2014

And They Were There: Reports of Meetings

Ramune Kubilius

Northwestern University, r-kubilius@northwestern.edu

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

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

Recommended Citation

Kubilius, Ramune (2014) "And They Were There: Reports of Meetings," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 26: Iss. 5, Article 50.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.6884>

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 — 33rd Annual Charleston Conference

Issues in Book and Serial Acquisition, “Too Much is Not Enough!” — Francis Marion Hotel, Embassy Suites Historic Downtown, Courtyard Marriott Historic District, Addlestone Library, College of Charleston, and School of Science and Mathematics Building, Charleston, SC — November 6-9, 2013

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 2013 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' PowerPoint slides and handouts, plenary session videos, and conference reports by the **2013 Charleston Conference** blogger, **Donald T. Hawkins**. Visit the conference blog at: <http://www.katina.info/conference/charleston-conference-blog/>. The **2013 Charleston Conference Proceedings** will be published in partnership with **Purdue University Press** in 2014.*

*In this issue of **ATG** you will find the fifth installment of 2013 conference reports. The first four installments can be found in **ATG** v.26#1, February 2014, v.26#2, April 2014, v.26#3, June 2014, and v.26#4, September 2014. We will continue to publish all of the reports received in upcoming print issues throughout the year. — **RKK***

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2013 LIVELY LUNCHES

A Guided Tour of Issues and Trends (The 13th Annual Health Sciences Lively Lunch) — Presented by **Deborah Bleic** (University of Illinois at Chicago); **Robin Champieux** (Oregon Health & Science University); **Elizabeth Ketterman** (East Carolina University); **Ramune K. Kubilius** (Northwestern University); **Marysue Schaffer** (Washington University, St. Louis); **Anneliese Taylor** (University of California, San Francisco); **Andrea Twiss-Brooks**, Moderator (University of Chicago)

NOTE: This was a sponsored lunch that required pre-registration.

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

The topic tour began after greetings from **Wendy Bahnsen** (lunch hosts were **Rittenhouse Book Distributors**). **Kubilius** provided the annual re-cap of the past year's various “family dramas” in the scholarly publishing world: births (new products), re-marriages (mergers), deaths (ceased products and titles). Starting her short introduction, moderator **Twiss-Brooks** joked that “if it's Friday, it must be data management day.” Library space is under pressure and budgets increasingly are under scrutiny, but collaborative opportunities abound, for example in health care policy and global health arenas. **Bleic** shared findings of her team's study of health sciences journals that found a high correlation between link-resolver, citation, and vendor data. She also reported on recent articles by others that discuss the impact of platform design on use statistics. **Champeaux** spoke on research and researcher profiling, impact study trends, and a different conversation about OA, moving from the “public good” argument, to strategic views on re-usability and reproducibility. **Schaffer** described the ten-year experience of **Washington University** with library-based bioinformaticists, subject experts who

serve as a bridge between the library and basic scientists. **Ketterman** shared her institution's two libraries' experience in developing a shared book collection policy for the multidisciplinary area of neuroscience. **Taylor** addressed current issues with eBooks, the choices and challenges of devices, formats, bundled as well as open content, budget constraints. The tour proceeded quickly, but time was left for a few questions after each brief presentation.

Changing Operations of Academic Libraries — Presented by **Jim Dooley** (University of California at Merced); **Allen McKiel** (Western Oregon University); **Robert Murdoch** (Brigham Young University)

*NOTE: **Dinesh Siddaiah** (Indian Institute of Technology Ropar) was unable to attend this session.*

Reported by: **Margaret M. Kain** (University of Alabama at Birmingham, Mervyn H. Sterne Library) <pkain@uab.edu>

Dooley, **McKiel**, and **Murdoch** discussed current trends and the impact in their respective libraries. In his comments, **Dooley** modified the session title, adding the words “Beyond Paper” to emphasize the most visible “gamechanger.” E-journals are now the largest part of the collection and provide the user with immediate access. Discovery services are being implemented in some libraries. Librarians are focused on mapping resources that match the users' needs; as such there has been a shift to usage and access away from purchase or subscription. Libraries are using the pay-per-view option for articles; demand-driven acquisition and short-term loans for eBooks. The goal is no longer to grow a large print collection but to focus on providing electronic access. Metadata is now being obtained from vendors; in-house metadata has been shifted to managing the quality control of vendor records rather than original cataloging. The physical library space has also changed; some changes include modular furniture, wifi, white boards. Libraries are now learning commons involved in activities such as self-publishing, creation of digital content. Library instruction is now integrated at the level of the assignment and an integral part of the curriculum. Students are working collaboratively and have a preference of working in the library where there are always people available to help.

Collection Development in the Network World: Where Do Libraries Add Value? — Presented by **Sheila Corral** (University of Pittsburgh)

Reported by: **Benjamin Sinnamon** (SILS Student, University of South Carolina) <sinnamon@email.sc.edu>

The session began with the premise that collection development has been historically central to the librarian profession. Also, libraries (and to some extent, librarians) have been judged by their collections with a focus on size and scope. **Corral** pointed out that library mission statements generally refer to making information available, which is very similar to Google's goal. The similarity should highlight the need for libraries to differentiate themselves from Google. The concept of

continued on page 93

And They Were There from page 92

“value-added” could be a way to create this differentiation. **Corrall** raised four questions for debate on how to add value in the collection development process. A lively discussion followed, expanding on the ideas brought up in the presentation. Two themes seemed to rise. First, the critical need for communication and collaboration between librarians, professors, vendors, and IT. Second, metadata access and making content discoverable. To quote one attendee, “We got rid of the catalogers and now we need them again.”

Consider this session to be “as advertised” (in the conference program).

Creating a New Collections Allocation Model for these Changing Times: Challenges, Opportunities, and Data — Presented by **Gregory Crawford** (Pennsylvania State University); **Lisa German** (Pennsylvania State University)

Reported by: **Alexis Linoski** (Savannah College of Art and Design) <adlinoski0812@yahoo.com>

This session discussed the revamping of the budget allocation formula at **Pennsylvania State University**. With budgets being cut, this was a timely and well-done topic. After surveying their users, several recommendations were made. Some of these were:

- The collection would be location bound, but would be viewed as one collection;
- The allocation would be aligned with the academic structure;
- Funds for major electronic resources would be taken off the top (amount would be reviewed yearly);
- All libraries (there are 23 in the system) would receive some minimal level of funding.

The formula itself includes: enrollment, number of degrees, number for faculty, number of students (graduate students rated higher), number of credit hours by course level, and the number of degree programs per academic department. Underdeveloped areas would perhaps receive additional weighting.

Facing Fears About Deselection and eBooks; Strategies to Help Both Faculty and Librarians Feel Safe — Presented by **Carol Cramer** (Wake Forest University); **Ellen Daugman** (Wake Forest University); **Caroline Mills** (Furman University)

Reported by: **Robert Weaver** (Liberty University) <rweaver@liberty.edu>

The presenters opened this session by asking for a volunteer, and your intrepid **ATG** reporter stepped up. An old directory of government publications was torn up to visually emphasize that we should not fear to weed our collections of items which no longer have value.

The presenters laid out some tested techniques for minimizing fears about weeding:

- Get the librarians behind the project — a united front gives support you need.
- Get the teaching faculty involved — listen to and address their concerns, without surrendering control of the project.
- Have deselection guidelines: Ongoing, Data-Driven, Multi-phased, Inclusive. Multi-phased is one of the most important guidelines, as interested parties need to know that nothing is going to happen overnight. There should be reasonable time allowed for all stakeholders to be informed and give input on weeding decisions.
- Keep everyone informed at every stage of the project. Nothing dispels fears like knowing what’s going on.

The presenters suggested creating a LibGuide or weeding blog to publish updates to the project. One-on-one meetings with interested faculty work well to keep them supportive.

The Session ended with a lively give-and-take question session. By the end no one seemed afraid to weed!

Is There a Future for Collection Development Librarians? — Presented by **Tom Karel** (Franklin & Marshall College)

Reported by: **Sarah Pettus** (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <pettuss@email.sc.edu>

Karel began by briefly discussing how the collection development process happened in the past when librarians used to sift through publisher catalogs in their print form. Now patron-driven acquisitions and vendor changes are altering the way collection development functions. Further, university faculty are less interested in actually ordering the books themselves and are not well informed on how the eBook industry can influence a collection.

For academic libraries, a weeding project is a delicate task. In this instance, the faculty will definitely have an opinion on which material stays and which material is tossed. One piece of advice that **Karel** gave was “be ruthless but not reckless” when weeding out a collection, especially a special or unique collection. He also stated that the faculty will have journals in mind for the serials side of acquisitions; those are important to bring into the collection. Recently faculty members have been requesting more videos and moving image materials. Some of the items are in a format that is outdated or the rights cannot be obtained. Librarians are encouraged to work with the faculty in the acquisitions and collection development processes to enhance the collection experience.

Rethinking Your Acquisitions — Presented by **Michelle D’Couto**, Moderator (ProQuest), **Jeffrey Daniels** (Grand Valley State University); **Tracey Leger-Hornby** (Worcester Polytechnic Institute); **Cyril Oberlander** (SUNY College at Geneseo)

Reported by: **Veronica Fuller** (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <fullerv@email.sc.edu>

In this interesting session, the panelists answered questions given by the moderator, **D’Couto**. The first question was “What does acquisitions mean in your library?” The panelists discussed how they are moving away from traditional models due to different options being available now. Librarians should stop focusing on the process but on how they do the process and why, such as getting patrons the materials they need. The next two questions asked were “How has acquisitions changed in the last three years? How will it change in the next five years?” A few of the answers included having a balance of print and digital content, doing heavy weeding, and getting past building permanent collections. The following question was “Are you considering a DDA program?” One panelist was already doing a variety of DDA programs while another was doing a small pilot program. None of the panelists liked all of the eBook interfaces and platforms. The last question asked was “How do you address the challenges of DDA?” Once again, the panelists discussed how too many interfaces are complicated and cumbersome. Something is needed to consolidate them all. I felt this session was as described in the program.

Revising a Collection Development Manual: Challenges and Opportunities — Presented by **Tony Bremholm** (Tulane University); **Joshua Lupkin** (Tulane University); **Eric Wedig** (Tulane University)

NOTE: Session title was changed by the presenters to ***Collection Development Manuals and Their Discontents***

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

Hurricane Katrina wreaked havoc in many ways for libraries in New Orleans, and **Tulane University** was no exception. Post-Katrina, collec-

continued on page 94

And They Were There from page 93

tions decisions needed to be made quickly, but nearly eight years later staff wanted to revisit their policy document in light of personnel changes, position responsibilities, and strategic planning. This session shared the process for revising **Tulane's** collection development manual and some of the challenges faced during that process. **Bremholm** discussed a shift away from focusing on collections and what that means for libraries — a worthwhile topic for discussion, but one which seemed somewhat tangential in this context and which would have been better served by a separate presentation. **Lupkin** facilitated the bulk of the discussion, emphasizing the importance of documenting both best practices and failures, as well as tracking institutional decision-making history. While a manual can take many forms, staff should consider the document's purpose, relevant stakeholders, and the library's culture when deciding what type of collection development manual will work best at their institution.

Streaming Video in Academic Libraries: Preliminary Results from a National Survey — Presented by **deg farrelly** (Arizona State University); **Jane Hutchison** (William Paterson University)

Reported by: **Calida Barboza** (Ithaca College)
<cbarboza@ithaca.edu>

farrelly and **Hutchinson** presented the results of their 2013 survey of the current state of streaming video in academic libraries with regard to prevalence, responsibility, hosting platforms, and discovery. During the session, instrument design, content, and responses were discussed. As described in the program schedule, funding, access methods, day-to-day treatment of content, acquisitions models, technological infrastructure, staffing needs, adherence to copyright laws, metadata, digitization, and policies related to streaming video were covered. Demographic data of survey respondents were also presented. The presenters identified the following areas for additional research: case studies for work flow and personnel demands, use data, return on investment, cost per use, quality of and satisfaction with vendor catalog records and metadata, analysis of interfaces, and interaction of streaming video with discovery tools. **farrelly** and **Hutchinson** will publish their findings in *Against the Grain*.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2013 AFTERNOON CONCURRENT SESSIONS 1

Copyright in the Digital Era: The HathiTrust and Georgia State University Cases — Presented by **Jack Bernard** (Associate General Counsel, University of Michigan)

Reported by **Posie Aagard** (University of Texas at San Antonio Libraries) <Posie.Aagard@utsa.edu>

This fast-paced and information-packed session, presented by **University of Michigan's** legal counsel, provided a summary of the **George State University** and **HathiTrust** appeals.

The presenter began with some similarities:

- Both cases were federal suits that listed university libraries and their officers as defendants.
- Both defendants won their initial cases.
- Both plaintiffs appealed.
- For both, the plaintiffs must proffer a 'prima facie' case. (Through litigation, they must prove their cases.)
- The copyright holder must prove that he's the proper holder.
- Defendants made infringing, substantial (not de minimis) use of a protected portion of a plaintiff's works.

Both appeals' rulings are positioned to set or reverse precedents related to fair use under copyright law. **Bernard** stepped the audience through the fair use checklist that the circuit judge applied to the Georgia State case in determining that the uses of materials in online course reserves were not infringing. The **HathiTrust** case established some important new guidelines related to transformative use: The court ruled that Section

108 is NOT precluded by any other section of the law for libraries; and searching, indexing, preservation, and access for individuals with print disabilities do NOT constitute copyright infringement.

All of the materials presented were interesting, informative, and necessary to set the context. The only regret for this session was insufficient time for questions.

Data to Decisions: Shared Print Retention in Maine — Presented by **Becky Albitz** (Bates College); **Deb Rollins** (University of Maine)

Reported by: **Pamela Bobker** (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <bobker@email.sc.edu>

At last year's **Charleston Conference**, the Maine Shared Collections Strategy (MSCS) grant was presented as part of the Shared Print Archiving: Making it Work preconference; this year, **Albitz** and **Rollins** gave an update on this project. Funded in part by the **Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS)**, this is collaboration among eight of Maine's largest libraries, plus the state's consortium, and is an effort to review and analyze collections data in order to make decisions for retaining print copies of materials. In this presentation, **Albitz** and **Rollins** summarized the MSCS partners, project goals, the significant challenges of gathering and analyzing the collections data, the decision process, and the importance of disclosing retention decisions. The goal of the project was a shared approach to managing legacy print collections for the future. The plan uses a distributed model, rather than a centralized storage facility. Titles with retention commitments are owned and stored in the owning library and continue to circulate as usual. The project also involves eBook-on-demand and print-on-demand service models. Going forward, the plan is to set up a governance and business model that will sustain the work beyond the IMLS grant. The speakers did an excellent job of presenting the material.

Do Approval Plan Purchases Circulate More Than Firm Orders? — Presented by **Kay Downey** (Kent State University); **Rob Kairis** (Kent State University at Stark)

Reported by: **Melody Dale** (Mississippi State University)
<mdale@library.msstate.edu>

In this session, **Downey** and **Kairis** discussed their findings from an analysis comparing circulation of firm orders versus approval plan orders. Although the speakers noted possible inaccuracies in relating usage to value (for example, the inability to know if circulated material is actually read), the lack of other ways to evaluate value of materials makes usage statistics the most useful tool available. Findings showed very little statistical difference in usage of firm orders and approval slip orders, with an average of 4.5 uses per book regardless of the acquisitions model. Similarly, the subject coverage of firm orders and approval plan orders had little statistical difference. Despite the low statistical difference in usage and subject coverage however, the average price of approval plan orders (\$12.40) was lower than the cost of firm orders (\$7.82) in **Kent State University** at Stark. The average cost per use of print serials during the same time period was nearly \$365, which may be a future area of study for the presenters. The overarching finding of the study was that usage of print monographs is still significant and a sound investment.

How is That Going to Work? Rethinking Acquisitions in a Next-Generation ILS — Presented by **Megan Drake** (Pacific University); **Siôn Romaine** (University of Washington); **Kathleen Spring** (Linfield College)

Reported by: **Kristina M. Edwards** (Bridgewater State University) <Kristina.edwards@bridgew.edu>

During this session three librarians from member libraries of the Orbis Cascade Alliance talked about their recent move to a shared **ExLibris'** Primo ILS. Each acquisitions department had to work to redefine their

continued on page 95

Your Library—eImagined for Health Sciences

- 24/7 user access to health science database
- eBook Database for fast content search
- Purchase and Patron Driven Acquisition models available
- Pay only once—for the life of the edition

Visit **R2Library.com**
Start your free 30 day trial today!

R₂ DIGITAL
LIBRARY

Visit **R2Library.com** to learn more
Or call us at 800.345.6425 x600

Rittenhouse Book Distributors, Inc.
511 Fehleley Drive | King of Prussia, PA 19406
www.rittenhouse.com

And They Were There from page 94

workflows and procedures as a result of this new move to Primo. Each library did extensive testing to fully understand how the new system works and how the system treats the various aspects of acquiring materials of different types. Through their testing they also had to ensure that the system was fully functional and worked properly to meet their needs. Throughout the process each library also needed to decide what data needed to be migrated and mapped from their current one to the new Primo system. Decisions also needed to be made about database cleanup. Depending on what areas needed to be cleaned up, each library had to decide if they were going to do the cleanup before migration or if it made more sense to do it as an ongoing project after the migration. This presentation gave a great overview of the various issues involved in a migration as well as pointed out that such a move, while a lot of work, provided a new opportunity for the acquisitions librarians to re-evaluate their workflows and find new ways to streamline processes.

Metadata and Open Access — Reliably Finding Content and Finding Reliable Content — Presented by **Sommer Browning** (University of Colorado Denver); **Jean-Claude Guédon** (University of Montreal); Laurie Kaplan (Proquest)

Reported by: **Julia Hess** (Helen K. and James S. Copley Library, University of San Diego) <jlhess@sandiego.edu>

This fascinating session looked at the concept of open access metadata from two perspectives: those of a librarian and of a university professor. **Kaplan** opened with a brief history of open access and an explanation of the concern many have with the reliability of open access content. **Browning** then spoke about her experience with open access content in the library catalog, noting common obstacles, such as the increased difficulty

of troubleshooting technology problems and the lack of control libraries have over the content's accessibility. She proposed that more transparency would solve many of these problems, specifically suggesting that contact information and technical details should be included in metadata for open access materials. Finally, **Guédon** gave attendees a professor's perspective on the issue, listing several types of information he would like to see in metadata in open access repositories, emphasizing the importance of licensing information and a reliability indicator. This panel provoked much discussion about the problems posed by open access and the standards for open access metadata recently proposed by a **NISO** working group.

Pitch Perfect: Selling to Libraries and Selling Libraries to Non-Users — Presented by **Dave Celano** (Springer); **Melissa Oakes** (ProQuest); **Marianne Ryan** (Northwestern University); **Mark Sandler** (Committee on Institutional Cooperation)

Reported by: **Emily Whitmire** (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <whitmier@email.sc.edu>

"Pitch Perfect" challenged librarians to think of their work "in the context of sales," opening a new way of thinking in terms of hiring, management, and daily practices among library staff.

Sandler (Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), Director, Center for Library Initiatives) emceed the presentation with the theme of the 1992 film *Glengarry Glenn Ross*, relating **Alec Baldwin's** sales tactics throughout. **Sandler** pointed out that academic libraries have a large customer base that they can convert to users. Library staff can use upselling techniques to increase value to current users. **Celano** (Springer, VP for Library Sales) described qualities that make a good salesperson, including good sense, ability to think on one's feet and be a closer. He stressed that it takes time to build trust and networks. **Oakes** (ProQuest, Sales Manager) emphasized the importance of active listening, asking

continued on page 96

And They Were There from page 95

thoughtful questions, and understanding how a product selector makes decisions. She noted that the ability to help the selector seek budget approval for a product is vital to sales skills. **Oakes** outlined the characteristics of a successful sales organization, such as understanding its goals and knowing the customers.

Referencing the lack of chemistry between **Natalie Portman** and **Hayden Christiansen** in *Star Wars* Episodes II and III, **Ryan** (Northwestern University, Associate University Librarian for Public Services) discussed ways to improve the relationships between faculty and librarian liaisons. She emphasized a proactive approach, providing training, support, clear expectations, and collaboration with campus and vendor partners. **Ryan** recommends librarians use the force to guide active communication among the stakeholders. **Sandler** concluded the presentation with the reminder that “libraries are only as useful as they are used” and libraries must use the tools discussed to develop staff in marketing skills to create new users.

Secrets in Vendor Negotiations — Presented by **Matt Dunie** (Data-Planet); **Carl Grant** (University of Oklahoma Libraries); **Michael Gruenberg** (Gruenberg Consulting)

Reported by: **Calida Barboza** (Ithaca College)
<cbarboza@ithaca.edu>

The presenters described the elements of a negotiation (objectives, timetable, team, and strategy) and, as stated in the session abstract, they provided actionable takeaways that attendees can use in negotiations with vendors. They advised librarians to negotiate and buy collaboratively and to demand that vendors defend their price quotes. The presenters divulged that vendors won't immediately tell librarians the price of a product because they don't know what librarians are going to make them go through before the sale is made. They stated that by asking for pricing right away, librarians lose leverage. Attendees were advised to save trials for closer to when they think they are going to subscribe to a product and to run a minimal procurement process to use as a bargaining chip when asking for a larger discount during price negotiations.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2013 SHOTGUN SESSIONS

Next Gen ILL: Tales From the Trenches — Presented by **Becky Imamoto** (University of California, Irvine)

Preparing Perpetual Access Holdings Data with Perl: Context, Workflow and Scripts — Presented by **Viral Amin** (Marymount University)

The High Cost of Too Much — Presented by **Susan Klimley** (Columbia University)

Comparing Statistics across Platforms—Dos and Don'ts — Presented by **Deborah Kegel** (University of California, San Diego)

NOTE: The third and fourth listed presenters switched the order of their presentations.

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

Four short presentations made up this session. In the first, **Imamoto** described a series of pilot studies dating back to 2011 that examined savings in time and money in building the collection. All were built around ILL requests for books, sometimes substituting purchase for ILL. Pay-per-article will be the next pilot. Former programmer **Amin** put his skills to the test to merge and normalize e-journal holdings lists from two lists (consortial and local). The goal was to identify unique titles,

gaps, merge dates available, making data manipulatable, but admittedly, in the end, he noted that no one approach offered the perfect solution. **Kegel** shared insights into usage data challenges for journals, eBooks, and databases. She gave examples on how to identify normal variations vs. anomalies; strange or odd eBook usage. Sometimes one has to be a good diagnostician to determine the true problem: Was the wrong title turned off? Is the resource OA? What is counted? She highly recommended some techniques learned in the preconference. Like all of the speakers, **Kendall** was passionate about her topic. Who can afford “too much,” she asked. How can libraries move beyond big deals with their titles patrons want mixed in with titles they can't use, and costs that exceed inflation? She advocated for the return of the selector and recognition of the value a library brings as a purchasing agent.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2013 AFTERNOON CONCURRENT SESSIONS 2

Contemplating e-Scores: Open Ruminations on the E-score, the Patron, the Library, and the Publisher — Presented by **Lisa Hooper** (Tulane University)

Reported by: **Calida Barboza** (Ithaca College)
<cbarboza@ithaca.edu>

Hooper explained how the needs of readers of musical texts differ from the needs of readers in other disciplines. In her overview of the current state of e-scores, she described the intent of providers of e-score products, database features, interface limitations, and vendor-facilitated self-publishing for composers. She also talked about the possible future of e-scores and commercial publishers' ability to include the features and functionality professional musicians want in their products. Among the problems **Hooper** found with e-scores are the impracticality of using some of them in a performance setting, the increasing number of errors being introduced into the music, and the limitation of database content to scores that are out of copyright. **Hooper** asserted that librarians should be concerned about e-scores because professional musicians are using them. She wondered if librarians are failing to meet the needs of faculty and students by not providing access to e-scores. After the formal presentation, attendees gathered in small groups to discuss ideal solutions to the issues **Hooper** presented, the barriers to enacting these solutions, and other problems that might arise.

Creating Screen Literacy: Bridging the New Digital Divide — Presented by **Lindsay Johnston**, Moderator (IGI Global); **Paul Chilsen** (Carthage College); **Todd Kelley** (Carthage College); **Christine Wells** (Carthage College)

Reported by: **Tara Cassidy** (Virginia's Community Colleges)
<tcassidy@vccs.edu>

Johnston moderated this session in which **Chilsen** (Carthage College, Associate Professor of Communication and Digital Media), **Kelly** (Carthage College, VP for Library and Information Services), and **Wells** (Carthage College, Adjunct Faculty, Education Department) each provided insights on the digital media creation landscape, an increasingly critical component of communication literacy in a culture where roughly 90% of our media interactions are screen-based. Communication literacy, or creating knowledge out of information and communicating it effectively, is a natural evolution of information literacy. Communication literate students mediate and create with technology, are critical media consumers, understand that there is an audience online, and understand the importance of one's voice and original work. Libraries deliver technology tools and basic how-tos, but communication literacy instruction for digital natives is often the missing link.

Several institutions are beginning to consider courses that teach digital media creation in the same light as writing intensive courses. Could a quality student film project take the place of a written paper, and even be more accountable by virtue of wider audience? It's not enough to simply access YouTube and the rest of the media landscape; students also need to understand the tools and skills to communicate via media rather

continued on page 97

And They Were There from page 96

than exclusively consuming. Regardless of the level of technological sophistication, student empowerment comes from seeing their work on the screen and understanding what it takes to execute this kind of work, rather than becoming a media guru.

Ebooks Down Under — Presented by **Tony Davies** (Swinburne University of Technology); **Michelle Morgan** (University of Western Australia)

Reported by: **Christine Fischer** (UNC Greensboro)
<cmfische@uncg.edu>

This engaging presentation offered the history and current status of eBook DDA programs at two universities in Australia. According to **Davies**, Swinburne launched DDA with **EBL** in 2006. For titles autopurchased in the first six months based on their established criteria, 75% had loans following the purchase. The library was more recently able to compare librarian-selected and autopurchased eBooks in a case study of around 2,200 titles divided nearly equally between the two acquisitions methods. All books purchased via DDA had subsequent loans, while 21% of the librarian-selected titles had loans following purchase. Selection practices were revised to reflect what was learned. The experience described by **Morgan** was similar for their library's 2010 pilot DDA project — 77% of autopurchased eBooks saw additional use. Two years later 99.59% of titles added to the collection through DDA were being used subsequent to purchase. The popularity of eBooks with users and the cost-effectiveness of DDA ensure continued support of the e-preferred program. Discussion during the question and answer portion of the session included user reaction to eBooks, usage statistics, subject coverage, and profile changes over time based upon assessment.

Libraries and their Role in Open Access: Challenges and Opportunities — Presented by **Laura Morse** (Harvard University Library); **François Renaville** (University of Liège Library); **Christine Stohn** (Ex Libris)

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

Approximately thirty people attended this session where three well-organized presenters discussed the changing ecosystem of scholarly communication and the changing roles of libraries. **Stohn** (Ex Libris) discussed how librarians had important roles to play in managing the institutional research output and providing discovery for both articles and research data beyond institutional subscriptions. **Morse** (Harvard University Library) discussed varying open access policies across Harvard and how metadata is made available for harvest. She pointed out that there is an enormous opportunity for librarians for the creation and verification of metadata and for bibliographic research. **Renaville** (University of Liège Library) reviewed open access at the University of Liège and the decision of the University to create an institutional bibliography and repository. According to **Renaville**, librarians have important roles as coaches to help authors deposit works and to make the works available. The session and speakers presented a variety of examples of libraries and others working together to enhance the roles of libraries and librarians in open access. The presenters asked librarians in the audience what their libraries are doing to concretely promote open access. The audience was also asked for their ideas on how others might become involved.

Making “Too Much” Manageable and Discoverable: How Publishers, Vendors and Libraries Can Work Together to Help User Unlock the Full Potential of the Library Collections — Presented by **Jesse Holden** (USC); **Alexandra Lange** (Elsevier); **John Law** (ProQuest); **Sadie Williams** (ProQuest)

Reported by: **Alexis Linoski** (Savannah College of Art and Design)
<adlinoski0812@yahoo.com>

This session discussed how publishers, vendors and libraries are working to streamline the process for maintaining accurate holdings, thus increasing discoverability of resources. Currently libraries manage holdings via the catalog, along with other tools to facilitate access. This session challenged attendees to consider moving past managing all assets via the library catalog.

Two notable initiatives were presented. **Elsevier** is working on a metadata exchange from the publisher side that would provide not only subscription information directly to **Serials Solutions**, but open access articles as well. They are also looking at ways to share holdings with Google (there would be an opt out option). The hurdle here will be data quality and format.

Along these same lines, the **University of Southern California** is working with **ebrary** and **Serials Solutions** on an agreement to automatically activate eBook titles purchased via **ebrary** in **Serials Solutions**.

Both of these initiatives relieve the libraries of the task of activating holdings in **Serials Solutions**. It was an interesting discussion.

Open Access Publishing Funds in Action: The Experience at Three Libraries — Presented by **Robin Champieux** (Oregon Health & Science University); **Margaret Moore** (University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill); **Doug Way** (Grand Valley State University)

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

While about 60 percent of journals listed in DOAJ don't charge processing fees, larger, more prominent journals do charge and many have a hybrid model. The SPARC site contains survey results of libraries that have funds. The three libraries represented in this session illustrated different funding sources and implementation of OA funds. **Grand Valley** launched its program in 2011 to remove financial barriers to making content OA and increases awareness. It uses central library funding and partnered with the campus research office. Challenges include raising awareness, maintaining the fund while at the same time, resources are being cancelled. A **Grand Valley** biology professor's contention probably rings true — “I love the idea of OA but it takes a program like this to make it a reality.” **UNC Chapel Hill's** experience dates back to 2005, but since June 2013, the program has been suspended and funding, perhaps through an endowment, is being sought. During the course of the fund, begun as a pilot, the health sciences and academic library shared costs, with the health sciences library managing the fund. Surveys were done in 2006 and 2011. **OHSU's** experience, a pilot, was only one year in duration. The pilot raised the visibility of OA and the library, but it was decided to perhaps move efforts (and investment) into an institutional repository and various library publishing initiatives.

Shared Print on the Move: Collocating Collections — Presented by **Rebecca Crist** (Committee on Institutional Cooperation); **Sherri Michaels** (Indiana University)

Reported by: **Melody Dale** (Serials Cataloger, Mississippi State University)
<mdale@library.msstate.edu>

With many libraries faced with overcrowded stacks and the need for study spaces, librarians are finding new ways of working with each other to collocate collections. In this session, **Crist** and **Michaels** discussed

continued on page 99

And They Were There from page 97

the benefits of collocating shared print storage among the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC), a consortium comprised of fifteen universities. Some of the benefits of shared print mentioned include remedying overcrowded stacks and cost-effectiveness of partnership, and the speakers conveyed the significance of librarians' natural instincts as sharers in making the partnership successful. Additionally, the collocation of materials provided further benefits, such as the pooling of resources and the ability to ensure that materials are kept in preservation-quality storage. The various roles of partner libraries were discussed, including hosts, contributors, and borrowers. It was emphasized that each contributor retains ownership of materials regardless of relocation to a partner library's facility. The CIC is currently working towards a comprehensive collection of scientific journals which will be housed in a storage facility at Indiana University, and they have created a gap list which they hope to fill in the future.

Working Better Together: Library, Publisher and Vendor Perspectives — Presented by **Maria Collins** (North Carolina State University); **Nicole Pelsinsky** (ProQuest); **Mary Somerville** (University of Colorado Denver); **Aaron Wood** (Alexander Street Press)

Reported by: **Heather Donnellan** (Elsevier, Science and Technology Books) <h.donnellan@elsevier.com>

This panel took us through examples of collaboration between libraries, publishers, and vendors, and how these collaborations can produce new workflows for libraries and improve discoverability for researchers. Each presenter represented a different sector, providing examples of real partnerships and the benefits that resulted from each. (**Collins** is Head, Acquisitions and Discovery, **North Carolina State University**; **Pelsinsky** is Manager, Global Implementation Services, **Serials Solutions, ProQuest**; **Somerville** is University Librarian, **University of Colorado Denver**; **Wood** is VP, Systems and Data Architecture, **Alexander Street Press**). Examples included expectations from both parties in order to make the most out of the partnership, like vendors providing library partners with training and reporting, and those libraries choosing services that complement, not compete with, in-house systems. Wins included tangible results like optimized metadata, and cultural changes like library staff thinking broader and smarter.

It was easy to see that each presenter had a lot of information and examples on the topic. The examples and benefits given were very clear, and the way each presentation built on each other made it easy for the audience to follow.

*That's all the reports we have room for in this issue. Watch for the final reports from the 2013 Charleston Conference in the next issue of **Against the Grain**. Presentation material (PowerPoint slides, handouts) and taped session links from many of the 2013 sessions are available online. Visit the **Conference Website** at www.katina.info/conference. — KS*

Rumors from page 91

oggy-educational-outcomes-cost?utm_source=internal&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=billbowen101414

Speaking of which, there will be an intriguing session with **Joe Esposito**, **Roger Schonfeld**, **Deanna Marcum**, and **Susan Stearns** on Thursday, November 6, called "The Spaces Between: A Research Agenda Between Librarians, Publishers, and Vendors."

Just heard that the versatile **Scott Alan Smith**, Library Director at **Langlois Public Library** who also has an article in this issue of *ATG* (p.102), will once again be donning his bookseller hat. **Scott** will soon begin working with the hard-chargin'ly wonderful **Jay Askovich** and the

continued on page 101

Facebook and Twitter icons with PROQUEST.COM text.

CREATE AWESOME RESEARCH MOMENTS

With ProQuest®
Research Companion.

Designed to enhance student research and critical thinking skills, this information literacy product effortlessly guides students through the research process by combining:

- More than 100 embeddable short instructional videos
- Assessment capabilities
- Customization features
- Interactive research evaluation tools

This easy-to-use resource supports library and faculty information literacy instruction to create a solid foundation for lifelong learning.

TO REQUEST A TRIAL AND PRICING, VISIT
http://go.proquest.com/research_companion.