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I had the chance to attend the Association of College & Research Libraries Biennial Conference in Portland, Oregon this year. The conference had a large number of sessions on a variety of topics. This year I was most interested in the data-related sessions, and below are two highlights.

Amanda Whitmire, Heather Coates, and Jenny Muilenburg held an excellent session on creating data management curricula at their universities. All three have developed courses or workshops on the best practices of research data management (RDM). Amanda Whitmire from Oregon State University described her two-credit, ten-week course for graduate students that incorporates Data Information Literacy (DIL) pedagogy (http://wiki.lib.purdue.edu/display/site/Home). Her course was open to students from all disciplines, and provided graduate students a forum to apply data management best practices to their discipline-specific projects. She used a variety of resources to build the class, including the DataOne Modules (https://www.dataone.org/education-modules) and the New England Collaborative Data Management Curriculum (NECDMC) lesson plans (http://library.umassmed.edu/ necdmc/index). You can view her class guide for more information at http://guides.library.oregonstate.edu/grad521.

Jenny Muilenburg from the University of Washington talked about her pilot NECDMC-sponsored workshop on the fundamentals of research data management. She developed a seven-week drop-in workshop series that met for one hour each week. As with Whitmire’s course, the information was not discipline specific, so that anyone could drop in, and a few librarians attended to learn more about RDM. You can find her course schedule, lesson plans, and exercises on the guide at https://canvas.uw.edu/courses/889213.

Finally, Heather Coates from Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis described her workshop series for health sciences graduate students. She primarily discussed an activity she created in which participants mapped data outcomes to connect their research questions with desired products. You can find Coates’ mapping worksheet and much more at https://scholarworks.tupu.edu/handle/1805/6043.

In “Promoting Data Literacy at the Grassroots: Teaching & Learning with Data in the Undergraduate Classroom,” Adam Beauchamp from Tulane University and Christine Murray from Bates College discussed the intersection of data reference and data management. The challenge is that data reference librarians tend to assume that students know what to do once they have data, while data management best practices presume that students have had experience with primary research data collection. In other words, it can be difficult to help a student find data if they are not certain how their question would be measured. Their session suggested three possible approaches that could help: 1) discovering data through literature; 2) teaching the evaluation of data sets; and 3) teaching students how to operationalize their research questions. During their session, they discussed how they implemented these plans in their classes. You can see their abstract and PowerPoint on the ACRL Website at http://s4.goeshow.com/acrl/national/2015/conference_schedule.cfm.

If you missed ACRL, the proceedings are available at http://www.ala.org/acrl/conferences/acrl2015/papers as well as many of the posters and PowerPoints for the panels at http://s4.goeshow.com/acrl/national/2015/conference_schedule.cfm.
to explain why the purchase of the material(s) would strengthen the overall collection and assist in course or research development. In the first year, they were able to honor all the requests by using money from other sources. The librarians felt these grants strengthened ties between faculty and the library liaisons as well as justified support of the libraries, the collection, and the budget to the administration. They found this program was especially useful for new faculty.

Evolution of Mobile Device Use in Clinical Settings — Presented by Ramune K. Kubilius, Moderator (Northwestern University); Jeannine Creazzo (Saint Peter’s University Hospital); Hob Brooks (Wolters Kluwer Health)

Reported by: Erin Wentz (MCPHS University) <erin.wentz@mcphs.edu>

Kubilius (Collection Development / Special Projects Librarian, Galter Health Science Library), session moderator, introduced the speakers and the topic.

Brooks (Senior Director of Business Development) shared a sampling of results from Wolters Kluwer Health’s soon-to-be-published second survey of Ovid users about mobile device usage. The company plans to repeat the survey annually. Since the first survey, the company has seen a growth in content demands and screen time from clinical users at all levels and across all devices. Users increasingly rely on a combination of smart phones, tablets, and desktop/laptop computers in their personal and work lives. Wolters Kluwer Health intends to leverage technology’s capabilities to enhance the entire content experience. Audience members were surprised to learn that Ovid is releasing its first mobile app, OvidToday.

Creazzo (Manager, Library Services) provided an overview of the hospital library setting, including the wide variety of patrons served, the pressures to justify resource expenditures, and the influence of Electronic Medical Record integration on library services. Limitations with staffing, infrastructure, and hospital security measures pose challenges for mobile resource usage.

The speakers showed the intersection of users’ demands and barriers to adoption. Content reflected the advertised (conference program) description, but minor organizational adjustments and stronger connections between the speakers’ pieces could have enhanced the presentation.

How Can Libraries, Publishers, and Vendors Work Together to Prevent Abuse? — Presented by Linda Treffinger, Moderator (HighWire Press); Claire Sinks (The Journal of Immunology); Sara McClung (University of California, San Francisco); Margaret Hogarth (Claremont Colleges); Paul Moss (OCLC)

Reported by: Chris Vidas (Ball State University) <cdvidas@bsu.edu>

Piracy is an issue that increasingly affects the publishers and vendors that provide information and the libraries that purchase their products. Unfortunately, researchers are often unwittingly caught in the turmoil that results from attacks by those attempting to illegally obtain and distribute information. This session discussed the measures being taken by publishers, vendors, libraries, and investigators to limit the impact that thieves can have on the information industry. Furthermore, tips were provided to attendees to enable more stringent security measures to be instituted to prevent ongoing abuse of library resources. Although aspects of the discussion were somewhat technical, the majority of the information was practical and accessible so that listeners of all levels could remain engaged and retain recommendations that could be easily and immediately implemented. Ultimately, libraries need to work closely with those providing information resources to help prevent abuse, because little can be done to directly control inappropriate user behavior.

Preservation of Audio-Visual Collections and Modern Storage Media — Presented by Corrie Marsh, Moderator (Stephen F. Austen State University); Fenella G. France (Library of Congress)

Reported by: Morag Stewart (University of Washington) <mkstew@uw.edu>

The afternoon session’s small audience received a fast-paced, sometimes technical, overview of research projects in audio-visual and media preservation at the Library of Congress. In the first part of the presentation, France described studies of CD aging. Results indicate that professionally produced CDs generally age better than writable discs, and CDs (having larger data bits) present less risk of data loss than DVDs. Newer non-invasive techniques aid in assessing risk to materials and offer new avenues for preservation. For example, infrared spectroscopy can be used to evaluate magnetic tapes for sticky shed syndrome before there is visible evidence of a problem or tapes are damaged in playback. IRENE (Image Reconstruct Erase Noise Etcetera) and the Berkeley Optical Sound Reconstruction Project utilize 2D and 3D scanning technology for sound recording reconstruction of damaged or otherwise unplayable wax cylinders and other formats. Brief mention was also made of preservation concerns with fugitive media, 20th-century materials generally considered relatively stable. Overall, the presentation served to remind listeners that, while environment and handling are important, manufacturing processes play a significant role in the lifespan of storage media and need to be considered when evaluating risk.

Streamlining and Advancing Collection Development with GOBI: Bringing Your Collection Into the 21st Century — Presented by Christa Poparad (College of Charleston); Lindsay Barnett (College of Charleston); Sarah Hoke (YBP Library Services)

Reported by: Katie O’Connor (College of Charleston) <oconnorkm@cofc.edu>

The three presenters focused on how GOBI, a Web-based application from YBP, can aid in collection development. Poparad and Barnett discussed the new liaison structure at the College of Charleston and
There is much yet to be done to improve content discovery. The session itself proved that usage. The session description failed to note the level of detail that each chain. Accuracy and timely flow of data are important since they drive data and the need to use consistent data formats throughout the supply of improving and synchronizing bibliographic metadata and holdings recommendations were made in the white paper including the importance bib records that impact discovery from the library perspective, the view of the service providers, and the publisher perspective. Several recommendations were made in the white paper including the importance of improving and synchronizing bibliographic metadata and holdings data and the need to use consistent data formats throughout the supply chain. Accuracy and timely flow of data are important since they drive usage. The session description failed to note the level of detail that each panelist provided in their perspectives. The session outline and compared it to previous years’ surveys to show some general trends.

This panel presentation provided an overview of a white paper released by a working group of publishers, librarians, and vendors trying to improve discovery in libraries and find practical ways to accomplish this aim along the entire supply chain. Moderated by Kemperman (Director of Business Development and Publisher Relations, OCLC), the panel included Fons (Executive Director, Data Services & WorldCat Quality, OCLC), de Lange (Head of Third-Party Platform Relations, Elsevier Science), and Ruschoff (Director of Technical Services & Strategic Initiatives, University of Maryland, College Park). Speakers outlined the basic issues and described the elements of the bib records that impact discovery from the library perspective, the view of the service providers, and the publisher perspective. Several recommendations were made in the white paper including the importance of improving and synchronizing bibliographic metadata and holdings data and the need to use consistent data formats throughout the supply chain. Accuracy and timely flow of data are important since they drive usage. The session description failed to note the level of detail that each panelist provided in their perspectives. The session outline and compared it to previous years’ surveys to show some general trends.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2014
AFTERNOON NEAPOLITAN SESSIONS

Budgets, Services, and Technology Driving Change: How Librarians, Publishers and Vendors are Moving Forward. — Presented by Meg White, Moderator (Rittenhouse Book Distributors, Inc.); Kitty Henderson (EBSCO Information Services)

White served as moderator, introducing Henderson who provided a look at a survey conducted by EBSCO of over 200 North American academic libraries and top 100 publishers with whom they do business, and compared it to previous years’ surveys to show some general trends. There was a large amount of information shared in this presentation, much of which confirmed the continuation of historical trends such as libraries moving away from print subscriptions. The survey indicated that while the economic conditions for many libraries are still tough, there is a general improvement, with more libraries reporting increased budgets than in the previous four years of surveys. The survey also revealed that the average expected publisher price increase for 2015 would be between 5-7%. Other trends of note were an increase in the number of libraries using or pursuing Discovery Systems; a decrease in the number of publishers willing to consider short-term loans as a viable DDA model; and a decrease in the number of publishers who would consider adding new Open Access titles in the coming year.

Finally, over half of the libraries surveyed said they were planning on increasing expenditures on individual eBooks in 2015.

Online Learning, MOOCs, and More — Presented by Ann Okerson (Center for Research Libraries); Franny Lee (SIPX); Deanna Marcum (Ithaka S+R)

This session covered the place MOOCs have in contemporary education. Studies were presented to address key measures that play into MOOCs in online learning. To see how administration and faculty feel about MOOCs, interviews were done in ten public flagship universities that focused on strategy and perception. The administration hopes for online learning to broaden access to higher education. Faculty had varying opinions, from those who think that personal interaction that can only be gained in classroom is ideal to those who have seen online learning being used before and have more confidence in its benefits. Many faculty members also didn’t want to be using materials created by others and were not onboard with MOOCs. A test was done to compare MOOCs side by side with traditional classes and also case studies for those without traditional classes. It was discovered that learning outcomes were similar in hybrid courses and traditional. All subgroups of students did about the same in both class types. Overall the students like the hybrid classes less because they were harder and they felt they learned less. Some benefits for faculty who used MOOCs were professional development, flexibility to try new teaching approaches in classes, and relief from time pressures during semester. Some challenges were hard to find content that matched the level that their students were at, not enough assessment opportunities, how it

continued on page 80
worked with other technology such as Blackboard system, and student engagement. Also discussed was SIPX, which is a cloud-based Web service for managing and sharing digital course materials.

**What's the Big Idea? Mellon, ARL, AAU, University Presses, and the Future of Scholarly Communication** — Presented by Leila Salisbury, Moderator (University Press of Mississippi); Charles Watkinson (University of Michigan); Helen Culyer (The Andrew W Mellon Foundation); Raym Crow (SPARC); Barbara Kline Pope (The National Academies)

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

Unfortunately, the layout of the venue was less than optimal for hearing and seeing the speakers at the front of the ballroom (not on a stage) who were responding to moderator Salisbury’s questions in round robin fashion. Still, some food for thought was shared on questions about 1) needs not yet met, 2) discoverability, 3) what should stop being done. Opinions on the first included: leverage data repository infrastructures for supplemental digital objects (Watkinson); leverage digital communications (Crow); devise clearer guidelines for peer review (Culyer). Salisbury posed a question about whether discoverability or money is the true problem, and Pope commented that one can’t expect people to find things just because they’re online. University finances are complicated: funding differs, and there is a “class” system of institutions (Culyer). Watkinson mentioned “first book” models and disenfranchised scholars — foreign, independent, or based at smaller institutions. Advice on what to stop doing? Watkinson: university presses should stop creating a “Rolls Royce” when people want “Toyotas.” Crow: stop looking for others to solve problems. Pope: the challenge is to break even while producing scholarship (and bookstores should probably stop stocking books). Culyer: stop funding “cool, one off, digital” and push on experimentation with new genres that might be reproducible. Discussion ranged from more comments on “first book” (problem or not), on “predatory” publishers, and on discoverability (of the whole book).

**THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2014**

**MORNING PLENARY SESSIONS**

**Hyde Park Debate -Resolved: Wherever Possible, Library Collections Should Be Shaped by Patrons, Instead of by Librarians** — Presented by Rick Anderson (University of Utah); David Magier (Princeton University)

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

Over the years, the traditional Charleston Conference Hyde Park debate (conducted by Oxford Union rules) has been in various conference calendar spots. In 2014, many seemed to enjoy a “first thing on Friday morning” debate between Anderson (in favor), no stranger to conference goers, and Magier (opposed), who might not be as familiar to some attendees. The premise and opening poll: Whenever possible, library collections should be shaped by patrons instead of librarians. Anderson’s opening statement emphasized that this premise was not always possible politically or structurally, that there are means and ends. He argued that the end is not collection size or coherence, but rather scholarship. Collections focus on relevance over time, but who is the judge of relevance? He argued that PDA (patron-driven acquisition) eliminates guesswork by librarians. He downplayed the fear that this method of collection building moves a library’s work to the periphery and has allowed user behavior to drive collections.

Magier, on the other hand, argued that he is not against PDA. It can be logical and democratic, a useful tool, but patron selection alone won’t achieve the desired ends either. Libraries shape collections and take the best actions to achieve balance. His opening remark concluded that patron-driven librarians can best shape collections. During Q&A, the debaters’ lively rejoinders sometimes caused audience laughter, e.g., “Bad things happen when patrons go wild” (Anderson). The audience got involved, bringing out points about usage (statistics) not being pure, and the fact that PDA can create more unique collections. Nimble-fingered audience members who participated in the online poll prior to the debate voted 57 (yes, I agree) and 42 (no, I disagree), while in the closing poll, 94 (I agree) and 95 (I disagree). With that, another Hyde Park debate ended.

For a thorough journalist’s view of the Hyde Park debate, read the report of conference blogger, Donald Hawkins: http://www.against-the-grain.com/2014/11/hyde-park-debate-the-friday-opening-session/. The debaters’ statements and opening/closing poll results can be found in the conference site: http://2014charlestonconference.sched.org/event/a7e1353171736cdad1b96644b07e06ab#.VQ9AZwF-ZB.

**What Faculty Want Librarians to Know** — Presented by James J. O’Donnell, Moderator (Georgetown University); Phil Richerme (Joint Quantum Institute); Christine Fair (George-town University); Timothy Johnson (College of Charleston)

Reported by: Katie O’Connor (College of Charleston) <oconnorkm@cofc.edu>

This panel of academic professionals spoke about how they use their library, what services they wish were offered, and their overall feelings about libraries.

Physicist Richerme kicked off the session by describing a typical day. He began by checking the preprint site arXiv to catch up on new papers and abstracts. Books are not really an up-to-date source of information, and even journals are no longer as current as they once were. Richerme addressed the issue of data archiving in physics, stating that there really isn’t a need for this service.

Classics professor Johnson opened by reflecting on his early memories of libraries. Like many of his peers, he enjoys the familiarity of holding books and journals in their physical form. For him, research is still very much a hands-on experience. In his professional life, Johnson has found that a problem exists with access to materials. He spoke about the need for a link among public, private, and school libraries because, ultimately, libraries are the “life source of our culture.”

Fair echoed Johnson’s call for better access. She does have a need for physical books, and frequently these books are located in libraries to which she doesn’t have access. She expressed a desire for her university to improve their relationships with other libraries that do have materials she needs. Fair also mentioned the need for better customer service. Libraries need to ensure that helping students is a top priority.

**FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2014**

**CHARLESTON NEAPOLITAN SESSIONS**

**Let’s Talk: Bringing Many Threads Together to Weave the Scholarly Information Eco-system** — Presented by T. Scott Plutchak (University of Alabama at Birmingham); Greg Tannbaum (ScholarNext Consulting); John Vaughn (Association of American Universities); Howard Ratner (CHORUS)

NOTE: Laurie Goodman, Editor-in-chief of Gigascience joined the panel.

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

continued on page 81
As moderator Plutchak would describe, this session was a “facilitated conversation,” with no presentations, some informal agreement among the participants, and his role was to pose an occasional question and keep the discussion moving. The discussion brought out various threads of the scholarly ecosystem tapestry, including the increasing number of federal mandates (e.g., OTSP), the increasing emphasis in higher education to manage workflows as well as measure research outputs, and the importance of making it all discoverable and accessible. Competing communities have differing needs. Vaughn alluded to warring factions (but later mentioned that no one group can work alone). He described that the scholarly communication system is working well and scholars think they have access to more than ever. Provosts feel that research libraries are funding professional societies. The explosion of costs experienced by libraries have to be figured out and managed. Tananbaum described SHARE and CHORUS, the working groups, the network of federated repositories. Discovery is important as are efficient paths; it is necessary to get a handle on who’s writing what, and stakeholders want to know on whose dime. Ratner mentioned the importance of inter-operation (DOI, ORCID, FundRef, etc.) and the role of CHORUS in aiming for transparency and efficient workflows (Plutchak opined that academia is known for efficient workflows). The data space needs context, and what researchers submit needs to be leveraged. Goodman mentioned the role of librarians as curators of information who have a driving force. The session ended, the ecosystem was described, and probably each audience member left, pondering where he or she fits in.

To Boldly Go Beyond Downloads — Presented Carol Tenopir (University of Tennessee, Knoxville); Gabriel Hughes (Elsevier)

Reported by: Julia Blake (Franklin University Nationwide University) <julia.blake@franklin.edu>

Hughes from Elsevier talked about defining usage, noting that we have traditionally used downloads as a proxy for reading. However, this is likely diverging with downloads becoming only a small part of use as sharing technologies become so prevalent — everything from citation managers with collaboration tools to email and Facebook. Sharing is not done to get around entitlements or licenses, but for convenience and scholarship. There are different kinds of sharing, from individual-to-individual to the author sharing his/her own work with the public. Sharing is a bit different from the original download, as sharing implies a recommendation of sorts. But how to measure this use? Elsevier is funding a study by Tenopir and her team to look at this. They are looking at ways to measure or extrapolate secondary use after download or even use with no download at all (ex: sending right out of a database). They want to look at both formal (ex: citation manager) and informal (ex: Facebook/email) sharing, and look at differences across disciplines, education levels, age groups, etc. So far they have been doing interviews and focus groups, with a wide survey out now. Expect more results in the future.

This was one of the best sessions I attended.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 2014
MORNING CONCURRENT SESSIONS

Filling the Physical or the Virtual Stacks? Assessing the Value of Electronic Course Adopted Books in Comparison with their Print Counterparts — Presented by Maria Savova (Claremont Colleges Library)

Reported by: Elizabeth Siler (University of North Carolina Charlotte Atkins Library) <esiler3@uncc.edu>

Claremont Colleges Library, the main library of the eight Claremont Consortium of colleges, did a study to compare the student preferences for print books versus eBooks. To find their sample of books to compare, they used the colleges Course Adopted Books list. They purchased both the print and the electronic format each book. The print books could be checked out for seven days and the eBooks were hosted on several different platforms, and varied from single user to multiple user. The study ran from Spring 2013 through Spring 2014.

When comparing the two types of monographs they reviewed different data. For eBooks they looked at data including the number of downloads, unique users, length on online sessions, and length of download days. For the print books they looked data such as the number of renewals, circulations, and the length of the loan period. Results calculated as a whole for the three semesters showed that although there was significant eBooks usage, there was still a slight favorability of the print books. The final conclusion thus far is that there is not a clear preference and having both is an asset to the students.

Gift-Gaining: Ideas for Effective Gift Processing — Presented by Mark Henley (University of North Texas Libraries)

Reported by: Matthew Whitney Haney (Student, University of South Carolina-Columbia) <mhaney@email.sc.edu>

While this session was led by the new gifts coordinator, it did not provide the listener with much new information. Going through his presentation, there were many times he conveyed the fact that this position was handed to him, not because he wanted it, but because he was the only one qualified. He did give information on the problems, which he faced, the solutions that were devised. However, most of these problems were issues libraries face on a regular basis and his solutions were far from original. That being said, there were a few things that one could find helpful in the session. One was what was to be done with the books the library did not want that it had been given. The presenter suggested either selling them in a library store, or going to Websites like U.S. Book Exchange and Better World Books. To prevent unwanted gifts, he suggested creating a list of areas of interest and publishing the list widely. Overall, the session, while not the most stimulating, had a few good ideas to provide.

How Users' Perception of E-Books Have Changed or Not: Comparing Parallel Survey Responses — Presented by Steve Carrico (University of Florida); Tara Cataldo (University of Florida); Trey Shelton (University of Florida)

Reported by: Robin Sabo (Central Michigan University) <sabo1r@cmich.edu>

Presenters compared the results of eBook usage surveys of Florida colleges and universities from 2009 and 2014. In 2009, there were 536 completed surveys representing 28 institutions; and in 2014, there were 571 completed surveys representing 30 institutions. Survey results in response to the question, “Have you used an eBook provided by your college or university library?” declined from 44% in 2009 to 34% in 2014 while vendor statistics showed a doubling or tripling of eBooks usage dependent on subject area. This finding was attributed to students not differentiating eBooks from other electronic resources such as journals and being unaware that the eBooks used were provided by the library. eBooks were preferred for their accessibility, timeliness and space-saving attributes while print books were preferred for ease of reading. In 2014, 32% of undergraduates reported not using eBooks.

The presenters concluded that “academic publishers are still creating obstacles for library users of academic content” and “library users (many from the digital native generation) don’t really like eBooks, but they use them because eBooks often are the only format made available and are more convenient than print books.”
copyright legislation, embodying fair use for readers and respect for the rights of authors and the contributions of the value-adders in the publication chain? Could there be copyright law that would provide what we need by way of user rights? Will we always have General Counsel review multi-page documents of painfully explicit clauses about data mining, DRM, and numerous other emerging technical issues?

Perhaps in the U.S. we’ve just become a little cynical about the possibility of legislative remedy for any problems, especially where financial interests are involved. Maybe it’s time for us at least to begin to imagine the alternative. Our colleague Winston has led a heroic effort in IFLA to make a case to WIPO to get library concerns represented as far as possible in statutes around the world. We should support those efforts — and is it time to think how we would ramp them up? Maybe nothing can be done quickly; but if we don’t make a start, then nothing is likely to change at all.

Endnotes
2. See their journal at: http://www.banglajol.info/index.php/JBAS
5. http://www.eifl.net/

And They Were There

Privacy in the Digital Age: Publishers, Libraries and Higher Education — Presented by Joe Esposito, Moderator (Consultant); Todd Carpenter (NISO); Helen Cullyer (The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation); Tracy Mitrano (Cornell University)

Reported by: Cheryl Aine Morrison (University of Washington) <ehodin@u.washington.edu>

Mitrano opened the session with a discussion on vulnerabilities created by outsourced software and electronic services. Data mining is particularly troublesome especially when there is a lack of transparency by vendors and little oversight by an outside agency. Although not quite on the topic of higher education, she illustrated the troubling nature of data mining by highlighting a case where elementary school children were used, without permission, to promote market share, while marketing was increased to students who were purchased surprisingly did not reflect the usage of the DVD selected was because of its viewing policy; videos could be viewed five times before a purchase was initiated from their deposit account. Neither school spent their entire deposit accounts. Both libraries such as DVDs need to be replaced or fixed. One reason ROI for physical materials is negatively impacted when resources such as DVDs need to be replaced or fixed. One reason Kanopy was selected was because of its viewing policy; videos could be viewed five times before a purchase was initiated from their deposit account.

UM and Simmons piloted a streaming video PDA project with Kanopy streaming videos. Both schools needed to find resources to support the growing distance learning student population. The presenters chose streaming video for reasons including eliminating the need for DVD players and the cost of loss and damage to DVDs. ROI for physical materials is negatively impacted when resources such as DVDs need to be replaced or fixed. One reason Kanopy was selected was because of its viewing policy; videos could be viewed five times before a purchase was initiated from their deposit account. Neither school spent their entire deposit accounts. Both libraries chose broad collections from Kanopy. The streaming videos which were purchased surprisingly did not reflect the usage of the DVD collection in terms of subjects. Marketing was increased to students and faculty because users were unaware their library had streaming videos. The presenters believed faculty is the primary factor for driving usage for any resource.

That’s all the reports we have room for in this issue. Watch for more reports from the 2014 Charleston Conference in upcoming issues of Against the Grain. Presentation material (PowerPoint slides, handouts) and taped session links from many of the 2014 sessions are available online. Visit the Conference Website at www.katina.info/conference. — KS