

December 2012

And They Were There-Reports of Meetings

Sever Bordeianu

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, sbordeia@unm.edu

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



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

Recommended Citation

Bordeianu, Sever (2012) "And They Were There-Reports of Meetings," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 24: Iss. 6, Article 35.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.6249>

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 — Presentation from the Frankfurt Book Fair, OLAC, and the 31st Annual Charleston Conference

Column Editor: **Sever Bordeianu** (Head, Print Resources Section, University Libraries, MSC05 3020, 1 University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131-0001; Phone: 505-277-2645; Fax: 505-277-9813) <sbordeia@unm.edu>

Lessons Learned From Digital Publishing — Frankfurt Book Fair, October 10-14, 2012, New Zealand

Reported by **Anthony Watkinson** (CIBER Research)
<anthony.watkinson@btinternet.com>

Librarians who have been to the **Frankfurt Book Fair** will know that it is huge, very international, and extremely difficult to navigate. Publishers are letting their hair down and selling to one another, and librarians who come to the booths are not unwelcome, but they are not expected. The 2012 “Messe” followed the trend of recent years in that there were lots of small events alongside the main business which continues on the exhibition floor and (for very big business) in the nearby five-star hotels.

I have been asked to report on one such small event under this title that happened on the so-called SPARKS stage close to the area for the booths of the academic publishers. The panel was convened by **Richard Mollett** who runs the (UK) **Publishers Association**. Two of the three panellists had strong contacts with the academic sector. These were **Richard Charkin** of **Bloomsbury** once big at **OUP**, **BioMed Central** and **Macmillan (Nature)**, and **George Lossius**, the CEO of **Publishing Technology** better known for its Ingenta brand. The third panellist was **Matt Hanbury** of **Murdoch Books**. He is the nephew of **Rupert**.

What was different about this occasion was that though the questions were directed to these heavyweight types in their roles of big trade (consumer) publishers they were all firmly grounded in the digital environment and there was frequent looking back to what the academic sector had been doing for years. A year or so ago, digital for these people in their current roles would have been for the future. It is now current.

The basic story came out early. Print is in a mess. Print has to learn from the digital experience. Publishers have to get content to where it is needed. Big deals by big publishers at big discounts are ludicrous. We have to say no to **Amazon**. Publishers have to get out the hands of the big technology companies or they will suffer. This group was really interested in tablets, though a different collection of people from the industry might have been less optimistic.

Charkin argued strongly (as he does) that publishers must work harder to get closer to authors. He was not explicit, but what he meant was that the role of agents has to be rolled back. “What was the invention of the decade,” asked **Mollett**. **Charkin** plumped for the stapler for the century, but for the last decade, perhaps the Kindle. The others were less positive. There was a general view that there had been too much emphasis on process and not enough on exciting new products.

Murdoch was impressed by the way in which his uncle charged for digital content. **Charkin** spoke about site licensing as a great STM invention — of course, jointly with libraries. In trade publishing there are no publisher-owned silos and no service like **CrossRef**. **Charkin** took a straw poll of the audience and few knew what **CrossRef** was — a different world. There was a strong feeling that publishers should work together on eBooks but not much idea of how or how the **Department of Justice** might allow this.

There was a lot of concern about copyright and other legal protection measures. It was said that **Google** has spent \$300 million on patents, which is more than they have spent on research and developments. However, for publishers Digital Rights Maintenance has no future and (**Hanbury** felt) may give a false sense of security.

“What about the future?” asked a questioner. Is multimedia or trans-media (the appropriate jargon term) the way forward? There was no agreement on this. Characteristically, **Charkin** was bullish about working with technology partners on apps. **Murdoch** was doubtful. Most innovations have not worked — part-books were an example given.

Mollett asked what they asked for in a digital aggregator as yet not so big for trade eBooks as they are in the academic sector. There was no clear answer forthcoming.

Finally the panel were asked for bullet points for the future. Print will remain said two of the speakers, but **Charkin** was looking forward to getting rid of his warehouse, though accepting the just-in-time approach of print-on-demand. He is investing in XML workflows and cultivating his authors.

This was a good panel. Trade publishers who know how to move optimally in the digital world are keeping quiet about their real perceptions. There is still a level of real uncertainty. At the same time, the amazing amount of experimentation (touched on in the **Charleston** panel featuring **Brantley** and **Shatzkin**) was not seriously referred to. Are others working with authors to create new entities?

OLAC 2012: The Audiovisual Cataloguers Biennial Conference — October 18-21, 2012, Albuquerque, NM

Reported by **Sever Bordeianu** (University of New Mexico Libraries) <sbordeia@unm.edu>

Transformational. A powerful and often overused term, but also highly appropriate to the current state of librarianship. It is fitting that **OLAC** is a biennial conference, since the great transformation looming over cataloging is scheduled for the year between conferences, 2013. We are talking about the catalogers’ version of Y2K, the official introduction of RDA. RDA, the Resource Description and Access rules, which are modernizing the tried and true Anglo American Cataloging Rules – AACR(2) permeated this conference and brought to light the profession’s efforts to transition to this new environment.

The conference took place over a four-day period in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The theme this year was post-modern cataloging appropriately emphasizing RDA and its companion concept FRBR, the Functional Requirement for Bibliographic Records. These are the profession’s cutting edge efforts to maintain a leading role in the new information environment. For catalogers this conference was truly a power event, filled with top-quality workshops by leaders in the field, the very people at the forefront of developing, testing, and implementing the new rules. Most readers of this column will be familiar with their names.

There were two pre-conference workshops. The first, *Managing Catalog Departments, the Accidental Leader*, conducted by **Rebecca Lubas** from the **University of New Mexico** and **Bobby Bothmann** from **Minnesota State University**, **Makato**, looked at how one trains and learns to become a manager and a leader. The second, *Map Cataloging*, conducted by **Paige Andrew** of **Pennsylvania State University**, provided an excellent opportunity for those “who only occasionally have the pleasure of working with sheet maps” to learn about map cataloging. This quote from the program brochure perfectly sums up the nature of the conference. Yes, the presentations were highly theoretical and serious, but there was also a “fun” element, and the discussions were lively and animated. There was an abundance of great examples and exercises which kept everyone interested and engaged.

In the opening keynote address, **Eric Childress** from **OCLC** gave a textured analysis of past and future, of where the traditional information production and delivery models are, and how they are being supplanted by new models. The talk was titled *Big, Social, and Media-rich* and covered the history of modern media (book, journal, music, video publishing) and its evolution in the present. There is no doubt that new

continued on page 71

And They Were There from page 70

models are constantly appearing and evolving, presenting an array of new ways of creating, delivering, charging for, and using information. What's passing are the old models of exclusive professional creator corps, publishing houses, TV networks, and movie studios, in favor of "everyman" creators, crowdfunding, crowdfunding, and the creation of "intentional data," such as Twitter. These changes are directly contributing to an explosion in innovation for both the creation and delivery of content.

The workshops covered specialized topics, and contained both theory and exercises. Each workshop was offered twice, so participants did not have to miss out on a favorite topic. In *Constructing RDA Access Points*, **Adam Schiff**, principal cataloger at the **University of Washington Libraries**, and well-known figure in cataloging circles, covered the major and minor differences between AACR2 and RDA noting that in many cases "best practices" have not yet been established. **Schiff** did an excellent job explaining how subtle changes in terminology — from "headings" to "access points" or "main entry" to "preferred title" — are marking a shift in thinking to reflect the new electronic environment. In the same vein **Jay Weitz's** two workshops *Sound Cataloging* and *Video Cataloging*, and **Steve Shadle's** *eSerials Cataloging Using the CONSER Standard Record* highlighted the changes in philosophy and practice between the old AACR2 rules and the new RDA environment. A powerful concept in eSerials cataloging is the "provider-neutral" record which is central to the cataloging of electronic serials. Overall, serials have always been at the forefront of cataloging thinking (this report is written by an inveterate serials cataloger) and as such, the transition to the post-modern is fairly smooth. **Weitz**, who is database specialist at **OCLC**, and **Shadle**, serials access librarian at the **University of Washington Libraries**, have both been active in the discussions and implementation of RDA. These two speakers, as well as **Adam Schiff**, were able to impart inside information of the process of developing RDA and shared the latest developments about pending issues.

The other workshop presenters were equally impressive. **Vicki Sipe**, from the **University of Maryland, Baltimore County** discussed *Cataloging Visual Images*. The workshop satisfied both newcomers to visual image cataloging by addressing such basics as "visual literacy," or how to interpret an image, and the more seasoned catalogers by addressing complex issues such as construction of the rules and differences between libraries, museums, and archives. For example, libraries may not have unique items, whereas museums and archives probably do. This, of course influences the way the images are cataloged and described. Another interesting point made during the workshop is that with advent of technology, the MARC 520 field — the summary of the image — which was vital in a card environment and the early online catalogs, is now being supplanted or replaced by thumbnail images supported by virtually all finding tools.

The other prevalent topics were FRBR and Metadata, which together combine to give users a much more nimble way of finding exactly what they are looking for. With the proper metadata schema and applying the various parameters of the Functional Requirement for Bibliographic Records, users can easily find a specific movie version of their favorite book (**Hamlet** was mentioned several times, as was **Othello** and many others) and also find out if the library owns it, and where to get it.

The FRBR workshop was conducted by **Kelley McGrath**, metadata librarian at the **University of Oregon**. The importance of FRBR can be summarized by the observation that "libraries describe publications, but users care about versions." FRBR emphasizes WEMI, the Word, Expression, Manifestation, Item concept, which enables users to find the exact version of a work they are looking for. The Metadata workshop was conducted by **Rob Olendorf**, data librarian at the **University of New Mexico**, and **Zoe Chao**, metadata librarian also at the **University of New Mexico**. **Olendorf** and **Chao** made a very strong point about data "flexibility" which can impede "interoperability." For librarians, who take standards and consistency seriously, this message was very welcome. A related topic *From Carrier to Equivalence: Cataloging Reproductions in an RDA/FRBR Environment*, presented by **Morag Boyd** and **Kevin Furniss** recommended focusing on cataloging the manifestation-in-hand, and thus giving users the versions they want.

Bonnie Parks, head of cataloging at the **University of Portland** provided *Best Practices for Batchloading e-Serials*. In the midst of all the abovementioned discussions about RDA standards and metadata schema, loading vendor records can bring in some wild cards. Oftentimes vendors do not follow these rules as closely as librarians would like, and sometimes not at all. **Parks** talked about record quality, workflows, how to select a vendor and very importantly, loading responsibilities. This last point is important because libraries need to have more than one individual who can perform these complex tasks.

Nine poster sessions dealt with interesting examples from the cataloging world, such as applying mobile technology, using RDA to catalog 3D objects, or dealing with DVD and CD collections. All instructive, creative, and fun.

Throughout the workshop, several themes emerged. These were brilliantly summarized in the closing keynote address by **Lynne Howarth** from the **University of Toronto**. **Howarth**, who attended, at least partially, every single presentation, provided "bons-mots" quotes from most. The overarching theme was the transition from modern to post-modern cataloging. She noted that the term "postmodern" is currently in the top 40% of lookups on *Merriam-Webster.com*. The juxtaposition of AACR2 (modern) and RDA (post-modern) was really what every workshop addressed, each in its focused way. In the opening keynote **Eric Childress** looked at the continuously-changing AV landscape, away from the traditional model of centralized author, publisher, and distributor, to the social, cloudsourced, crowdsourced, and mobile. For serials, the transition to the post-modern is fairly smooth. Audio-visual and image cataloging are also keeping up, especially with the application of FRBR principles, which emphasizes versions rather than publications. This requires the application of more powerful and portable metadata schema, including XML, Dublin Core, and others, which will at first supplement and eventually replace the MARC record. In fact, several speakers mentioned the limitations of MARC and its eventual disappearance. This conference certainly showed where the future is.

The next **OLAC** conference will take place in 2014. The venue has not been established yet, but it will be "somewhere in the Midwest." It will be interesting to see how far the profession has moved in the intervening two years and how well we were able to cope with the new models. What is certain is that **OLAC 2012** proved that librarians are seriously dealing with impending changes, being active participants and shapers of this future. **OLAC 2014** will be an interesting conference that will shed light on how visionary today's leaders and practitioners have been.

Issues in Book and Serial Acquisition, "Something's Gotta Give!," Francis Marion Hotel, Embassy Suites Historic District, Courtyard Marriott Historic District, and Addlestone Library, College of Charleston, Charleston, SC, November 2-5, 2011

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

Column Editor's Note: Thank you to all of the **Charleston Conference** attendees who agreed to write short reports that highlight sessions they attended at the 2011 conference. All attempts were made to provide a broad coverage of sessions, and notes are included in the reports to reflect known changes in the session titles or presenters

that were not printed in the conference's final program. Please visit the Conference Website for archival information where a link to many presentations can be found, on the 2011 Charleston Conference Slide-Share Group Page. Permission was received from all of the plenary

continued on page 72

And They Were There
from page 71

speakers to post their recorded sessions online, so they are added to the Video page on the Conference Website. The 2011 Charleston Conference Proceedings were published in partnership with Purdue University Press in 2012 and are now available in print and online. See: <http://www.thepress.purdue.edu/titles/format/9780983404323>.

In this issue of *ATG* you will find the final installment of 2011 conference reports. The first five installments can be found in *ATG* v.24#1, February 2012, *ATG* v.24#2, April 2012, *ATG* v.24#3, June 2012, *ATG* v.24#4, September 2012, and *ATG* v.24#5, November 2012. Watch for 2012 Charleston Conference reports to begin in the next issue of *ATG* (v.25#1, February 2013). — RKK

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2011

(continued from previous installment)

FRIDAY CONCURRENT SESSION 2

Using Your Library's Annual Report to Market Library Services

— Presented by **Corey Seeman** (University of Michigan)

Reported by: **Anne K. Abate** (Library Discount Network)
<anne@librarydiscountnetwork.com>

The speaker started by reviewing how the **Kresge Library** at the **University of Michigan** has been reporting their story to associations and their college. He highlighted the importance of an annual report and what libraries should feature in the document. **Seeman** shared some of his own theories about how the report should be created and distributed. He then went through their most recent annual report in minute detail, showing each section and how they are reporting the information. This part of the presentation was a bit tedious, as we saw little of the actual content and just quickly scrolled through the Web screens. The session provided a good overview of what they are doing with this reporting tool. There was no time for questions at the end, which would have enhanced the presentation.

Contextualizing and Interpreting Cost per Use for Electronic Journals — Presented by **Matthew Harrington** (Virginia Tech); **Connie Stovall** (Virginia Tech)

Reported by: **Jill Crawly-Low** (University Library, University of Saskatchewan) <jill.crawley@usask.ca>

This presentation generated a lot of interest based on the standing-room-only attendance in a small room. It was also content-rich: I could have listened to the entire presentation again to better follow their thinking. Statistical analyses of library data are useful to librarians as budget shrink and we need to demonstrate the value of library activities to university administrators. However, numerical data such as cost per use, which is often used in serials decisions, do not indicate value until they are combined with other criteria. Existing stats used by libraries answer questions, but give an incomplete picture. For example, COUNTER-compliant stats don't indicate how an article is chosen or used; article downloads indicate what is chosen but not how they are used; and citation reports indicate scholarly activity. **Virginia Tech's** relational database for serials decision-making includes cost and use data that

can be mapped across a variety of additional values such as time, subject, fund, discipline. The result is more useful data that are valuable in serials collections management.



Demand-Driven Success: Designing Your PDA Experiment
— Presented by **Charles Hillen** (Loyola Marymount University);
Glenn Johnson-Grau (Loyola Marymount University)
NOTE: There was a typo in the program book abstract.
The pilot program ran from February to August 2011.

Reported by: **Alison M. Armstrong** (McConnell Library, Radford University) <amarmstro@radford.edu>

Of all of the sessions I attended, this one had the smallest room and was packed. When they began the DDA plan, they had several desired outcomes: just-in-time, conservative process at point of need, and it could go in either direction; esoteric or patron demand that fills blind spots. This would give their patrons instant access to highly desirable content.

They learned that how you manage it is more important than the money part of it. For their profiling process, they spent about 12-15 hours over the course of two weeks. Obvious areas of concern were culled: reference, popular, certain publishers (Spark Notes), and set price caps by discipline.

They were able to monitor expenses in a weekly report and averaged 13 books purchased per week, and they said that using a pivot table in Excel was really helpful. Overall, it was a great success. They found a lot of what was purchased would have been missed with traditional selecting. So they used the 10-pages, 10-minutes, print/copy model as triggers.

They think they were successful, in part, due to doing a retrospective and adding a critical mass of records for each discipline.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2011
AFTERNOON PLENARY SESSIONS

The Future of Online Newspapers — Presented by **Debora Cheney** (The Pennsylvania State University Library); **Chuck Palsho** (Media Services Division, NewsBank, Inc.); **Chris Cowan** (ProQuest); **Fredrick Zarndt**, Moderator (Global Connexions)

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

Zarndt moderated the session which examined shifting sands for newspapers and news magazines. **Cheney** asked "what will online newspapers look like?" and admitted there is confusion about which way to go next. Eight news trends impacting libraries fall in two areas — changes in: 1) content; 2) delivery and access. There will be no single print object and the new "born digital" won't be an object, but a stream (or streams). Advice for libraries? Streamline collections, keep unique parts; mix and match providers and formats; stay up on research trends; preserve "born digital." **Palsho** argued that local news is important, with unprecedented opportunities for libraries to bring value to their communities (archiving, etc.). There are deepened partnership between news providers and aggregators and strengthened relationships / understanding between news buyers and users. **Cowan** talked about the transformation of newspapers (their dilemmas), the changing nature of news, and the impact on researchers. The editorial voice is being lost, and users have to adapt to "freemium" (some free, then pay). The article is gone. Libraries must keep adapting to support researchers. During lively Q&A, panelists talked about the diminishing role of proofreading and the telling of a story more than news (fuzzy reading). Reminders for libraries: consider the issues of non-traditional sources, e.g., blogs, which weren't built for archiving; and remember local newspapers that cannot afford aggregators, and student newspapers that may be lost for future researchers.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2011
"HAPPY HOUR" CONCURRENTS

continued on page 73

One on One: Casual Dialogue Between Librarians and Publishers — Presented by **Timothy Cherubini** (LYRASIS)

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

The title of the session implied a presentation of publisher and librarian viewpoints and indeed it was just that, but not “live,” rather it was a summary after the fact. **Cherubini** described findings from informal focus groups (including inspirations from the studies and articles of others) that sought to capture “day in the life” concerns of constituent groups. Everyone is concerned with content and remaining relevant. Publishers have ideas about their audience, while librarians bring to the table their relationships with publishers, and also their direct experience with how patrons seek and use information. Each party learned about the other (and expressed what they didn’t fully understand). Publishers, for example, revealed that consortia are mysteries to them, how each library is different, how **Amazon** causes them angst, and that changes in teaching will drive changes in the monograph. Finances in both libraries and publishing houses are being “bled”...

New Ways of Assessing Journal Value — Presented by **David Hoole** (Nature Publishing Group); **Jeff Clovis** (Thomson Reuters); **John McDonald** (Claremont Colleges)
NOTE: Clovis and McDonald and were previously unannounced speakers.

Reported by: **Kathleen Spring** (Linfield College, Nicholson Library) <kspring@linfield.edu>

This session focused on different ways to assess journal value. Although traditional indicators of quality (such as impact factor, press coverage, cost, return on investment, and usage) can be used to assess a journal’s value, **Nature Publishing Group (NPG)** has begun looking at more localized factors like cost per local citation and cost per local authorship as metrics of value. **Hoole** presented an overview of these newer indicators.

McDonald argued librarians need to think about when it is appropriate to use traditional global indicators and when it is appropriate to use local indicators. For instance, local indicators can provide evidence about what is happening at an individual institution, which might help persuade decision makers to keep particular resources.

Clovis described the Local Journal Utilization Report (LJUR) produced from Web of Science data. This report provides a view of what researchers are publishing from different perspectives, as well as what is being cited, and helps institutions determine which journals are essential for their communities. However, the cost of **LJUR** (approximately \$10,000) is certain to be prohibitive for many smaller institutions.

Hoole’s explanations of the newer indicators could have been clearer, and it would have been helpful if the program’s abstract indicated the session would be of greatest interest to larger, research-intensive institutions.

Implementing a Disapproval Plan: A Case Study of Rules-Based Weeding — Presented by **Doug Way** (Grand Valley State University); **Julie Garrison** (Grand Valley State University); **Rick Lugg** (Sustainable Collection Services)

Reported by: **Alison M. Armstrong** (McConnell Library, Radford University) <amarmstro@radford.edu>

Grand Valley State University worked with Sustainable Collection Services to evaluate their collection to make weeding decisions. They looked at no or low use titles, the length of time since it was acquired,

titles held elsewhere, and titles they would retain regardless. They were compared to authoritative lists and *Choice Reviews*. They checked for archival copies and **HathiTrust**. They looked at accessibility.

Sustainable Collection Services created a graph showing what was held versus weeded. They identified criteria: use, currency, holdings, and prestige/affiliation. They decided to use the following: published before 2000, not in *RCL*, never reviewed by **Choice**, and no circulation since a particular year. To retain a book, there needed to be justification for it to stay.

There were a few hiccups. They learned communication was important. One department demanded that all books be kept, and it has required some mending of relationships. Relationships are more important than the 200 books that were left that could probably have been weeded. For books that were retained from the lists, the rationale was added to the records.

This session had a lot of great information in a fairly short period of time, and the room was packed.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2011
MORNING PLENARY SESSION

The Status Quo Has Got to Go — Presented by **Brad Eden** (Dean of Library Services, Valparaiso University)

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

There are those who later said that **Eden’s** talk, the last plenary of the 2011 conference, should have been scheduled for the start of the conference. Others indicated they wanted to inform him that they were actually doing (or otherwise addressing) many of the things he mentioned as still warranting change. **Eden’s** stated aim was to “push the buttons” of audience members, and in that he seemed to succeed. In his text-dense slides, **Eden** shared a list of do’s and don’ts for libraries and those who work in them. He promised that his presentation would be posted in the conference site (it is). A “must read,” later probably searched for by most attendees, was the 2011 University Leadership Council report to provosts about libraries, “*Redefining the Academic Library: Managing the Migration to Digital Information Services*,” from which **Eden** highlighted several points (libraries are the “most valuable space on campus,” “transformational change,” etc.). **Eden** gave a pat on the back to “backroom people” because “they know how to describe documents.” Quite a few other authors, speakers, and various reports were cited to illustrate various themes. A boat theme emerged in the quote “If we don’t work as a team, we’ll sink with the boat,” and one questioner later asked **Eden** how can the smaller institutions (in a consortium, for example) help turn the direction of the Titanic. A self-improvement theme emerged as the speaker recommended a newsletter and various articles, and he reminded attendees that if one wants the real world to change, one has to stop complaining so one can contribute to results, and later — “there are always choices.”

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2011
INNOVATION SESSIONS

Kent State University Develops a New System for Resource Selection — Presented by **Kay Downey** (Kent State University)

Reported by: **Alison M. Armstrong** (McConnell Library, Radford University) <amarmstro@radford.edu>

Kent State has eight campuses with a total of 38,000 FTE. The collection management person is between requests, trials, and trial setup. **Kent State** (the collection person and others) decided that before a resource was subscribed to or purchased, it would not be put in the ILS (Millennium). While a resource is being trialed, they do not put it in the ILS at all, and it operates completely separate from the ILS until they decide to purchase/subscribe, at which point all of the data is imported into the ILS.

continued on page 74

And They Were There from page 73

They decided to use a content management system (CMS) to keep all of the pieces in one place. Students and faculty can see it, and librarians can score and add comments. There are different user profiles depending on an individual's function. In the request record they have an information checklist: we already have, we already have in print, etc.

This system keeps the process clear. There is a checklist for library and provider communications and standardized communication forms. There is a standardized price quote request process as well as a standardized feedback form with an open-ended comment field. The CMS tracks workflow and has helped manage the process, communication, made the process transparent, centralizes everything, and it identifies priorities for purchasing.

It would be nice to have the same process for consortia as well. They are hoping some of these elements will be integrated into an ILS in the future.

End User Tools for Evaluating Scholarly Content — Presented by **Carol Anne Meyer** (CrossRef)

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

Meyer started her presentation with case studies and examples of retracted articles, faculty authors who were forced to resign (over publishing scandals), and the non-standardized ways journals in the online world list retractions and corrections. The legacy of scholarly literature is of interest to **CrossRef**, and users deserve to know which version (of an article) to trust, which is the “version of record.” How can corrections be communicated by publishers (in a consistent fashion)? **CrossRef** believes that its CrossMark will address this challenge, and the first pilot was launched at **Vilnius Technological University (VGTU)** in Lithuania with its journal, *Business: Theory and Practice*. The launch is scheduled for 2012. The types of notifications that might be included in the pop-up window leading from the logo would indicate funding disclosures, publication history, and the like. **CrossRef** has prepared a number of presentations (including an article “What’s JAV Got to Do with It? Indicating Versions of Record with CrossMark.” *Against the Grain*. April 2011, p. 18.).

Many Hands Make Light Work, the American Version — Presented by **Frederick Zarndt** (CCS / Digital Divide Data / DL Consulting)

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

Zarndt, the current Chair of the Newspaper Section of **IFLA**, has been involved in digitization projects for many years. His presentation discussed preservation of historical newspapers, which are usually digitized with optical character recognition (OCR). Both newsprint and microfilm are often reproduced from sources (microfilm or deteriorated print) that provide end products with inferior print quality. Using crowdsourcing and inviting the public to correct the text facilitates a free and effective way of proofreading text, which has resulted in a more legible product for researchers.

The California Newspaper Digitization Project (<http://cdnc.ucr.edu/cdnc>), sponsored by the **University of California-Riverside**, is a part of the National Digital Newspaper Program (NDNP). It encourages users to correct text and has a list of the top correctors on its Website. The Australian Newspapers Digitisation Program (NDP) implemented a user text correction feature (UTC) when it launched its historical newspaper digitizing project. It is very popular, and text vandalism has not been a problem.

Hyde Park Corner — Presented by **Melody Burton** (Okanagan Library, University of British Columbia); **Kimberly Douglas** (California Institute of Technology)

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

The conference program reminds that “Hyde Park Corner in London is known as a place where one can go and express an opinion, sometimes even heresies.” Attendees can decide if the two speakers presented the points and counter-points attendees expected. As they stated at the outset, they wanted a “dialog” not a “debate,” passing the verbal baton back and forth. On **Burton**’s list of “something’s got to give” were budgets, jobs, salaries, “stuff we hate,” “stuff we love,” and that’s been going on a long time. **Douglas** indicated perhaps libraries need to focus on what our institutions need (e.g., a transition from “reader services” to “authoring services”), positioning the output so there’s public learning. A whirlwind tour of 2011 conference speakers’ comments included **Brad Eden**’s version of “tough love,” **Clifford Lynch**’s mention of scale and volume of the problem, and **Mark Dimunation**’s call to change and do what’s needed for legacy and the future. **Burton** encouraged a change in culture from defeatism to a culture of collaboration (“never let a good crisis go to waste”). New rules have to emerge, but we haven’t activated the reset button yet. Audience participation brought out other points — “just-in-time might work”; “universities are duplicative in the U.S.A.,” “librarians’ behavior is part of the problem,” the 2011 conference was about data. The relationship model of publishers and academic libraries has to change — it’s about serving scholarship. The bottom line? “Be the change you want to see” (again quoting closing speaker **Eden**).

Rump Session — Presented by **Katina Strauch** (Founder, Charleston Conference)

*NOTE: This session was moderated by **Katina Strauch**, who was joined by **Tom Gilson** (Associate Editor of *Against the Grain*) and in the beginning, the session was jumpstarted by **Ramune K. Kubilius** (a conference program director).*

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

In years past, **Charleston Conference** Rump Sessions often featured **College of Charleston** faculty or students sharing their insights about various pertinent information topics. In 2011, the Rump Session provided about a dozen “diehard” attendees the opportunity to share their thoughts about the conference, what they learned, what they liked (or did not), and what they suggested for future conferences. Many liked shotgun sessions. Some liked, others did not like, “revival meeting” style plenaries, such as the one presented by **Brad Eden** in the 2011 closing plenary on Saturday morning. One musical note (attendees tried to hum a few bars) was a possible 2012 theme, suggested during the Hyde Park Corner, “Stuck in the Middle with You,” which evolved, under coaxing by **Strauch**, into the more optimistic “Accentuate the Positive.” Was the Rump Session group correct in summarizing the 2011 conference as being about transformation-data, silos, hubs, and links, leaving the library, experimentation? Will the group’s suggested 2012 themes and speakers come to fruition and include business success cases and discussions about new roles and different sets of realities: legacy tasks, back end expertise, mergers, and convergences in “our world” — technical services, academic subject collections, and libraries? Will we hear secrets of the higher education mind (perhaps some library-friendly provosts?) The Rump Session broke up before the 2011 time capsule could be buried or the crystal ball for the 2012 conference “frozen for posterity,” and some attendees continued their discussion over an impromptu “dine-around” meal. 🍷

*Well, this completes the reports we received from the 2011 Charleston Conference. Again, we’d like to send a big thank you to all of the attendees who agreed to write short reports that highlight sessions they attended. Presentation material (PowerPoint slides, handouts) and taped session links from many of the 2011 sessions are available online. Visit the **Conference Website** at www.katina.info/conference. — KS*