it is now essential for new sales and business longevity. Most are not experts at this service so they do work with partners like **Portico**. Audience participation was valuable including a comment asking publishers to also include content like the **Editorial Board** information.

Gaming the Impact Factor — Presented by **Nawin Gupta** (Moderator, Journals Division Manager, University of Chicago Press), **Isabel Czech** (Director of Publisher Relations, Thomson Scientific), **Julia Gelfand** (Applied Sciences Librarian, University of California (Irvine)), **David Tempest** (Associate Director, Scientometrics & KM Research & Academic Relations, Elsevier Science)

Reported by: **Deborah McBride** (Journals Division, University of Chicago Press) <dmcbride@press.uchicago.edu>

The pressures of ever-tightening serials budgets and the need for scholars — especially junior faculty — to publish their work into prestigious outlets raise the stakes of rankings for everyone involved in scholarly journals publishing, leading some to abuse the system. The trend of gaming the rankings has recently spread into new areas. "**Gaming the Impact Factor**," a panel consisting of voices from the publishing, library, and ratings industries addressed recent abuses and proposed solutions.

The panel quickly focused on self-citation as the most pervasive form of abuse. Although the panel agreed that a rate of self-citation of twenty percent is acceptable, it is now creeping above the fifty or sixty percent range. Worse, authors are pressured by some houses to tweak their articles to raise their rankings, and mature journals are pressured to cite start-ups to boost the rookies' ratings.

While **Czech** elaborated on **Thomson's** ongoing efforts to eliminate the effect of gaming on their rankings, **Gelfand** advised librarians to use as many tools as available — from **JCR** to **Google Page Rank** to the **Bergstrom McAfee** model — to inform their acquisition strategy. Publishers in the audience argued that valuation over different formats is problematic.

Tempest showed that ethical means, such as releasing special issues on hot topics, could help publishers raise their impact factor. He dismissed the previously raised concern of publishers timing articles to release early in the year for more citations as a minor issue, as the practice increased the citations by no more than six percent.

The panelists and audience concluded that consistently strong content, backed by savvy, yet ethical, marketing, stood the best chance of staying on the shelves, while librarians were exhorted to consider a journal over time, rather than rely on the rating du jour.

The Serendipity of Online — Examining New Ways of Presenting Content and Services to Users — Presented by **Kevin Cohn** (Product Director, Atypon Systems, Inc.)

Reported by: **Michael N. Kaltwang** (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina)

Serendipity is the act of discovering something new that you didn't intend to find. It is one of the bedrock principles upon which bookstores and libraries are built. When a person walks into a library or bookstore with the intention to browse, they will go to a bookshelf or display rack and usually pick up a book that they never knew existed. That person has the option to browse through the book before deciding whether to get it or not. That person has the same ability to browse the Internet and discover new information.

Amazon and **Wikipedia** are two examples the speaker used to explain the potential of online medium for publishers and libraries. **Amazon** is the worldwide leader in employing technology to increase Internet sales. Their use of "Item-to-Item" collaborative filtering algorithms (customers who bought this — also bought these other items) creates personalized, targeted serendipity. **Wikipedia** uses extensive hyperlinking to create serendipity. It has 524 hyperlinks leading away from its Webpage defining "serendipity" to other pages on their site.

The algorithms of the future will guide users to content. Serendipity exists online but it needs to be guided by technological innovations. Will publishers and libraries begin using this technology to lure their customers?

The Vanishing Gypsies — Presented by **Alice Crosetto** (Coordinator, Collection Development and Acquisitions Librarian, University of Toledo)

Reported by: **Angela Kleinschmidt** (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina)

Crosetto presented her research on the **Library of Congress Classification System's** 2001 change in the subject heading from *Gypsy* to *Roma/Romanie*. She had asked for the documentation of this change from the **Library of Congress**, and concluded from the documentation that there may have been political reasons for the change. The speaker felt that the term *Romanie* was not as accurate because the term "gypsy" is understood to include several groups, one of which is the Romanies. She feels that this subject heading could hinder some researchers. After her presentation, the attendees had a lively discussion about whether or not the **Library of Congress** was susceptible to political maneuvering, and whether the Gypsy/Romanie issue was an example of such maneuvering.

The Impact of Internationalization on Collection Development in a Small Liberal Arts Institution — Presented by **Dr. Joyce Dixon-Fyle** (Coordinator/Librarian Collection Development, DePauw University), **Dr. Kathy Davis** (Director of Libraries, University of Wisconsin, Steven Point)

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

Many employers today hire students who have had international and multicultural experience. This desire is now a major concern being discussed in colleges and universities in the United States. **Davis** explained in this session how a library could better serve its international and study abroad students. International students often experience anxiety in the library, whether from not being understood or to not knowing library jargon and procedures. Some university libraries have included helpful material on their Websites, such as explanations of American library systems and multilingual resources. Other ways

continued on page 63

LIBRARIANS *Attention*

10% Off

Choose online access or online access plus print.

Online Access Plus Print - \$785

Online Access Only - \$735

Activate your access

to three of the ASA's journals and receive a 10% discount.

JASA, JBES, TAS

The ASA's peer-reviewed journals are essential content for any university collection serving mathematics and statistics faculty and students.

Journal of the American Statistical Association

Journal of Business & Economic Statistics

The American Statistician

Subscribe now at www.amstat.org/publications.

And They Were There from page 62

to help international students are providing a library liaison, having access to country-of-origin sources, and taking library instruction to the student. A helpful resource for study abroad students is setting up a research contact. **Dixon-Fyle** discussed the difficulty in acquiring international publications for smaller colleges. It is usually expensive, and assessing the needs of the unique international user takes staff and time. The best thing for the library to do is to select materials that reflect heritage, counter prejudices and stereotypes, provide news resources, and strengthen foreign language holdings. **Drs. Davis** and **Dixon-Fyle** closed their session with a lively group discussion about internationalization at the session attendees' libraries.

Would You Like Those Ebooks Shelf-Ready? — Presented by **Heather D'Amour** (Monographs, Gifts, Collections Budget Librarian, University of Calgary), **Kathy Carter** (Coordinator, Bibliographic Services, University of Calgary), **James Shetler** (Vice President, Library Technical Services, YBP Library Services), **Christopher Warnock** (CEO and CTO, ebrary)

Reported by: **Robin Champieux** (Blackwell Book Services)
<robin.champieux@blackwell.com>

This session included two interesting perspectives — that of the libraries and their work to define specifications and expectations, and that of vendors and the factors influencing the delivery of load-ready records. Two issues influenced the **University of Calgary**, **University of Alberta** and the **Alberta Library Consortium's** decision to go shelf-ready: eBook cataloging backlogs and the knowledge that for these institutions MARC records provide the best discovery tool.

Shelf-ready eBook records must be standardized, consistent, easy to manage, and integrate into an existing catalog. Moreover, they must reflect local and consortia needs.

Shetler described the options and challenges vendors encounter in the delivery of quality eBook records, and the service **YBP** has developed to meet customer expectations and specifications. The challenges are largely related to the expense of creating original records when acceptable copy is not available and accommodating customization. Currently, **YBP** converts print records to eBook records, can customize for site-specific URLs, and include local data.

Both **Shetler** and **Warnock** identified some of the important questions and developments that will influence how libraries and vendors treat eBooks in the future. Uncertainties about the long-term survival of the **OPAC** and the viability of the **MARC** data structure were raised. **Warnock** closed with the positive statement that he viewed this as a time when there is tremendous potential to positively impact library workflows and efficiencies. 🍷

*That's all the reports we have room for in this issue, but there are many 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.*