February 2011

And They Were There -- Reports of Meetings

Ramune K. Kubilius

Northwestern University, Galter Health Sciences Library, 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. (2011) "And They Were There -- Reports of Meetings," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 23: Iss. 1, Article 32.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.5755>

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.

590 Local Notes from page 59

he asked the concierge for directions. "Is that him — the keynote speaker?" he overheard someone saying.

"Yes, that's him," came the reply. I recognize him from the Web photo."

"Oh, there you are, Walter," a voice greeted him as he stepped into the ballroom. "I'm so glad that you're here. You had us a bit worried, you know, you're up in a few minutes."

Mitty looked around the room. Yes, there was Jenkins, his old rival at *American Libraries*, eyeing with a studied indifference, and he caught sight of Andrea Pritchard from Princeton on his left. She looked up and gave him a wave. She and Mitty had been close

friends at Harvard's Frye Institute, but he knew some of what he had to say today in his address wouldn't go over well with her and the old guard she represented. His plan for common ground between publishers and librarians would anger both, and his bold strategies to capture a new generation of users would trouble the traditionalist, but no matter. There was nothing he could do about that, he thought. They had to hear the truth. No matter what they would say later.

Somewhere a voice brought him around. Someone was speaking to him. "Hey, like the printer's not working or something. I mean, like I can't get to — well, like it doesn't work at all. I mean the thing won't print." An undergraduate stood in front of the reference desk, eyed Mitty good-naturedly, and smiled. He wore a Budweiser shirt and a pair of cut-off Levis.

Mitty glanced over at the printer. He got up and faced the machine cautiously.

"Oh, yes, the printer," he said. "Well, the folks at circulation would probably know what to do. Did you check with them?"

He hated printers. Why couldn't the things work for more than a couple of print jobs? They were so blasted frustrating — running out of toner — jamming when you least expected. "Confound the whole lot of them," he muttered.

Just then, a student came over from circulation to look at the printer. "Oh," he said, "not a problem. We can fix it." Mitty felt a measure of relief.

"Well, er, thanks," he mumbled and walked carefully back to the reference desk. 🐼

Endnote

1. **James Thurber** (1894-1961) a noted American humorist, cartoonist, and short-story writer who frequently wrote for *The New Yorker*.

And They Were There — Reports of Meetings

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

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

Column Editor's Note: Thank you to all of the 2010 Charleston Conference attendees who agreed to write short reports that highlighted sessions they attended. All attempts were made to provide a broad coverage of sessions, and notes are included in the reports to reflect changes in the session titles or presenters that were not printed in the conference's final program. Slides and handouts from many 2010 Charleston Conference presentations can be found online at <http://www.slideshare.net/event/2010-charleston-conference>, and the *Charleston Conference Proceedings* will be published sometime in Fall 2011. In this issue of *ATG* you will find the first installment of reports, and keep reading as we continue to publish all the reports in upcoming issues throughout the year. — **RKK**

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2010 PRECONFERENCES

Lost in the Forest of License Negotiations??? Your Glowing Breadcrumbs at XXX Charleston Conference — Presented by
Anjana Bhatt (Florida Gulf Coast University)

Reported by: **Angela Dresselhaus** (Utah State University)
<angela.dresselhaus@usu.edu>

Bhatt presented an excellent full day preconference session on license negotiations. Prior to the session she requested that each participant submit a questionnaire designed to gather information on the level of expertise and responsibilities in the group. Participants were also asked to evaluate their license negotiation workflow and bring questions and suggestions to the group meeting in Charleston. Results from the questionnaire indicated that many people had concerns about various aspects of licensing, including

granting indemnity, post cancellation access, and uncertainty about handling legal documents without proper legal training.

The questionnaire results provided the jumping off point for the next section on license and copyright issues. Licenses are important as a means to balance the rights and responsibilities of both the vendor and the library/customer. **Ms. Bhatt** instructed the group to become familiar with U.S. copyright laws and CONTU guidelines for applying the principles to license negotiations, especially regarding issues related to Interlibrary Loan and class packs. While librarians should become familiar with U.S. copyright laws, we were cautioned to avoid license agreements that require the library to become "Copyright Police."

The preconference was wrapped up with discussion on the various pricing models and general negotiation tips. The final 20 minutes were dedicated to answering questions from the group and a brief discussion on the use of QR codes in libraries.

The Radically Different Future of Collection Development — Presented by **Rick Anderson** (University of Utah); **Dan Hazen** (Harvard University); **Greg Raschke** (North Carolina State University); **Ivy Anderson** (California Digital Library); **Judy Luther** (Informed Strategies)

Reported by: **Jennifer Smathers** (The College at Brockport, State University of New York, Drake Memorial Library) <jsmather@brockport.edu>

This pre-conference was split between formal presentations, group discussions and group reporting. The presenters set the stage and got attendees' creative juices going regarding the possible, most likely, and radical futures of Collection Development.

continued on page 61

And They Were There from page 60

Rick Anderson was an expert moderator, explaining the format and briefly discussing the events over the last century that have forever changed how we build collections. He also introduced the attendees to the word of the day, “Defunctitude.”

Raschke discussed the importance of marrying usage data with feedback from our communities to inform our library collection decisions. He credited **John Vickery** (Collection Manager, Management and Social Sciences, NCSU) for his work on the presentation. **Ivy Anderson** explained how the **California Digital Library (CDL)** has collaborated on the management of retrospective print serials collections. **CDL’s** recent eBook survey preliminarily shows that their users desire the physical book, while at the same time, they are asking for increased eBook content. According to **Hazen**, we are all in a “state of existential uncertainty regarding collections.” Barriers to advancing the future of collections include; aggregators creating effective monopolies, libraries not fully developing technological tools to add value, resistant institutional cultures, and a general lack of research regarding true effectiveness of prior collaborative ventures. Capitalizing on organizational efficiencies and outsourcing exotic services aren’t radical responses, beyond the challenges of institutional boundaries. **Luther** focused on changing channels to content, noting information is being consumed in ever-smaller pieces. This has created the challenge of counting usage at the purchase level while consumption is occurring at the unit level.

While the group discussions regarding future scenarios were fascinating, they seemed to veer more towards the fate of libraries (and librarians) than the fate of library collections. Possible reactions toward the futuristic library scenarios ranged from “Become an organic farmer” to “Take over university presses and get into collecting scholarship at the pre-publication stage.”

Negotiating With Vendors: Dos and Don’ts — Presented by **Buzzy Basch** (Basch Subscriptions); **Bruce Strauch** (The Citadel); **Rick Burke** (SCELC); **Kim Armstrong** (Center for Library Initiatives); **Adam Chesler** (ASTD); **Chuck Hamaker** (UNC Charlotte)

Reported by: **Jennifer Castaldo** (The Johns Hopkins University, The Sheridan Libraries) <jcastaldo@jhu.edu>

This preconference brought together people with different perspectives in dealing with licensing, which made for a balanced and insightful view on how to best negotiate these contracts. First, we heard from **Strauch**, a lawyer from the **Citadel**, who laid the groundwork by presenting common licensing terms and also explained that a campus lawyer will not be much help throughout this process. He stressed that everything needs to be read carefully and nothing should be taken as boiler plate. Next, we heard from **Chesler** from **ASTD** who focused on being prepared when going into negotiations as well as asking if you don’t understand something. Sometimes librarians are scared to ask questions, but you could be putting your college at risk. Then, we heard from **Armstrong** from the **CIC**, who came with the consortium point of view. She discussed best practices for negotiating and the importance of building relationships. She also touched on what to do when negotiations are not going well, such as bringing a buddy with you and using the librarian community. Then, we heard from **Burke** from the **SCELC** with another consortium point of view, who illustrated two different types of negotiation styles: being nice and waging war. He said to be assertive, but also flexible without being aggressive. We need to be reasonable to reach an equilibrium that works for both parties. Finally, **Hamaker** from **UNC Charlotte** spoke from the field with some examples of challenges that he has faced while negotiating, such as dealing with huge price increases. Common themes of the morning’s speakers included being prepared and informed, the importance of building relationships with vendors, and “If you don’t ask, you don’t get.”

A Comparative Overview of Journal Discovery Systems: Library Users Offer Their Experiences — Presented by **George Machovec** (Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries); **Rebecca Lenzini** (The Charleston Company); **Dennis Brunning** (Arizona State University); **Ronda Rowe** (University of Texas at Austin); **Martha Whittaker** (George Washington University Libraries); **Amanda Price** (Mississippi State University)

Note: Rebecca Lenzini and Dennis Brunning did not present at this preconference.

Reported by: **Beth Ketterman** (East Carolina University, Laupus Health Sciences Library) <kettermane@ecu.edu>

Machovec kicked off this preconference event with an historical perspective on indexing and abstracting services which have paved the way for more sophisticated discovery systems, which aim to refine the **Google Scholar** concept. **Machovec** also mentioned the “big five” discovery systems on the market today: **Primo/Primo Central** from **Ex Libris**, **Encore/Encore Synergy** from **Innovative Interfaces**, **Serials Solutions’ Summon**, the **EBSCO Discovery System**, and **OCLC’s WorldCat Local**.

Next was time for each of the three librarian presenters to discuss their experience with a discovery system. **Rowe** discussed perceptions about **WorldCat Local**, including that its core is as an OPAC, proprietary vendor records can increase duplication of records, ILL stats post-launch were not overwhelming, and user feedback had so far been underwhelming. **Price’s** presentation on **EBSCO’s Discovery System** focused mostly how to engage staff in the launch of the system, and that thorough training for staff is a must. **Whittaker’s** presentation focused on the process of evaluating and implementing a tool. **GWU’s** task force is composed of mostly non-tech services staff which might not be ideal for every library going through this process, systems with hosted solutions only are under consideration, and that evaluation criteria were developed and included in a survey tool developed for staff input.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON PRECONFERENCES

Innovative Practices in Electronic Resources and Acquisition Management — Presented by **Ryan Weir** (Murray State University); **Geoffrey P. Timms** (Mercer University); **Kelly A. Smith** (Eastern Kentucky University Libraries); **Regina Koury** (Idaho State University); **Denise Pan** (University of Colorado Denver)

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

Pan, influenced by the work of **Maureen Sullivan’s** “Appreciative Inquiry” and the “4-D Cycle”, and incorporating ideas by **McAfee** (2009) and **Cook** (2008), approached workflow reorganization by creating a learning culture. She also established routine and ad hoc meetings and modeled deliberate communication and organization of information through meeting minutes and the use of Web 2.0 tools.

These tools included wikis (for processes, meeting minutes, and agendas) and blogs (for troubleshooting and project management). Technological improvements to usability in each helped with buy-in. A content management module was eventually custom-added using **Drupal**, allowing ideal features, like status triggers and a single organized platform. **JIRA**, **Remedy**, and **SharePoint** were additional product suggestions from the audience.

Koury offered experience using **Google Applications**, praising the integration of docs, calendar, and websites; autosave functionality; simple conversion compatibility; and track changes options. Her reference desk used blogs effectively as a strong institutional knowledge repository that can be categorized, is searchable, and has RSS capability. The cons were only a small learning curve and somewhat less compatible spreadsheet application. Audience members suggested **Google Forms** for orders, trials, and reporting access problems.

continued on page 62

And They Were There from page 61

Smith outlined another approach to reorganization using “process mapping.” She named additional tools such as **SharePoint**, **SFX’s UseStats**, and **Drupal**, but did not fully explain their use. After a break, **Smith** led the group in a Storyboarding exercise to engage in collaboratively identifying innovative and useful tools for e-resource management.

Next, **Timms** described the **Mercer University** experience with a serials cancellation process. This involved a specifically mandated minimum of three face-to-face interactions with department faculty to communicate decisions. Approaches included deduplication, demonstrating use, and considering embargo access with ILL for current content. Results included happy surprises in faculty discovering otherwise unknown content, improved faculty relationships, and increased instructional sessions in the library.

The preconference concluded with **Weir** outlining **Murray State’s** collection development changes, including: **Elsevier** transactional access, boxing in lieu of binding, and exploring the withdrawal of print duplications. Most intriguing was the **SAALCK Last Copy Agreement** — a consortial and non-binding one-page agreement aiming to collaboratively manage collections across Kentucky libraries.

Overall the preconference struck a good balance between sharing several new ideas and a feeling of solidarity in what is often a stymied state in e-resources management.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2010

Let Them Eat... Everything: Embracing a Patron-Driven Future — Presented by **Rick Anderson** (Associate Director for Scholarly Resources & Collections, University of Utah)

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

Anderson characterized library practices as “less sane” (ILL, big deals including subscription and approval plans, reference, bibliographic instruction, redundant cataloging, and print runs) and “more sane” (document delivery, **Wikipedia**, shared cataloging, ease of use, print-on-demand, and patron driven acquisitions). Graphical interfaces have made the library’s walls very fuzzy and the library huge. Game changers in the next five years: budget weakness, **Google Books**, **HathiTrust**, patron driven options, and the **Espresso Book Machine**. **Anderson** expects **Google Books**, with its discoverability and availability, and **HathiTrust**, due to its size, robustness, trustworthy archiving and effective metadata, to essentially replace the library. He described the **Espresso Book Machine**, in use at the **University of Utah** library, as “the coolest thing I have ever seen;” it will drive innovation. Utah has experienced a high demand for self-publishing and for blank books. There are opportunities for the library to publish unique materials and to partner with the university press. **Anderson** noted that we are not yet where we can go to a completely patron-driven acquisitions model, that even for general collections all material is not available electronically, budgeting is difficult in a patron-driven model, and that this will exclude special collections. Nevertheless, we need a North Star to set our sights on — easy, immediate access to all books and articles. We won’t reach it, but need to stay focused on it.

A Consortium for Sharing Primary Materials — Presented by **Joseph J. Esposito** (CEO, GiantChair)

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

The proposal: Create a consortium of academic institutions to digitize and share important primary materials, starting with a detailed plan defining goals and issues, carefully delineated governance struc-

ture and carefully controlled membership. **Esposito** proposed starting with five founding institutions, each digitizing a particular collection of importance and scope, all having access to each others’ collections. Primary documents would present fewer problems at first and could provide a test platform for other content types. The consortium would be run by a strong management team, not at the board level. This team would create a business plan, obtain start up grants, set up an advisory committee, and develop policies (including setting a membership fee). He foresees such a consortium having enormous leverage with costs remaining steady while value grows. Numerous issues will arise, but he noted that sometimes thinking too big and worrying too much about potential problems gets in the way of getting started. The key elements here are: primary documents, careful planning, control, and management. **Esposito** emphasized the need for stiff membership requirements, performance audits and eliminating “free riders” by, for instance, charging unaffiliated scholars a fee for access and assigning them to a member institution for authentication.

Who Do We Trust? The Meaning of Brand in Scholarly Publishing and Academic Librarianship — Presented by **Anthony Watkinson** (Senior Lecturer, Department of Information Studies, University College London), moderator; **Kent Anderson** (CEO/Publisher, The Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery); **Dean Smith** (Director, Project MUSE); **Hazel Woodward** (University Librarian Cranfield University UK); **Allen Renear** (Associate Dean for Research and Associate Professor, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign)

Reported by: **Audrey Powers** (UCF-Tampa)
<apowers@usf.edu>

Four presenters and a moderator representing the publishing industry and academic libraries provided their viewpoints about trust in an ever exploding Web environment. Each presenter offered a different perspective of the meaning of trust based on the presenter’s point of view; publisher, vendor, librarian, and researcher. The presentations provided different perspectives on trust in the scholarly environment, but they all ultimately pointed to the information seeking behavior of end users. Because the explosion of published scholarly materials has created an environment where there is too much to read, the trend is to move away from finding and reading authoritative, trustworthy articles to exploiting content with text mining and strategic reading. Topics covered included skepticism and distrust of the publishing world, public access to research, the trust dynamic between publishers and librarians, users’ trust in the information resources in the Web environment, and the fact that the importance of trust is being exaggerated.

Charleston Conference Observatory: Are Social Media Impacting in Research? — Presented by **David Nicholas** (Director of the Department of Information Studies, UCL Centre for Publishing and CIBER Research Group); **Ian Rowlands** (Professor of Information Studies, University College London, (UCL)); **Deanna Wamae** (Senior Vice President of the Americas, Emerald Group Publishing Inc.)

Reported by: **Lettie Conrad** (SAGE Publications, Inc.)
<Lettie.Conrad@sagepub.com>

Online tools such as **Twitter** and **Wikipedia** are no longer exclusively social media; these devices can now also be considered “scholarly media,” as **CIBER’s** most recent studies show that notable numbers of researchers and educators worldwide employ these sites in the course of their academic work. On the day after an extensive online survey on the use of social media in scholarship was completed, **Nicholas** outlined the scope and purpose of the **CIBER’s** 2010 contribution to the **Charleston Observatory**. **Rowlands** went on to share freshly tabulated data that demonstrates how scholars fit generic online tools, such as **Skype** and

continued on page 63

And They Were There from page 62

Google Docs, into their workflow at nearly every stage of research. The perceived benefits were around speedy dissemination with wider audiences and without the access restrictions of alternate media. **Wamae** presented data showing that, for these scholars, utility will determine adoption. The group concluded that libraries and publishers alike must adapt to these trends and collaborate in order to integrate academic services and products easily into preferred mainstream social media. Slides from this and other **Charleston Conference** presentations can be found online at <http://www.slideshare.net/event/2010-charleston-conference>.

THURSDAY LIVELY LUNCHES

JSTOR's Use of Social Media: One Organization's Story
— Presented by **Jenny McKillop** (Education Coordinator,
JSTOR | ITHAKA)

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

JSTOR's Education Coordinator, **McKillop**, presented **JSTOR's** experiences using social media such as **Facebook**, **Twitter**, **YouTube**, and blogs to interact with users. The presenter emphasized what worked for **JSTOR** and touched on some social media that did not work as well. **JSTOR** uses **Facebook** to facilitate user issues and complaints, to allow users to give positive and negative feedback, and to push out information to users. They have also successfully used **Twitter** to push out useful information to users and have established a **YouTube** channel to present training videos. **JSTOR** did not have much success with either **Second Life** or **myspace**. When getting started with social media, **McKillop** emphasized the importance of setting goals, allowing two-way conversation, keeping true to your brand, knowing your venue, listening to your audience, and dropping what does not work. The audience was made up almost exclusively of other vendors and publishers with some librarians in attendance. The presenter was open to an exchange of ideas and there was robust interaction between presenter and audience, some of whom were already using social media to connect with users and others curious as to how to get started. An informative session that proceeded as advertised.

Great Expectations: Maximizing Efficiency and Value in Collection Management and Discovery — Presented by **Kittie Henderson** (EBSCO Information Services), moderator; **Jennifer Bazeley** (Miami University of Ohio); **Beth Bernhardt** (UNC-Greensboro); **Kristina Krusmark** (EBSCO Information Services); **Michael Gorrell** (EBSCO Publishing)

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

In a departure from Charleston tradition, **EBSCO** held a luncheon similar to sessions many are familiar with at **ALA** conferences to showcase their products. Well over 100 people enjoyed a free lunch and lively chatter before learning from **EBSCO** personnel and satisfied customers how **EBSCO** can make managing e-resources easier for libraries. **Bazeley** described better communication and efficiencies achieved by moving subscriptions to **EBSCO** and utilizing the **EBSCO A-Z list**, **ERM**, and **EBSCOnet**. **Krusmark** explained how the rich information **EBSCO** has permits populating multiple integrated tools. **Bernhardt** showed that use of the discovery service (linked to the library's mobile app and to LibGuides) increased usage. **Gorrell** focused on the superiority of the **EBSCO Discovery Service** over similar products due to its quantity of full-text, rich metadata and inclusiveness, apparently unaware that selling goes against the spirit of this conference, which has always been issue-based, and attempts to be a level playing field for all.

Digital Warfare: Navigating the E-book Minefield — Presented by **Jillian Tweet** (IGI Global); **Tim Cherubini** (LYRASIS); **Tim Rogers** (NC LIVE); **Kirstin Steele** (The Citadel); **Rachel Dicker** (Baker & Taylor)

Reported by: **Kyle McCarrell** (Augusta State University)
<kmccarre@aug.edu>

Led by **Tweet**, the panelists gave their thoughts and opinions regarding eBooks and how publishers and librarians can work together to enhance content for users. **Cherubini**, who attended via audio **Skype**, gave a brief history of eBooks and raised the questions that dominated the rest of the session — can publishers learn anything from e-journals regarding pricing or access, and is a standardized platform for vendors to market their eBooks necessary for academic libraries? Regarding the first question, discussion between the audience and the panel focused on the inherent differences in pricing models between monographs and journals and the viability of consortial purchasing of eBooks. **Rogers** pointed out that from his experience, the lack of uniformity of a standardized platform, or at least a set of basic standards, was problematic. Publishers' concerns, expressed by **Dicker**, included the balancing of the time and money invested in research and development for a product that could quickly become outdated in the rapidly changing eBook environment. Speaking for the academic libraries, **Steele** mentioned that users don't care about platforms as much as desiring access to information. Overall, the session resulted in a healthy discussion between librarians and publishers on how to improve usage and materials.

Give 'Em What They Want: Patron-Driven Collection Development — Presented by **Karen Fischer** (University of Iowa Libraries); **Michael Wright** (University of Iowa Libraries); **Hope Barton** (University of Iowa Libraries); **Kathleen Clatanoff** (YBP)

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

The impetus for this PDA (patron-driven acquisition) pilot project at the **University of Iowa** was a **CIC** library conference on collections in 2009. A landmark 1979 study at **Kent** showed that 39.8 percent of books did not circulate in the first six years after purchase. **ARL** data also shows that 56 percent of collections never circulate. In cooperation with **YBP** and **ebrary**, Iowa launched the project in the Fall of 2009 with the **MARC** records of **ebrary** loaded into the catalogue. If the patron clicked the eBook more than ten times, it was purchased. This proved such a success that the project had to be scaled back after only two months since the \$50,000 budget was being exhausted too rapidly. The usage shows that, while traditional academic publishers were popular, **Amacom** (a division of the **American Management Association**) was also popular. The data also indicated that usage of the print copy dropped if the electronic version was available, older publications were chosen well as recent ones, and there was significant interest among students in the social sciences and humanities. The PDA program will continue. A cost comparison will be made between the PDA model and Iowa's subscription to **ebrary's Academic Complete**. Slides of the presentation are available at: http://ir.uiowa.edu/lib_pubs/61/.

Reference on the Run: The New Portable Era Is Here! — Presented by **Rolf Janke** (SAGE Publications); **Casper Grathwohl** (Oxford University Press); **Cassidy Lackey** (Handmark Studios)

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

The session held promise, but the results fell short.

Moderator **Janke**, Vice President of **SAGE Publications**, admitted in his introduction that he knew little about mobile reference and that

continued on page 64

And They Were There
from page 63

he wished to use this session to further his knowledge. While he was friendly and engaging, this lack of knowledge led to awkward silences during the question/answer period.

The two presenters, **Grathwohl** and **Lackey**, gave distinctly different presentations on how their companies are using mobile reference. **Grathwohl's** long, detailed presentation meandered without making conclusions. In about five minutes, **Cassidy** explained the relationship between **Handmark** and **Oxford Press**, giving examples of current applications developed for mobile reference such as "word of the day."

Future presentations would benefit from presenters from **EBSCO** or **GALE** reference, which both presenters claimed to be at the cutting edge of mobile reference. The description predicted a panel with audience discussion; this never transpired.

Pay-Per-View Isn't All Wet: Providing Articles Can Save the Budget — Presented by **Barbara MacAlpine** (Trinity University)

Reported by: **Glenda Alvin** (Tennessee State University, Brown-Daniel Library) <galvin@Tnstate.edu>

Four years ago, **Trinity University's** librarians realized that the costs of their large database packages were increasing to the point that they could no longer afford them and they turned to pay-per-view as a viable option. They set up transactional access with their two major e-journal providers, **Wiley** and **Elsevier**. The librarians explained the new procedure to the academic departments and the faculty who wanted to participate were assigned usernames and passwords. Students are provided mediated access by librarians or a faculty member.

Trinity implemented **Elsevier's Article Choice** which costs \$30.00 per article. **MacAlpine's** informal survey of other libraries using pay-per-view with **Elsevier** showed an average allocation or "set aside" of \$30,000. **Trinity** uses pre-paid tokens with **Wiley** which cost between \$10.50-\$28.50 per article. From 2006-2010, the library has paid for less than 400 articles at a cost of \$37,000 over the four-year period. If the library had continued with the journal packages, they would have spent approximately \$150,000 per year over the same four years, with total expenditure of at least \$600,000. This session was helpful and informative for anyone considering pay-per-view.

Be Careful What You Wish For: You Might Get Statistics — Presented by **Susan Klimley** (Health Sciences Library, Columbia University)

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

Klimley used her experience reviewing statistics of usage (and cost) at her institution as a springboard for discussion with session attendees. Primarily speaking about journals, she posed questions, shared quandaries: deep log analysis — which IPs and how long? (weaknesses of proxy listings for statistics); HTML vs. PDF download statistics? (significant differences with some platforms); does anyone use monthly statistics reports?; are parts of articles viewed significant?; costs per download? Among the frustrations: non-COUNTER statistics; "unprotected" (able to cancel) vs. "tied up in big packages" restricted titles. Additional topics arose during discussion: publisher/statistics site administration challenges (**Columbia** has more than 75 people with administrative accounts to **HighWire!**) and the role (or not) of impact and other factors in potential cancellation decisions. It was clear that **Klimley** views past **Charleston Conference** speaker, **Phil Davis**, as an authority, since she cited his papers on more than one occasion (for example, "Why usage statistics cannot tell us everything, and why we shouldn't dare to ask" (<http://hdl.handle.net/1813/2569>)). **Klimley's** observations and the discussion she led turned out to be prescient, since, for example, "are articles actually read" came up in other conference discussions.

Library Connections: A Non-Linear Approach to Planning, Marketing and Creating the Positive User Experience — Presented by **Leah Dunn** (Guilford College)

Reported by: **Kristina M. DeShazo** (Oregon Health & Science University Library) <deschazok@ohsu.edu>

Loosely based on the popular **BBC** television series "Connections" hosted by **James Burke**, **Ms. Dunn** briefly described how the **Guilford College** library went about assessing and effecting change in student, staff, and community perception of the library. A survey of student needs yielded results typical for many libraries including a desire for more study space and longer open hours. Follow-up planning incorporated a grant to hire a consultant who looked at library operations and conducted an in-depth learning behavior survey. Participation in a community book discussion and 24-hour access during exams provided key positive marketing of the library, both inside the building and out. While creating a positive user experience meant the addition of a popular materials section based on survey input which indicated an interest in young adult fiction, popular magazines, travel guides, and popular DVDs. Though only a small number of individuals were in attendance, a lively discussion ensued with all participants contributing ideas about creating positive user experiences.

Who's Driving, and Where? Incorporating Patron-Driven Acquisition Models into Library Collection Policy — Presented by **Kathy Brannon** (Coutts Information Services); **Steve Carrico** (University of Florida Smathers Library); **Paul Lightcap** (University of Florida Smathers Library); **Robin Champieux** (EBL)

Reported by: **Mike Diaz** (ProQuest) <Mike.Diaz@proquest.com>

Lightcap and **Carrico** set the stage with the observation that demand-driven acquisition (DDA) for many libraries was still an "odd appendage" to overall collection development and acquisition plans and processes, but they saw **University of Florida** moving along a path toward much deeper integration of DDA into their operations.

Champieux added a vendor perspective that many libraries were concerned that programs could be "budget busters" or that users might make poor decisions. She discussed how developing targeted profiles and leveraging of selector expertise within the workflow could help mitigate potential issues.

Brannon underscored that vendors can play a critical role in helping libraries bring DDA into collection development approaches and acquisition processes, including the development of test profiles. She talked about how vendors can partner with libraries to streamline acquisition processes and make costs easier to manage and more predictable.

Many of the attendees compared notes on their programs during a lively question-and-answer session. Some libraries had inserted a selector approval step into their DDA program and others talked about reconciling their program with ILL and approval plans. Starting up slowly was advised, as managing the ramp up in costs during the initial years of a program can be difficult.

The Next BIG Idea — Presented by **Robb M. Waltner** (University of North Florida); **Michael Kucsak**, (University of North Florida); **Michael Arthur** (University of Central Florida).
Note: Michael Kucsak, (University of North Florida) did not participate in this session.

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

The inspiration for this session came from the presenters' desire to do more with what face-to-face conference collaboration provides. **Arthur**

continued on page 76

Biz of Acq from page 75

Figure 8. Email routing allows acquisitions staff to have customized emails for different requests

Figure 9. A screenshot of the ILLiad add-on for Amazon.com

Here is the breakdown of student requested items which were cataloged in 2009 and 2010:

2009 (October – December) Student requests purchased (119 total items cataloged)

22	19%	Never circulated
65	55%	Circulated 1-2 times
32	27%	Circulated 3 or more times

Table 1. GIST Student purchase requests, 2009

2010 (January - November) Student requests purchased (83 total items cataloged)

14	17%	Never circulated
59	71%	Circulated 1-2 times
10	12%	Circulated 3 or more times

Table 2. GIST Student purchase requests, 2010

Since October of 2009, we have been tracking GIST interlibrary loan and purchase requests. On the whole, 80% of requests initially processed by Acquisitions were eventually purchased (data collected from October 2009 to December 2010). 9% of requests were routed to IDS for borrowing from other institutions, and 11% of purchase requests were cancelled. The most frequent reasons for cancelling a request included textbook requests or items already owned by SUNY Geneseo. Items routed to ILL generally included holdings readily available within our consortia, thus easily obtained with a 2-3 day delivery window. The turnaround time for purchase requests averages out to 14 days.

Conclusion

GIST is a flexible system designed to leverage existing systems and improve workflows in acquisitions, as well as enable more cost-effective decisionmaking in ILL. Making use of the request management software ILLiad, GIST is designed to transform current purchasing workflow and help staff make better use of data and time. This year has seen the release of GIST's Gift and Deselection Manager, which streamlines gift processing and weeding analysis. Next year, we are releas-

continued on page 77

Rumors from page 68

now happily retired **Jim** says that about the only thing he misses about working, besides a paycheck, is seeing "old friends, "long time" friends" (we aren't getting older, as the commercial says, we're getting better!). Anyway, **Jim** has two grandchildren and another set of twins is coming along. He is going to be busy! Speaking of which, my granddaughter's first birthday is March 7! How time flies!

Did you read the article in the last *ATG* by the bam-zowie **Sara Killingworth** ("The Future of the Textbook," p.45-48, v.22#6)? This is definitely a fluid and evolving market. There was an article in the *Wall Street Journal* as well, "Publishers expand e-Textbook offerings for Classroom," (*WSJ*, Feb. 25, 2011) which talks about a deal between McGraw-Hill and the textbook start-up **Inkling**.

continued on page 81

And They Were There from page 64

praised ways technology has allowed more accessible collaboration. But the goal, **Waltner** offered, was getting at the root cause of issues in order to truly take collaborative action.

Arthur and **Waltner** can both be praised in their efforts paring down this session, originally billed as an all-day preconference, to a mere hour and fifteen minutes. Anticipating audience reluctance to provide ideas in this short timeframe, the presenters outlined their perspective of key ideas. General agreement settled upon the idea presented by **Waltner**, that **the Scholarly Publishing Model is Broken (and has been for years)**. A loosely facilitated discussion followed, touching on myriad perspectives, obstacles, and some causes.

The concepts behind this type of session format — releasing the wisdom of the crowd, expanding the Unconference approach — were described, but not fully-employed. Unfortunately, due to time limitation, the session ended with a rush to exchange contact information and without clear objectives for exactly what to do next.

That's all the reports we have room for in this issue. Watch for the more reports from the 2010 Charleston Conference in upcoming issues of Against the Grain. Presentation material (PowerPoint slides, handouts) and taped session links from many of the 2010 sessions are available online. Visit the Conference Website at www.katana.info/conference. — KS