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In this brief plenary session, Okerson familiarized attendees with the SCOAP3 project — its formation by a coalition of stakeholders operating under a fair share principle, each country contributing its own. From initial consultations in 2005, the project developed an early business model, received “expressions of interest,” with bids and evaluation, and publishers opting in. The “go live” date will be Jan. 2014 with a “reconciliation facility” for redirecting cost reduction increases. In a wider context, SCOAP3, though physics subject-oriented, can serve as an observatory, a case study, and libraries cannot afford to “opt out” of this trend. This type of activity can decrease subscription costs and provide a voice in governance, become part of the IR, and the larger OA community.

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 2012 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, highlighting those that were not printed in the conference’s final program (though some may have been reflected in the online program). Please visit the Conference Website, http://www.katina.info/conference, for the online conference schedule from which there are links to many presentations, handouts, plenary session videos, and plenary session reports by the 2012 Charleston Conference blogger, Don Hawkins. Visit the conference blog at http://www.against-the-grain.com/category/blog-posts/charleston2012/. The 2012 Charleston Conference Proceedings will be published in partnership with Purdue University Press in 2013.

In this issue of ATG you will find the final installment of 2012 conference reports. The first four installments can be found in ATG v.25#1, February 2013, v.25#2, April 2013, v.25#3, June 2013, and v.25#4, September 2013. Watch for 2013 Charleston Conference reports to begin next year in the February 2014 issue of ATG. — RKK

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2012
AFTERNOON PLENARY SESSIONS

SCOAP3: Going Live with the Dream — Presented by Ann Okerson (SCOAP3 Steering Committee Member, and Senior Advisor to CRL, Center for Research Libraries)

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

In this brief plenary session, Okerson familiarized attendees with the SCOAP3 project — its formation by a coalition of stakeholders operating under a fair share principle, each country contributing its own. From initial consultations in 2005, the project developed an early business model, received “expressions of interest,” with bids and evaluation, and publishers opting in. The “go live” date will be Jan. 2014 with a “reconciliation facility” for redirecting cost reduction increases. In a wider context, SCOAP3, though physics subject-oriented, can serve as an observatory, a case study, and libraries cannot afford to “opt out” of this trend. This type of activity can decrease subscription costs and provide a voice in governance, become part of the IR, and the larger OA community.

Find > Search — Presented by Marjorie Hlava (Access Innovations); Elisabeth Leonard (SAGE Publications Ltd); Meg White (Rittenhouse Book Distributors, Inc.); Stanley Wilder (UNC Charlotte); Elizabeth Willingham (Silverchair)

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

White served as moderator and the panel provided input to questions she posed — How do organizations view “search and find?” How are we doing? Can we do better, etc.? Leonard, representing vendors, stated that data must be analyzed — it explains usage, the patterns of authors, users, readers. One can’t sit with the user every day. Willingham mentioned that “search” starts at the authoring process: that is why it is so hard. Hlava maintained that designing a search algorithm is a 5% discovery and 95% knowing what the users want. Wilder argued that there is an element of “attitude” and “churn,” and that after building consensus on the centrality of issues, resources are poured into that area. Google sets the bar. As for the tolerance for false positives, there seems to be an expectation of “surprise me” rather than a definitive answer. “Don’t change the search, but where they go” (are led). Can users be educated about taxonomy, “library science meets computer science,” MARC vs. field data…? Consumers will look and look (for shoes or airline flights), but for medical searches, they want to know when “they are there”… Quoting an earlier plenary speaker continued on page 77

The Scholarly Publishing Scene
from page 75

occasion, however. Getting a dozen contributors for a book on sustainable manufacturing took less than a week. I give contributors nine months or so to submit their chapters (the human gestation period just feels right). I often have to wait longer, and sometimes I have to hound months or so to submit their chapters (the human gestation period just feels right). I often have to wait longer, and sometimes I have to hound months or so to submit their chapters (the human gestation period just feels right). I often have to wait longer, and sometimes I have to hound months or so to submit their chapters (the human gestation period just feels right). I often have to wait longer, and sometimes I have to hound months or so to submit their chapters (the human gestation period just feels right). I often have to wait longer, and sometimes I have to hound months or so to submit their chapters (the human gestation period just feels right). I often have to wait longer, and sometimes I have to hound months or so to submit their chapters (the human gestation period just feels right). I often have to wait longer, and sometimes I have to hound months or so to submit their chapters (the human gestation period just feels right).
“The Charleston Advisor serves up timely editorials and columns, standalone and comparative reviews, and press releases, among other features. Produced by folks with impeccable library and publishing credentials...is a title you should consider...”

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 9, 2012
HAPPY HOUR SESSIONS

Changing the DNA of Scholarly Publishing — The Impact of the Digital Leap — Presented by Rolf Janke (SAGE/CQ Reference); Lisa Jones (Georgia Gwinnet College); Damon Zucca (Oxford University Press)

Reported by: Robert Matuozzi (Washington State University Libraries) <matuozzi@wsu.edu>

Zucca (Oxford University Press) began with the new Oxford Handbooks Online series. Responding to information overload across scholarly disciplines, these edited Handbooks offer review essays on the current state of the literature. A collaborative approach including end-user research behaviors emphasizes the independent publication of chapter-level content and online access to similar content across OUP online products. Jones (Georgia Gwinnet College) described building a working collection of best available resources (streaming video, for example) with teaching faculty tapped as subject specialists, light curricular integration of library resources, and participation in a 32-institution consortium. Janke (SAGE/CQ Reference) contrasted the static “container” print monograph typically available to one user with digital and electronic ubiquity, evolving dynamic content, mobile apps, and enhanced format design.


NOTE: The speaker changed his presentation title to “5 Minute Fiction: Interstitial Publishing and Mobile Platforms.”

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

Esposito modified the title of his presentation and opened his remarks with the comment that the session would probably have no practical use for what they, attendees, hear, since it was more a speculative discussion. Still, he held the audience’s interest as he discussed technical and structural issues of the “born mobile” world, mentioned current mobile endeavors. A “detour” took the audience into audio publishing and the keys to its success. Esposito argued that “interstitial” publishing may provide opportunities in the world of fiction (5-10 minute “chunks”), and also may hold potential for certain parts of the scholarly publishing world, though he acknowledged there are types of content (e.g., STM) for which it might not be effective. “Interstitial” publishing can serve us during daily unplanned, but inevitable and opportune moments between larger events. Cumulatively, those moments make up hours each day. Presentations are often effective when presenters share stories, and Esposito did so with his personal anecdote about his reading (device) practices. How do we get from there to here (intersititial, mobile device—ready content)? There is value to legacy content, content needs to be “chunked,” there needs to be a new category of metadata, searching needs to be at the paragraph, not chapter level. As with anything else, users’ experience needs to be built upon and studied.

continued on page 78
Some Charleston Conference: Saturday morning “tech talks” can be not only about “tech” aspects of newly-released or upgraded products and services. Experienced conference attendee Burke described Udini, a product earlier available to individual researchers, and for the past eight months, available for institutional licensing. She broadened the discussion to highlight why such an information product is desirable — to alums, libraries, development offices, and universities. Burke, Udini seeks to address the needs of alums with broad ranging subject interests, and who may need information from various sources — journals, news publications, reports. Strategically, from the company’s perspective, was the development of a product that permits views of “free” full-text available (part of the licensed product), and also the “pay-per-view” option so searchers can access additional desired content. Burke highlighted points made at an earlier conference session on products and services for alums. She advised libraries to be strategic, “get the alum office to pay” for the product (the price is probably the cost of an annual alum dinner). Session attendees asked about the tiered business model, the “recruited content” for the product, and the recommended target group of alums, learning the development office jargon phrase, “addressable alums” — that is, all living alums.

_Continued on page 79_
New website with improved features & functionality!
Free trials now available!

More Convenient Access:
- Search results for the most recent books
- New Browse functionality, including Country Browse

Better and Faster Discovery:
- Improved search engine and metadata
- Robust faceting and filtering to narrow search results

More Research Tools and Conveniences:
- Enhanced citation and linking tools and options
- Improved content alerts
- Integration of World Bank data and Custom eBook Tool (Phase Two)

Look for us at Charleston 2013!
Contact onlineresources@worldbank.org for more information and free trial!
elibrary.worldbank.org
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SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2012
INNOVATION SESSIONS

All Together Now: Using an Internal Google Site to Streamline Workflows — Presented by Christa Poparad (Addlestone Library, College of Charleston)

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

Although not strictly about collection development or acquisition-related use of technology, this presentation by Poparad offered a case study on the use of Google Apps for Education (Desk Google) in one library with a large student worker population (and a 30% turnover). The application described was designed with input from 6 staff members, and its intent is to coordinate, inform, and train students who work in a merged information desk environment (formerly Student Computing Support Desk and the Reference Desk), to ensure they had the information they need to serve users. To stay in touch with student workers, their use of mobile devices was built into the designed application. The design was to ease scheduling and coordinate shift coverage, there was an emphasis on linking, not duplicating, disparate information. A Table of Contents in the Wiki assists in finding the spot to help answer questions at the desk, to provide easy access to library policies (including an affiliates’ table), and a secure place to store computer log ins and passwords. Reference questions are handled in a triage format, and consultation requests are encouraged. There is live chat, a knowledge base for questions, and links to reporting library technology problems, requesting ILL and media, booking library classes, etc. The Learning Management System has a checklist for student workers to learn library skills. Electronic resource problems are reported in the appropriate forms for further action.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2012
AFTERNOON PLENARY SESSIONS

Hyde Park Corner Debate: The Traditional Research Library Is Dead — Presented by Rick Anderson (University of Utah); Derek Law (University of Strathclyde)

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

This year a Hyde Park Corner Debate replaced a “what I learned at the conference and wish for next year” wrap-up session featured sometimes in this session timeslot. (The Rump Session later in the afternoon was available for those who wished to discuss the conference just concluded.) Two friendly foes, Anderson and Law, presented their viewpoints. Anderson argued that it’s not a format question but more of relevance. Our current system of classification is a mastodon. The practice of seeking out, gathering, and organizing (information) is no longer relevant. Our current system of classification is a mastodon. The practice of seeking out, gathering, and organizing (information) is no longer relevant. Although librarians help to construct research, that model is not scalable. Library interfaces to content are “hostile.” Reality won’t conform to our ideals. As we emerge from the ashes, the world of research will be the better for it. Law argued the “plus ça change” position, that the concerns of 12th-century Bologna still apply: faculty have budget concerns, students worry about tuition, rights holders are concerned about massive copying. Research institutions and their libraries are not children’s playgrounds and not democracies. Crowd

continued on page 80
sourcing and self-taught students are “lost boys.” Tradition is as it should be — marked by adaptability and flexibility. Ranganathan’s fifth law of library science still applies: “to provide the right information to the right user at the right time.” Audience members were invited to vote online, both at the beginning and end of the debate, and, it turned out, changed their votes from “no” (48% to 33%) to “yes” (52% to 67%) in the end — the traditional research library is dead.

---

**Rump Session – Charleston Conference Resolutions**

Compiled from notes taken by JoAnne Sparks (Macquarie University) <joanne.sparks@mq.edu.au>

As the last conference session, in recent years, the Rump Session has given those “last standing” (still in Charleston) an opportunity to share views about the conference just concluded and provide input on ideas for future conferences. This year, the discussion was moderated by Katina Strauch (College of Charleston and Charleston Conference founder) and Tom Gilson (College of Charleston, emeritus).

Well this completes the reports we received from the 2012 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 2012 sessions are available online. Visit the Conference Website at www.katina.info/conference. — KS

---

**I Hear the Train A Comin’ — “Too Much is Not Enough!”**

Column Editor: Greg Tananbaum (ScholarNext Consulting) <greg@scholarnext.com> www.scholarnext.com

The theme of this year’s 33rd Annual Charleston Conference is “Too Much Is Not Enough!” Normally, the conference theme provides easy fodder for me to generate my November column. I grab a few choice lines from the song and repurpose them to fit specific emerging trends in academic publishing. The artful lyrics of a Cole Porter or George Gershwin tune carry universal meanings that extend, with only minimal strain, to the world of scholarly communication. This year, however, presents a substantially greater challenge. A primary hurdle is that I am completely unfamiliar with the song “Too Much Is Not Enough” — who sings it, when it is from, and the lyrics are all a complete blank. A quick Web search reveals two possibilities — a 1986 collaboration between the Bellamy Brothers and the Forester Sisters, and the eighth track on the 1990 Deep Purple album, Slaves and Masters. The former, unfortunately, makes the artistic choice to repeat its chorus six times over its three-plus minute running time. I say “unfortunately” because the chorus burrows into the listener’s brain as follows:

Too much is not enough
Too much is not enough
Of your love, love, love
Too much is not enough
Too much is not enough
Of your love, love, love.

…so that holds little promise as column fodder. However, the Bellamy Brothers are like Leonard Cohen compared to the sledge-hammer subtlety of Deep Purple’s songwriting. Presumably, Against the Grain is a family publication, which makes quoting from these lyrics a challenge. Suffice it to say, the lead singer appears to have amorous intentions of an insatiable (and explicit) nature, hence the title, “Too Much is Not Enough!” It would not be possible for me to apply enough Purell to cleanly extract a column from the Deep Purple lyrics.

This is an extremely long-winded way of explaining that I am modifying the “pull a lyric” gimmick for this year’s Charleston column. While it would no doubt be an invigorating mental challenge to apply a line like, “Love is the crime, you stand convicted / You keep on coming back for more” to scholarly communication, I am lowering the degree of difficulty. Instead, let’s look at four issues in our industry that have generated significant attention in recent months, and that figure to continue to burn brightly in the days to come. These are topics for which too much discussion and attention is truly not enough.

**Open Data**

The idea that the raw building blocks of science — the data — should be made available for free reuse has gained traction on a number of fronts. Much of the attention pertaining to the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy’s memorandum on “Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Research” focused on the expectation that federal research agencies with R&D budgets of $100 million would develop public access for the literature their funding supports. However, the directive also encompasses research data. It decrees that “digitally formatted scientific data resulting from unclassified research supported wholly or in part by federal funding should be stored and publicly accessible to search, retrieve, and analyze.” This is but one prominent development in the realm of open data.

The European Commission held a public consultation on open access to research data in July inviting statements from researchers, industry, funders, publishers, and libraries. The result of this consultation may well be policy and financial support for open data as a component of “Horizon 2020,” the EU’s new program for research and innovation. From a practical standpoint, Dryad has emerged as a viable general-purpose repository to house the data underlying scientific publications. Dryad has integrated data submission for more than 30 journals, making it easy for scholarly authors to share their data with the world in an open manner.

OSTP, Horizon 2020, and Dryad, are representative of a growing support for open data. Proponents believe that sharing data openly facilitates increased discoverability and reusability, reduces the gaps in the research cycle, and lessens the likelihood that multiple laboratories will be pursuing duplicative research in siloed environments. With the delivery of federal agencies’ plans to implement the OSTP directive and the 2014 rollout of Horizon 2020, open data looks to remain in the spotlight.

**Article-Level Metrics**

Article-Level Metrics (ALMs) are rapidly emerging as important tools to quantify how individual articles are being discussed, continued on page 81