

2016

And They Were There--Reports of Meetings

Ramune K. 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 K. (2018) "And They Were There--Reports of Meetings," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 28: Iss. 1, Article 28.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.7286>

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.

8 Library Services That Will... Make You Smile.

- 1) **Publishing Sources** - Almost 200,000 at our disposal
- 2) **New Title Selection Plan** - Immediate notification
- 3) **Electronic Ordering** - Simple online ordering system
- 4) **Early Release Program** - Immediate availability guarantee
- 5) **Cataloging** - We do the busy-work for you
- 6) **Comprehensive Reporting** - Up-to-the-minute order status
- 7) **Duplicate Order Alert** - We're on guard, you avoid hassles
- 8) **Paperback Reinforcement & Binding** - Avoid expensive wear & obsolescence

For more details, visit:
emery-pratt.com



“Things always go smoothly with Emery-Pratt. Their people are knowledgeable, and always provide friendly, rapid service.”

Cameron University
Lawton, OK

Emery-Pratt

Dependability. Reliability. Smileability.

1966 W M 21, Owosso, MI 48867-9317
Phone: 800 248-3887 • Fax: 800 523-6379
emery-pratt.com



And They Were There

Reports of Meetings — 35th Annual Charleston Conference

Issues in Book and Serial Acquisition, “Where Do We Go From Here?” — Charleston Gaillard Center, Francis Marion Hotel, Embassy Suites Historic Downtown, and Courtyard Marriott Historic District — Charleston, SC, November 4-7, 2015

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 2015 Charleston 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 at www.charlestonlibraryconference.com, and <https://2015charlestonconference.sched.org/>, 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 2015 Charleston Conference blogger, Don Hawkins. The conference blog is available at: <http://www.against-the-grain.com/category/chsconfblog/>. The 2015 Charleston Conference Proceedings will be published in partnership with Purdue University Press in 2016.

In this issue of ATG you will find the first installment of 2015 conference reports. We will continue to publish all of the reports received in upcoming print issues throughout the year. — RKK

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 2015 AFTERNOON PRECONFERENCE SESSION

Negotiating with Vendors — Presented by **Bernard “Buzzy” Basch** (Basch Associates); **Ward Shaw** (Independent Investor); **Bruce Strauch** (Professor of Business Law, The Citadel); **Dan Tonkery** (Content Strategy); **Michael Gruenberg** (Gruenberg Consulting LLC)

NOTE: Adam Chesler (AIP Publishing) and Jay Ven Eman (Access Innovations, Inc.) were added as speakers in this session.

Reported by: **Crystal Hampson** (University of Saskatchewan) <crystal.hampson@usask.ca>

This session's speakers, individually and collectively, brought considerable experience to the topic. **Basch** started off with what was

continued on page 52

And They Were There
from page 51

a recurring theme through the session: when negotiating, be prepared and know what you need for your institution. **Strauch** said to be wary of boilerplates, read the contract, and know that anything said outside of the contract itself, e.g., in a sales pitch or presentation, is not part of the agreement unless written into the contract. **Shaw** advocated to be clear about what you want, be realistic, and create a win-win. **Chesler** recommended to inform yourself and ask for what you need, e.g., text/data mining. **Gruenberg** advised to write down your objectives and strategy (what you want, and what less you are willing to take). Also, ask the sales rep the question: “Can you defend your price?” Once a product is produced, it can be sold to many people and the cost of distribution goes down over time. **Ven Eman** recommended to practice negotiating and to know what you want versus what you need. **Tonkery** noted that while journal prices are set by publishers, prices for resources created by the company are flexible. **Basch** wrapped up the session, noting that negotiation is possible.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2015
PLENARY SESSIONS

The Value of Libraries: An Association Leadership View —
Presented by **Courtney Young** (Pennsylvania State University)

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

Keynote plenary speaker **Young** had the honor of being the first 2015 conference speaker in the new venue at the **Gaillard Center**. Except for some initial sound level issues, the speaker was easily able to convey her passions as they align with the **American Library Association** and its strategic directions, activities into which she immersed herself during her term as president of **ALA** (she is currently immediate past president), in areas such as advocacy, partnerships, and diversification, inclusion, and equity. She mentioned core values, the transformation of libraries as spaces, the roles of public libraries, as well as the importance of library programming. Progress has been made and can still be made at the intersection of research and services. Although demographics have changed (the U.S. is becoming a majority minority country), society has a long way to go. Libraries can lead the way to a healthy community and can create safe havens; they are also a rich and untapped source of diversity. During the question and answer portion of the session, **Young** acknowledged that change in academia is not a fast process, and she talked about increasing opportunities for publisher and librarian collaborations. There is no other way to operate in the 21st century than to collaborate, she claimed, and she advised all to “put skin in the game,” be strategic, and remember that social media drives traffic.

Star Wars in the Library: Part I (The Revenge of the Jedi) and Part II (The Force Awakens) — Presented by **James J. O'Donnell** (Arizona State University)

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

Think big and do bigger (in libraries). Using many Star Wars analogies and quotes (and a light sword strategically hidden behind the podium until the right moment), **O'Donnell** opined that, as in that other world, ours has skirmishes, nail-biting episodes and much learning (eBooks are not working in 2015). We should have no more than three priorities or we have none. Where will we be 20, 50, 100 years from now? Work backwards. All our students are online. Knowledge is a verbal noun. The printed book has a glorious future. What would a universal library look like? The Jedi Library is untrue for collections (a collection of stuff, rather a collection for Jedi (defined users)). At

ASU, he shared, success is defined not by who is excluded but by who is included. Think strategically, he advised. We need to remember that even in libraries, we live in a large galaxy among galaxies.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2015
MORNING NEAPOLITAN SESSIONS

Think Like a Start-Up (or an Upstart) — Presented by **Ann Okerson** (Moderator, Center for Research Libraries); **Peter Brantley** (UC Davis Library); **Mitchell Davis** (BiblioLabs); **Franny Lee** (SIPX, ProQuest); **Jack Montgomery** (Facilitator, Western Kentucky University)

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

Moderator **Okerson** introduced the session and the panelists as the creative best, malefactors (in a good sense) of innovation, those who have used their creative energies. **Brantley** (formerly at New York Public Library) started out by sharing highlights from his career path, including working for **DLF** and **Internet Archive** where, to **Brewster Kahle**, “everything is always in start-up.” The work ethos he learned while working for HYPOTHESIS is transferrable to a larger organization. His advice? Never wait, move fast, don't wait for things to be perfect. **Davis** invited the audience to tour (with VIP passes) the locally based **BiblioLabs** (he's a founder), located near the conference center. Its product is Biblioboard. His prior career was at **CreateSpace** that became part of **Amazon** (becoming part of the fulfillment space) and **Minitex**. Libraries can be at the table. He had the experience of acting as his own venture capitalist. His advice? The minimum bar is to be excellent. **Lee** shared that her legal background and experience in copyright policy spurred her to be involved in building something with technology. Ideas grow from a spark, and at the end of the day, there will be things to do, pulls and pushes, choices to make. Think like a start-up, she advised. The moderator and each speaker offered other noteworthy observations and advice continuing into the audience participation portion of the program, including: if we make a mistake, we'll fix it solution / mindset (**Okerson**); be able to communicate why something is important (**Lee**); you can never do better than a group together...pursue radical transparency (**Brantley**); incremental failure is work... there is different currency in academe though a mission and goals are still essential (**Davis**)...

Industry Consolidation: Real Life Examples — Presented by **Bob Nardini** (ProQuest); **Tommy Doyle** (Elsevier); **Doug Way** (University of Wisconsin-Madison). Facilitated by **Charles Watkinson** (University of Michigan)

Reported by: **Crystal Hampson** (University of Saskatchewan)
<crystal.hampson@usask.ca>

The presenters provided a nicely balanced set of differing perspectives. **Way** began the session from a library's point of view. He would like jobbers to be neutral, be open to new ideas, advance technology, make life easier, improve efficiency, and play nice with others. Assuming past performance is an indicator of future performance, **Way** is not optimistic about consolidations in the book industry. However, since companies do listen, **Way** advocated that librarians speak up rather than grumble behind closed doors. **Nardini** pointed out a long history of consolidation in the book industry. He stated that fragmentation occurs when services are split between many companies and seamless becomes easier when services are all under one corporate roof. **Doyle** discussed using data to concentrate publishing efforts and resources on specific subject areas and to publish books that will be read. He also stated that consolidations are more successful if they are done for strategic fit rather than for essentially financial or opportunistic reasons.

continued on page 53

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2015
MORNING CONCURRENT SESSIONS

Elements of the Successful IR — Presented by **Corrie Marsh**
(Old Dominion University Libraries);
Dillon Wackerman (SFASU)

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

The presentation of **Marsh** and **Wackerman** included advice and examples. Libraries make connections and their staffs can be involved in many aspects of an institutional repository. Mediation can provide copyright checking and clearance. Documentation includes forms, policies, checklists. Project ideas and library expertise can be diverse, from helping launch a journal to sponsoring a specimen collection online (an example was given of the **National Center for Pharmaceutical Crops** — the site included metadata, in this case — geotags, patent numbers, article citations where a specimen was used). Extend the scope to include non-traditional, increase faculty involvement, look for unique collaborations. The IR can have a role in e-research. When doing marketing, have specific, tailored examples, be prepared with readership maps. The skill set of the IR team (or access to such skills) can present challenges since it can't always be predicted what project will come up inside and outside of the campus. All outlets should be explored for promotion and marketing — extensive and varied, top-down, tailored and specific. After the presentation, questions showed the many aspects of audience interest — embargos, metadata, viewers, formats, etc.

Faculty and Student Engagement with Streaming Video —
Presented by **Michael Arthur** (University of Alabama); **Beth Bernhardt** (University of North Carolina Greensboro); **Mike Eyler** (Swank); **Elizabeth Leonard** (SAGE)

Reported by: **Susannah Benedetti** (University of North
Carolina Wilmington) <benedettis@uncw.edu>

This session featured two academic librarians and two vendors discussing streaming video in academic libraries. **Leonard** provided findings from **SAGE** on how students engage with streaming videos, finding them on YouTube (71%), Google (45%) class Webpages (43%), and the library Website (32%), and how guiding them to the library's video content is critical. **Eyler** reported on how faculty use **Swank's** streaming feature films to demonstrate discipline-specific content in creative ways (*The Perfect Storm* and *Captain Philips* for maritime studies; episodes of *The Office* for business ethics). **Bernhardt** spoke about what faculty do (and don't) understand about streaming video, including public performance rights, copyright laws, the costs of streaming video, and issues with "transferring" VHS. She noted that librarians must be the educators about these complex issues. **Arthur** spoke about how libraries can promote streaming video, including active collaboration between subject librarians and faculty, creating separate funding for streaming videos, bringing in vendors to do presentations at department meetings, and focusing on discoverability in LibGuides and A-Z lists. All of the presenters emphasized the role of librarians in improving discoverability, working directly with faculty on the ins and outs of this valuable and emerging format, and learning how students engage with streaming video in order to provide the best content.



From Usability Studies to User Experience: Designing Library Services — Presented by **Lea Currie** (University of Kansas); **Julie A. Petr** (University of Kansas); **Kate Montgomery** (Tulane University); **Miri Botzer** (Ex Libris Group)

Reported by: **Beth Bohstedt** (Hamilton College)
<bbohsted@hamilton.edu>

This session illustrated two perspectives of how surveys and other tools were utilized to improve services in their libraries, specifically the use of **Ex Libris' Primo** as a discovery layer. The **University of Kansas** wanted to improve the user experience of Primo; in order to do this, they first had to ensure that the staff was comfortable with the tool. After the staff examined its strengths and weaknesses, they made suggestions for improvement, and then tested it again, resulting in a smoother and more enriched experience for their patrons.

Tulane University reached out to a broader audience for their usability surveys, as they prepared to roll out a redesign of their Primo interface. They undertook an iterative cycle, testing, making improvements based on the suggestions, then testing again.

Ex Libris also presented on the use and recent improvements of the Primo interface.

Gathering the Needles: Evaluating the Impact of Gold Open Access Content within Traditional Subscription Journals —
Presented by **Jill Emery** (Portland State University); **Alison Bobal** (University of Nebraska Medical Center)

Reported by: **Crystal Hampson** (University of Saskatchewan)
<crystal.hampson@usask.ca>

The two presenters looked at 2014 JR1-GOA [COUNTER Gold Open Access report] data from **Elsevier**, **Nature Publishing Group**, **SAGE**, **Springer**, and **Wiley** (but not, as indicated in the program, **OUP** or **Taylor & Francis**). **Emery** began the session by noting that more content is being published as gold OA by traditional publishers as a result of OA policies, particularly in Europe. Release 4 of **Project COUNTER** includes the new JR1-GOA report for gold open access usage. We would like to be able to tell what the impact of gold OA is on subscriptions. The presenters limited their investigation to the publishers they had in common, plus **Wiley** at PSU only. **Bobal** outlined the publishers' advertised practices regarding revenue from OA fees in hybrid journals and then provided examples of JR1-GOA usage from 2014. **Emery** outlined potential uses for the information in JR1-GOA: a baseline for future evaluation, promotion and advocacy for OA, a new type of usage statistics, and a negotiation point for subscriptions. In response to a question from the audience, the presenters noted it is difficult for publishers to break down statistics for open access usage that occurs after an embargo period is lifted.

Mind the Gap: Find and Fix the Mismatches Between Faculty and Academic Librarians — Presented by **William Cross** (NCSU Libraries); **Meredith Schwartz** (Library Journal); **Jennifer Albers-Smith** (Gale Cengage Learning); **Tamara Venit-Shelton** (Claremont McKenna College)

Reported by: **Emily O'Connor** (Rasmussen College)
<Emily.OConnor@rasmussen.edu>

This panelist session provided the results of a summary co-authored by *Library Journal* and **Gale** outlining the perceptions of both faculty and librarians of library services and resources, and best practices to close the gap in perception.

The first part of the session reviewed the details of the survey. Survey results are available here: <http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2015/09/academic-libraries/closing-gap-librarian-faculty-views-research/>. The

continued on page 54

And They Were There from page 53

panelists focused on best practices in the second half of the session. The general theme of this focus was that faculty need to be communicated to proactively about what librarians do, and can do (that librarians teach and work with faculty who teach, for example). Challenges may arise if some faculty think that librarians should be “invisible.” This faculty perception conflicts with librarians’ goals of providing services that need to be promoted or marketable. Best practices included librarians building upon their breadth of expertise outside of traditional library duties, marketing the library as the go-to for a variety of services, and “forcing” partnership between faculty and librarians through committee work, grant projects, and similar initiatives. The session was presented as described and many attendees expressed interest in future studies complementing this first wave of research.

[To see the full report, “Bridging the Librarian-Faculty Gap in the Academic Library,” visit www.thedigitalshift.com/research.]

Outsourced and Overwhelmed: Gaining a Grasp on Managing Electronic Resources — Presented by **Matthew Harrington** (North Carolina State University)

Reported by: **Cheryl Aine Morrison** (University of Washington) <erhodin@uw.edu>

In his presentation, **Harrington** began by exploring the challenges of managing electronic resource metadata. He addressed commercial Electronic Resource Management (ERM) services, their pros and cons, and why this requires libraries to monitor the metadata for accuracy. Using graphs and charts, he was able to demonstrate the complexity of the problem and make a case for a homegrown database, using Microsoft Access software to automate many of the management tasks.

He then walked the audience through some of the major considerations that went into developing the database, such as identifier choice and linking. He shared screenshots of the navigation and input portals that staff used in their day-to-day activities, briefly touching on the general workflows needed. He then discussed how the database has been recently redesigned to meet changing needs of staff, and introduced the Integrated Multi-Package Reconciliation Tool (IMPART) database design. He discussed some of the design considerations and launched a brief live demonstration for the audience. Attendees were very interested in seeing the database in action and would have preferred a little more time for this portion of the presentation.

Toward Improved ROI: Outcomes of Researching Current Pay-Per-View Practices — Presented by **Marija Markovic** (Acute Source, Inc.); **Steve Oberg** (Wheaton College, IL); **Connie Mead** (Wheaton College, IL)

NOTE: *Marija Markovic did not participate in this presentation.*

Reported by: **Marty Coleman** (Mississippi State University) <mcoleman@library.msstate.edu>

This session reported on outcomes of **Wheaton College** moving from big deal journal packages to a combined Pay-Per-View (PPV) and targeted subscription model. This session was built on a talk given at last year’s conference and the executive summary of the conversion is slated to be published in a future issue of *Against the Grain*. **Oberg** began with the background and review of the literature. The need for this project arose from the rising cost of big deal journal packages and the low usage of titles from those packages. For each title, they analyzed usage statistics and subscription costs to calculate the cost of use per year. These statistics were used to determine which titles had enough demand to justify the cost of a subscription. **Wheaton** chose to have unmediated PPV — the student did not know or need to know

that the access model was different. **Mead** reported on the results of the conversion. Costs in the initial years were substantially less and demand has steadily grown from 7,600 in FY 14 to an estimated 13,000 in FY 16. Monitoring usage was necessary as they wanted to be sure they were not paying for access to something they should have perpetual access to. A large number of requests for a specific title may trigger a subscription, or lack of use may be used to cancel a subscription. **Oberg** and **Mead** were very pleased with their results and stated that PPV may not be for everyone. Moving to the PPV model has provided improved user access to content with better ROI on collection dollars.

What ARE We Thinking? Collections Decisions in an Academic Library — Presented by **Linda Galloway** (Syracuse University); **Natasha Cooper** (Syracuse University); **Doug Morton** (Elsevier); **Shannon Pritting** (SUNY Polytechnic Institute)

Reported by: **Christine Fischer** (University of North Carolina at Greensboro, University Libraries) <cmfische@uncg.edu>

Cooper began the panel presentation with a look at the many challenges related to collections decisions, including purchasing models, formats, and licensing. A major issue is communicating institutional needs to publishers and vendors, and that became the overarching theme of the discussion. Representing a large private interdisciplinary university, **Galloway** discussed what is considered when adding new resources, including usability of the content, responsive design, compliance with web accessibility guidelines, and a preference for access by unlimited simultaneous users. **Pritting** described the complexities of building a research library from the ground up for a small, focused university with high-level researchers. Communication with vendors is critical, and it brings challenges such as negotiating pricing and successfully coordinating quick purchases when funding becomes available with a short turnaround. The session concluded with a vendor/publisher perspective. **Morton** discussed the tools and reports that can help inform decision-making. Vendors can provide value beyond just the products they sell, **Morton** stated, as he encouraged librarians to keep them informed of current and upcoming projects for which they could provide support.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2015 LIVELY LUNCH DISCUSSIONS

Changing Academic Book Market Landscape: What’s Next? — Presented by **Rick Lugg** (OCLC); **Carol Cramer** (Wake Forest University); **Alan Jarvis** (Taylor & Francis); **Kari Paulson** (ProQuest); **Mark Sandler** (Center for Library Initiatives)

Reported by: **Jennifer C. L. Smathers** (The College at Brockport, SUNY) <jsmather@brockport.edu>

As always seems to be the case with a “What Next?” session, it started with history, the sordid, yet long and glorious, history of selling and buying books. **Lugg** served as MC and leading historian for the 80 or so attendees. On the changing aspects of the marketplace, with smaller publishers being bought up by larger firms, **Jarvis** said, “I don’t even know what business as usual looks like.”

The most enlightening revelation came from **Paulson**, who indicated that publishers are fixated on selling titles, because they can forecast how many titles they will sell and use that as leverage for obtaining financing. Thus their inherent dislike of more ephemeral and unpredictable sales models (individual chapters and short term loans) that negatively impact their ability to gain financing. It caused me to wonder if this need for financing is related to the number of venture capitalist firms now holding publishers/jobbers.

While the session spent more time slogging through the backstory than its description seemed to promise, it was a necessary exposition

continued on page 55

And They Were There from page 54

for those new to the game. Attendees came away with a better understanding of the motivations surrounding rapidly-changing purchasing models for monographic content.

The Changing Nature of OA Journals: Helping Scholars Identify the Good, the Bad, & The Political — Presented by **Matthew Torrence** (University of South Florida); **Susan Ariew** (University of South Florida)

Reported by: **Neil Foulger** (Levi Watkins Learning Center, Alabama State University) <nfoulger@alasu.edu>

This session provided a useful overview of the Open Access (OA) movement. Both **Torrence** and **Ariew** presented the types of OA journals, the politics of the OA movement, how predatory OA publishers operate, the pros and cons of **Jeffrey Beall's** blog and List, and solutions to predatory OA publishers. There were four types covered: three actual and one ideal (no money needed to publish). The politics of the movement relate to free exchange of knowledge versus pricing models which include lack of oversight of OA publishers. This lack of oversight allows for some OA publishers to take advantage of researchers seeking publication, thus being “predatory.” The chief signs of a predatory OA publisher include lack of transparency and the tactic to request for author’s information and then charging the author to publish. **Beall** was described as an OA skeptic who supports traditional publishing despite his list’s purpose to assist libraries and scholars in avoiding scholarly publishing scams. The chief solutions discussed were the need to warn faculty researchers about predatory OA publishers and the creation of more tools to help discern reputable OA publishers. Audience members shared opinions and information regarding experiences with OA, making this session very informative and lively.

Facilitating Sharing Among Researchers — Presented by **Alicia Wise** (Elsevier); **Maggie Farrell** (Clemson University)

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

With chairs drawn in a circle and led by the session facilitators **Wise** and **Farrell**, participants, librarians, and publishers shared experiences and insights. It is relatively obvious that there are different sharing needs at different points in the research cycle, both during and post research and publication. In sharing, the goals are to support research and to provide access to research output. But what are researchers’ practices? Are they sharing links to their full-text or actually sharing articles? (Mention was made of another conference session, “The

Rumors from page 33

The eBook. What are we going to do about it? The divide between those who like e and those who like p is almost as bad as the presidential elections (okay, I am exaggerating). But it seems that I have talked to more and more people who prefer the print book rather than the eBook. Hmm... me... I like them both. Just finished reading *Vanity Fair* (**Thackeray's** not the magazine) and I have to admit I enjoyed reading it on my iPad. My son on

the other hand will not read books on devices and I am not going to say how much older than he is I am. Anyway, **Jim O'Donnell** (the director of the ASU Libraries and the keynote speaker at the 2015 Charleston Conference) recently visited our library. The library staff had a special hour plus interview with him to discuss interlibrary loan operations, renovating a library, engaging patrons, and eBooks. **Jim** is vocal about all the issues with eBooks — how they are all on different platforms, have different usage configurations, can print only a certain number of pages, etc., etc. You've heard it all.

To learn more, look at our **Penthouse Suite Interviews** for the 2015 Charleston Conference. We have interviews with **Erin Gallagher**, **Jim O'Donnell**, **Gary Price**, **Mark Sandler**, **Carol Tenopir**, **Alicia Wise** and **Courtney Young**. They have been edited into small 10-14 minute snippets which makes them very watchable. Check them out!

<http://www.charlestonlibraryconference.com/video/atg-penthouse-interviews/>

That's it for now! 🍷

Secret Life of Articles: From Download Metrics to Downstream Impact,” in which the studies showed that the second seemed more prevalent.) The popularity of portals such as ResearchGate can be challenging for publishers, but partnerships have developed between libraries and publishers that can benefit researchers, too. For example, the **University of Florida** has worked with **Elsevier** to allow a search in the institutional repository to pass through to **Elsevier**-published institutional authors’ works in ScienceDirect. An API allows an entitlements check to be done to lead to the final version or to the manuscript. **Wise** made the group aware of draft “STM Principles for Article Sharing on Scholarly Collaboration Networks” that were posted for public comment earlier in 2015. The round robin discussion followed the traditional “lively lunch” format, with interesting updates and fragments that abounded, but each attendee will have to determine where to go from here.

Vendorbrarians: Librarians Who Work for Vendors and the Value They Provide to Library Customers — Presented by **Robert Boissy** (Springer); **Charlie Remy** (University of Tennessee at Chattanooga); **Marliese Thomas** (Ex Libris); **Jalyn Kelley** (Client Services Manager, IEEE)

Reported by: **Mari Monosoff-Richards** (Librarian, Michigan State University) <monosoff@mail.lib.msu.edu>

This panel was organized to teach the audience about the jobs librarians take with vendors. They spoke about the pros (more money but not as much as you'd think, greater opportunities to climb the career ladder, travel) and cons (former colleagues who feel betrayed, lack of understanding about what librarians can do within the company) as well as what their jobs consist of. Their librarian training often plays a large role in the work that they do.

Each of the vendorbrarians encouraged librarians to speak to their vendors about what can be done better. At **IEEE**, **Kelley** said she presents a customer wish-list to her programmers once a quarter and it influences the product development road map. Someone warned that not all librarian desires are accomplishable, but another member of the panel chimed in that often desired changes are in the works or are new features that the library didn't know about and can be quickly activated. All three panelists encouraged librarians to speak with their vendors often. As vendorbrarians, they act as intermediaries and educators, not just sales people. Professionally they feel the responsibility to advocate for librarians within their organization. 🍷

*That's all the reports we have room for in this issue. Watch for more reports from the 2015 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.charlestonlibraryconference.com. — KS*