2014

Swets North America Scholarship Essay: 2013 Charleston Conference

Margaret Medina

Colorado State University, Margaret.Medina@colostate.edu

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

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

Recommended Citation

Medina, Margaret (2014) "Swets North America Scholarship Essay: 2013 Charleston Conference," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 26: Iss. 1, Article 13.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.6656>

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.

We Have A Winner!
Swets Revealed the 2013 Charleston
Conference Scholarship Recipient

Swets was proud to announce **Margaret Medina** as the winner of our \$1,000 scholarship to attend the **2013 Charleston Conference**. **Medina** is the Library Technician III of Monographs Section at **Colorado State University**.

Medina's essay, which explored the reality of the new library mantra "doing less with less" was an honest and insightful look at how her library is navigating workflows in the face of less budget dollars and less staff. The panel of judges praised **Medina's** winning essay as a dead-on characterization of issues librarians are facing today.

Medina was thrilled at the opportunity to partake in the **2013 Charleston Conference** — it was her first time attending. She explained, "I am honored and excited to win the **Swets Scholarship** to the **2013 Charleston Conference**. There are so many topics being explored in the sessions offered that make this a wonderful opportunity!"

"I can speak for the entire **Swets Charleston Scholarship** committee when I say that we were extremely impressed with **Margaret's** essay," stated **Kristin McNally**, Marketing Manager at **Swets**. "Every year we look forward to sending a deserving librarian to the conference for such an incredible opportunity to learn and grow with their colleagues, and I'm so excited that **Swets** was able to provide **Margaret** with this experience."

The **Swets Charleston Scholarship** committee is comprised of **College of Charleston's** Head of Collection Development and Founder of the **Charleston Conference**, **Katina Strauch**, **Chuck Hamaker**, Associate University Librarian for Collections and Technical Services at the **University of North Carolina-Charlotte**, and **Kristin McNally**, Marketing Manager at **Swets**.

About Swets

Swets is the global market leader in managing professional information. We develop and deliver innovating services that enable the use of knowledge to its full extent. From more than twenty offices around the world we actively serve clients and publishers in over 160 countries. Our active role in today's complex information marketplace has led *E-Content Magazine* to award us regularly in their annual "100 Companies that Matter Most in the Digital Content Industry." We are the only information agent to be ISO 9001:2008 certified on a global basis, which pays testament to our stringent operation and client service procedures. For more information on **Swets** see our Website, watch our videos or follow us on Google+, LinkedIn, Facebook, and Twitter.

Media Contact: Morgan Kaiser, Marketing Assistant. Tel: 856-312-2268, Fax: 856-632-7268, <mkaiser@us.swets.com>.

Swets North America Scholarship Essay — 2013 Charleston Conference

by **Margaret Medina** (Library Technician III, Monographs Section, Acquisitions and Metadata Services, Colorado State University) <Margaret.Medina@colostate.edu>

"In the past, we've always heard you need to do more with less. However, the new mantra seems to be to do less with less. To which do you adhere and why? Please address what information/metrics/services are essential and what can be eliminated."

Doing Less with Less in Monographs Acquisitions

In my 25 years with **CSU Libraries**, I have experienced the automation and technological advances that have allowed the Libraries to move the acquisitions and processing of library materials from a paper-based process to a computer-based workflow. In this time at **Colorado State University Libraries**, there has been a dramatic shift in collection development and acquisitions of monographic library materials. Prior to 2010, material selection was performed by librarians in their subject area of expertise. In 2010 we implemented the patron-drive acquisitions (PDA) of electronic books, a direction endorsed by a **CSU Libraries**-Information Technology Task Force. We started by loading weekly files of electronic book bibliographic records into our online catalog in 2010, and then in November 2011, we added Print demand-driven acquisitions (DDA) records to our online catalog.

The state of Colorado has seen a yearly reduction in higher education funding which has resulted in lower budgets for state universities. The trickle down effect has resulted in reduced dollars for the **CSU Libraries** and our Materials Budget. With most of our budget going towards Serials expenditures, Monographic spending has been greatly reduced. From fiscal year 2008-09 to FY 2012, there has been a 25% reduction in Monographic expenditure. In previous years we were purchasing more individual titles with less money and staff, we are now purchasing less individual titles with less money and less staff. Monographic expenditure in print and electronic in FY 2008-09 was \$29,709, and in FY 2012-13 it was \$10,591. In 2008, the Monograph unit had one department head, one administrative professional, and six classified staff members. With a hiring freeze and lay-offs in 2009, and loss of staff through retirement, and no salary increases for the last four years, classified staff have had to work more for less. Our Monograph section is presently at an all-time low of one faculty coordinator and three classified staff.

Technological advances have allowed our book vendor to provide discovery records for electronic titles in 2010 and print titles in 2011 into our online catalog for patron discovery and acquisitions. Our patrons are now making the Libraries' materials purchase decision for monographs. In 2008, a Library Collection study was done on ex-

penditures and circulation in our library. The circulation summary indicated that, of our 1.050 million **Library of Congress** classed volumes, 52.7% circulated at least once. The volumes had a publication date between April 1996 and August 2008.

For the electronic books, the short-term loans are eating up a lot of our budget so we have decided to lower the number of hits to result in a purchase. We now have enough discovery records in our catalog so that the DDA print records are being seen and requests for purchase are coming in from faculty and students almost on a daily basis. With purchase options in the catalog records, we let our patrons decide if they want the book shipped in 3-4 weeks or rush shipped at an extra cost to the library, and whether to be notified when the book is available for check-out.

Our Purchase Plan of monographic titles has been reduced as a result of less budget dollars to spend. We have eliminated all subject areas from our Purchase Plan except for subject areas of Literature and Veterinary Medicine. Faculty and students prefer to use materials in these subject areas in print format instead of electronic. As faculty are discovering, electronic books are much more useful for classroom instruction than putting a print book on Class Reserve.

We are also purchasing library materials through consortiums. We have an electronic book project with eight other libraries in the Colorado region so that the cost of the books purchased is shared by these participating libraries. This year **Colorado State University Library** is contributing more dollars to the project since our patrons purchased more books in the last year than the other libraries in the Alliance.

Smaller libraries in the consortium are benefiting since they are now jumping into the electronic book world.

As the purchaser of monographic materials for **Colorado State University Libraries** since July 2011, the purchase of a single title can now be a print version, eBook version with single user, multiple user or unlimited lending options at different price points. The print format may be published, but if a faculty wants the electronic version for multiple user access, do we wait for the electronic version or just order the print since it is available at the start of a semester? The ordering process has now become convoluted in relation to the published format of a book title and the intended use of a title.

Instead of spending money on individual monographic titles, **CSU Libraries** are also changing the expenditure of our materials dollars on online reference packages/collections of materials. These collections are

continued on page 39

purchased through our regional consortium with discounted costs.

Since 2008, **Colorado State University Libraries** have seen less budget dollars and less staff. To make the library more sustainable and relevant to our patrons, we have moved to a patron-driven acquisitions model for our monographic titles in print and electronic format. We have drastically reduced the number of monographs purchased since 2008. Also, there has been a reduction in the number of staff. We have instituted wherever possible a “cradle to grave” process and cataloging-at-receipt. With less budget dollars, less staff, and efficient workflow, we are doing less with less. 🌳

The Peripatetic Browser from page 37

Frederick Karl from the small discount rack. However, after some of the reviews I have seen on Amazon, I am having second thoughts about actually reading this colossal tome.

I dropped in very quickly to **The Iron Rail Book Collective** (no Website) which is, as one might expect, a small store largely focused on counter-cultural subjects. The French Quarter tour largely complete, I visited some stores in the rest of the city. **Maple Street Used and Rare Books**, <http://www.maplestreetbookshop.com/>, is two buildings, one of new and one of used books. Unfortunately, the used section was closed on this day. Next was **Blue Cypress Books**, <http://bluecypressbooks.blogspot.com/>, with a fairly standard selection of more modern used books. Finally, there was **McKeown's Books** (no Website). I did not make any purchases, and by now it was time to start home.

Overall New Orleans is a great city for book lovers. I highly recommend to anyone visiting that you request the book store map at the first store you visit. If you plan to do all the French Quarter stores in a day put on your walking shoes and have a rally point to drop books in case you get too ambitious in your purchases. Also stay focused. Depending on the time, there will be plenty of distractions in the way of Cajun food and cold beer that could prevent you from achieving your goal. If you have more than one day, well...Enjoy! 🌳

Book Reviews from page 36

archiving projects. This chapter effectively illustrates the advances being made in the field of personal digital archiving.

In the final chapter – “The Future of Personal Digital Archiving: Defining the Research Agendas” – **Clifford Lynch** of the **Coalition for Networked Information** brings the perspective of three decades of “trying to understand the ways in which information technology and ubiquitous computer communications networks are reshaping the scholarly and cultural record of our civilization.” He explores a dizzying assortment of possibilities for the future of personal digital archiving. 🌳

Don's Conference Notes

by **Donald T. Hawkins** <dt Hawkins@verizon.net>

Open Access To Published Research: Current Status and Future Directions: An NFAIS Workshop

Although many naysayers of open access (OA) exist, it is still important, and new directions are emerging. A workshop held by **NFAIS**, the **National Federation of Advanced Information Services**, in Philadelphia on November 22, 2013 entitled “Open Access to Published Research: Current Status and Future Directions” was very timely and appropriate. It drew an audience of 25 onsite and over 40 remote attendees.

Today's OA Landscape

Richard Huffine — Photo courtesy of Donald T. Hawkins.

Richard Huffine, Sr. Director, Federal Government Market, **ProQuest**, opened the workshop with a review of today's OA landscape. He began his presentation with a definition of OA from **Peter Suber**, co-founder of the Open Access Directory¹: “literature that is digital, online, and free-of-charge and most copyright and licensing restrictions.” This tag cloud shows some of the terms most frequently encountered in OA discussions.

Huffine reviewed the three generally accepted types of OA:

Gold: The cost barrier has been removed by journals with permission of the copyright holder. Gold OA includes journals dedicated to being open, articles in subscription journals, and supplemental data posted to an author-controlled site. Many gold publications are supported by Author Page Charges (APCs).

Green: The content is hosted on an institutional repository or is made available through “self-archiving” by the author or copyright holder. Publishers’ agreements govern what the author may do and what can be deposited in a repository.

Clear (Libre): Public domain content where the cost and usage restrictions have been removed. The main rights management

model is a **Creative Commons (CC)** license. Because data cannot be copyrighted, but a collection of it can, there will continue to be grey areas around derivative works derived from data, and many policies are not clear.

Mandates — policies requiring researchers to make their results freely available — are a recent OA trend. The U.S. Government has tried to legislate OA with little success; many of its proposals have been viewed as efforts to protect publishers’ investments. A recent memo from the **Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP)** directs agencies to develop plans supporting increased public access to research funded by the Federal government and requiring access to both the data and the publications.² Agencies were required to submit draft plans by August 2013 and begin collecting public input shortly thereafter, but the recent government shutdown severely delayed implementation of this mandate.

Huffine concluded that the ultimate outcome of today's OA issues may result in a variety of strategies depending on the research discipline and the willingness of researchers, institutional repositories, funders, and publishers to work together.

The Researcher's Perspective on OA

According to **Jean-Claude Bradley**, Associate Professor of Chemistry, **Drexel University**, openness in science is very field-specific because the amount of data to be shared varies significantly. The current research environment has created a selective bias towards which experiments are attempted because ambiguous or negative results are rarely reported in the literature. **Bradley** has created a “Chemical Rediscovery Survey”³ by doing a wide variety of experiments and making the data openly available for analysis. He has also assembled a database of data on over 20,000 chemical compounds, much of it donated by chemical companies.⁴ By making data openly available, many challenging chemistry questions can be answered more efficiently. **Bradley** was the first of several speakers who suggested that raw data should be made available before publication of a journal article, not afterwards as is now the case.

Government Responses to Researchers' Needs

The **National Science Foundation (NSF)** funds basic research in a wide range of disciplines with a mission to protect our ability to educate the next generation of scientists. Researchers funded by **NSF** publish their results in a wide variety of journals and are encouraged to make their data available through OA. The **OSTP** memo is aligned with the goals of **NSF**, but trust is important to sustain agency policies. **NSF** has a history of data sharing and fosters Gold OA by permitting researchers to include the APCs in their grant applications.

continued on page 42