Against the Grain

Volume 28 | Issue 4 Article 48

2016

And They Were There--Reports of Meetings

Donald T. Hawkins
dthawkins@verizon.net

Recommended Citation
Hawkins, Donald T. (2016) "And They Were There--Reports of Meetings," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 28: Iss. 4, Article 48.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.7492

And They Were There

Reports of Meetings — NASIG 31st Annual Conference and the 35th Annual Charleston Conference

NASIG Report Edited by: **Donald T. Hawkins** (Freelance Conference Blogger and Editor, "Don's Conference Notes") <dthawkins@verizon.net>

NASIG Annual Conference — ***"Embracing New Horizons"*** — Hotel Albuquerque, Albuquerque, NM — June 9-12, 2016

Reported by: **Steve Oberg** (Assistant Professor, Library Science, Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL and current Vice President / President-elect, NASIG) <steve.oberg@wheaton.edu>

NASIG (*http://www.nasig.org*, formerly the **North American Serials Interest Group, Inc.**) held its 31st annual conference in beautiful, sunny Albuquerque, NM from June 9-12, 2016. Several hundred attendees converged on the Hotel Albuquerque for three days packed with interesting conference presentations along with plenty of informal networking — one of **NASIG's** biggest strengths — and an engaging vendor expo. The conference theme, "Embracing New Horizons," set the tone for the event. Here are a few highlights from the conference program.

"Show Me the Value!," presented by **Matt Harrington** of **North Carolina State University** (**NCSU**, *https://www.ncsu.edu/*), described an interesting project to assess the ROI of consortial serial packages within the **Triangle Research Library Network** (**TRLN**, *http://www.trln.org/*). Commissioned by **TRLN's** Electronic Resource Committee, the project collated several assessment metrics including title-level analyses, collection-level graphs, and institutional-level comparisons as well as overall summaries of various metrics, all contained within a **Microsoft Access** database. **Matt** highlighted the following general points:

- Determining what is good or bad is about defining limits,
- The importance of mapping values along a spectrum to determine better vs. worse,
- The importance of using the right title-level identifiers to collate data in a useful way, and
- Cost and usage, the key pieces of data to assess ROI.

Matt selected year, institution, and ISSN-L for collating data, and emphasized that multiple pricing models among **TRLN** institutions made it a challenge to use cost in a comparative way. The only serial package that was common among **TRLN** institutions involved in this assessment project was a consortial **Springer** journal package. **Wiley** is problematic for cost comparison, since each **TRLN** institution has its own subscription/package deals from that publisher. Key takeaways from **Matt's** talk: thoroughly understand the data with which you are working; calculating ROI is a worthwhile but complex endeavor; and comparing serial packages across a consortium over time will lead to more effective collection decisions.

NASIG is frequently thought of as only about serials even though it covers a much broader range of topics, and this was borne out by another presentation that described one library's experience with streaming video. **Jennifer Leffler**, Technical Services Manager at the **University of Northern Colorado**, provided her audience with useful insights in her talk, "Juggling a New Format with Existing Tools: Incorporating Streaming Video into Technical Services Workflows." She pointed out that there isn't one type of streaming video; there are several, which include databases that are mostly subscription-based (think, for example, **Kanopy Streaming**, *https://www.kanopystreaming.com/*), locally hosted services (her institution uses an Ensemble Streaming Server), and externally hosted services. Streaming videos might be perpetual access, subscription-based, or expire after a certain term. **Jennifer** also talked about coping with teaching faculty's assumptions about streaming video, e.g., that everything is available in streaming video, ripping DVDs is OK, and library staff members don't need much time to make new streaming videos available (a week's notice is common). She next walked through several workflows they developed and discussed some of the common questions they encounter in those workflows. For example, are multi-year leases best treated as monographs or serials (answer: monographs)? Tracking the usage of streaming video is very important but there is not yet as much standardization as with other formats. Also, how do we define "good usage" for this format? Finally, **Jennifer** talked at some length about providing access to streaming video and the challenges her institution's users face in finding streaming videos by using a local catalog vs. a discovery interface (her library uses Summon). Attendees left this session with some practical ideas for how to cope with this important new format.

An inspiring presentation was given by **Heather Joseph**, Executive Director of the **Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition** (**SPARC**, *http://sparcopen.org/*) on "The Power of 'Open.'" **Heather** traced the history of the open access (OA) movement and how **SPARC** has progressed since its inception in 2002. In the process of doing that, she emphasized that OA is a technology driven movement, and quoted from a statement of the Budapest Open Access Initiative: "An old tradition and a new technology have converged to make possible an unprecedented public good." She pointed out that "open" access means immediate access to content AND full reuse of that content. "Open" can provide a solution to problems, and be used as a lever to create new opportunities. While diversity is a core strength of the OA movement, it also is a key weakness, since there are many problems to solve and many opportunities to pursue. Different user communities have their own expectations for OA:

- The library community might say that because of ever more limited budgets, it needs OA to alleviate cost pressures, especially for journals.
- The research community might say that it wants to find all the resources it needs without any restrictions or paywalls.
- Government bodies might say that the key driver for OA is business development.
- Funding agencies might want better ROI for societal impact.

Heather illustrated how government agencies view OA as a way to generate economic benefits by using the example of the human genome project. She noted that originally there were parallel models, one funded by federal dollars and the other funded by for profit entities. It turns out that the open version funded by the federal government generated over $700 billion in ROI, whereas the for profit version had a much more limited impact.

SPARC recently invited an independent consultant who knew nothing about OA to review how it is doing. The results of that review focused on four areas:

- The need to look at the whole board ("the open agenda"),
- Clearly defining the end goal of **SPARC's** efforts,
- The answer to the question, Why Open?, and
- The need to reward "open" in meaningful ways.

Defining the end goal, as one can imagine, proved quite challenging. **Heather** put it this way: We need to set the default to "open" in research and education, flipping our current default "closed" model on its head and making it the exception rather than the rule. We also need to not push for "open" for its own sake, but "'open in order to' do or accomplish something else that's concrete and desirable." She illustrated this by mentioning the "cancer moonshot" initiative led by **U.S. Vice President Biden**. That project has fully embraced this idea of "'open' in order to" accomplish strategic gains in cancer research in a short amount of time.

At the end of **Heather's** talk, she fielded several questions:

- *How are you reaching out to institutions regarding promotion and tenure (P&T) guidelines (to promote the value of "open")?* At **Indiana University — Purdue University at Indianapolis (IUPUI)**, they are working on crowdsourcing

continued on page 82

P&T guidelines. The broader research and education community can see what's out there, and **IUPUI** has set an example of how to incorporate the benefit of OA publishing into such guidelines.

- *Have we solved the problem of publishers' involvement in this P&T process?* In reality, the OA publishing industry is still pretty new. Article processing charges (APCs) are an initial model; is that the right system, one that is sustainable? **Heather** said that significant money still supports the old subscription model, and believes that this money needs to shift to a different model for there to be significant change.
- *Does SPARC have a position on SciHub?* **SPARC** does not support or condone illegal efforts. However, **Heather** believes that SciHub serves to illuminate the scale of the problem that OA is trying to solve.

Jim O'Donnell, University Librarian at **Arizona State University**, closed this year's conference with a provocative speech on how to re-imagine the services libraries provide, and the number of actual libraries we really need to have. He argues that we should think more collectively about our shared resources. In **Jim's** view, one of the things we must focus on is our core strength of being information consultants. He left us with a lot of possibilities to mull over.

The excellent program put on by **NASIG**, combined with an outstanding site in Albuquerque, left participants stimulated with thoughts of the future — ready to shape and embrace the new horizons awaiting us. The **NASIG** plenary speakers' talks are available on YouTube at *https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCVvnh_CzXS8YgftuvIypTiQ*.

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 fourth installment of 2015 conference reports. The first three installments can be found in **ATG v.28#1, February 2016**, **v.28#2, April 2016** and **v.28#3, June 2016**. We will continue to publish all of the reports received in upcoming print issues throughout the year. — **RKK***

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2015
LIVELY LUNCHES

Elsevier's Heirs, or, Yes, Copyright IS Confusing — Presented by **William Cross** (NCSU Libraries); **Molly Keener** (Wake Forest University Libraries); **Heather Morrison** (University of Ottawa – School of Information Studies)

Reported by: **Lisa Hopkins** (Texas A&M University-Central Texas) <l.hopkins@tamuct.edu>

The panel of three speakers presented a brief talk. **Morrison**, Assistant Professor at **University of Ottawa School of Information Studies**, presented a PowerPoint slide show about "Sustaining the Knowledge Commons" — the slides zipped by very quickly with little or no explanation. Her talk centered on issues surrounding Open Access, copyright and licensing. **Keener**, Scholarly Communication Librarian at **Wake Forest University Libraries**, spoke about the "Copyright Conundrum." She spoke about copyright as a bundle of rights, and faculty authors giving away part — or all — of their rights by signing contracts without reading them. Finally, **Cross**, Director, Copyright and Digital Scholarship, **NCSU Libraries**, went over many legal terms involved in copyright, as well as issues in negotiating contracts as authors. The three panelists led a discussion closely tied to the description of the "lively lunch," very centered on faculty and graduate students and their publications, negotiating contracts and issues surrounding IRs and Creative Commons. There was very little conversation about how this impacts the library and the role of the librarian — unless students or faculty members come to ask about his/her contract OR the library is involved in building an IR. The discussion was very centered on the publishing industry. The biggest takeaway from the discussion was that libraries must urge faculty (and grad students) to keep a copy of their publishing contracts AND print out terms from the Website (as a PDF with a date stamp) on the day they signed the contract.

If Students Were Cats: Understanding the Different Breeds at Your Institution — Presented by **Carrie Moran** (University of Central Florida); **Kyle Stewart** (Cengage Learning); **Jakarri Godbolt** (College of Charleston)

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

The title's name created the expectation that the session would classify users according to different breeds of cats. Being a cat-guardian, this session intrigued me. The description explained something different: creation of patron personas and Agile story-mapping techniques. These techniques are to develop a sample user persona that is a composite of users. The session matched the description as **Stewart's** descriptions of Agile's concepts and strategies alternated with **Moran's** discussions of how these concepts were applied in the re-design of the **University of Central Florida Library** Website. The first stage discussed interviews. Useful suggestions regarding interviews were supplied including a role play between **Stewart** and **Godbolt**. Once a set of interviews is obtained, categorization of responses is next. These results are then compared with website usage data. To provide a human face to the results and better empathize with the users, patron personas are created from like groups of users. The personas are created by story-mapping techniques. The personas are a way to test how successful the library meets the need of that persona. So how did cats fit in this presentation? They were in icons describing sample personas during this practical and active presentation.

continued on page 83

And They Were There
from page 82

The Future of the Subscription Agent — Presented by **Robert Boissy** (Springer); **Tina Feick** (Harrassowitz); **Dan Tonkery** (Content Strategy); **Jill Emery** (Portland State University)

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

During his introduction, moderator **Tonkery** described the history of the subscription agent, the impact of technology on the business, and facets of the changing environment that agents initially missed, such as how to work with consortia most effectively. **Boissy** talked about **Springer's** policy for working with subscription agents; he discussed the changes libraries have seen as fixed print pricing transitioned to custom pricing for electronic subscriptions. While urging agents to find ways to stay viable, he explained that his company does its own due diligence in monitoring agents. **Feick** shared some results of a survey on the role of the subscription agent she was involved with that yielded responses from more than 400 libraries, and she indicated that an article will be forthcoming. She talked about the complexities electronic journal packages bring to **Harrassowitz** and other agents at the same time that they offer the opportunity for agents to provide much needed services for libraries. Providing the librarian perspective, **Emery** talked about the role of subscription agents versus consortia and her interest in working within a contract so there is more accountability. The concluding remark was that agents will continue to be around to bring order out of chaos.

Then and Now: Re-visioning a Liaison Program in the Context of Library Restructuring — Presented by **Harriet Lightman** (Northwestern University); **Marianne Ryan** (Northwestern University)

Reported by: **Alison M. Armstrong** (Radford University) <amarmstro@radford.edu>

This Lively Lunch was led by **Lightman** and **Ryan**. At **Northwestern University**, they have found that hearing what others do can be helpful.

The audience was a mix of vendor representatives and librarians. Roles, terms, and structures vary from library to library. We went around the room and said our names, our institution, and a frustration in terms of liaison programs. Some topics were discussed further and others were more rhetorical. The session was interesting and a nice arena to toss ideas and concerns out in a lively discussion.

There were about 30 attendees in the session. **Harriet** and **Marianne** pointed out that all of us were worried about liaison programs. At **Northwestern**, they found that you can't do it all and you can't force people to do things they aren't good at. Now, they hold training sessions and have guest lecturers. They developed an expertise database which helps with referrals.

In the end, it is something we all struggle with at some point but, communication is important. This session may not have had all of the answers but, it was great to hear that we are all struggling with some of the same issues.

When You Come to a Fork in the Road, Take It (15th Annual Health Sciences Lively Lunch) — Presented by **Jean Gudenas, Moderator** (Loyola University Chicago Health Sciences Library); **Ramune K. Kubilius** (Northwestern University, Galter Health Sciences Library); **Cunera M. Buys** (Northwestern University Library); **Elizabeth Lorbeer** (Western Michigan University, Homer Stryker School of Medicine)

NOTE: This was an off-site session open to all that required pre-registration.

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

In this year's sponsored, but no holds barred lunch session, over 40 participants played off of **Lawrence Peter "Yogi" Berra's** quote: *"When You Come to a Fork in the Road, Take It,"* highlighting new roles and avenues for libraries and librarians. After greetings from **Wendy Bahnsen** on behalf of the lunch host, **Rittenhouse**, **Kubilius** presented the traditional brief "year in review" recap (since the 2014 conference), highlights that included independent publisher anniversaries, industry mergers and acquisitions, data sets and open access news.

Panelist **Lorbeer** presented "Textbooks: Trends, Alternatives & Experimentation," how her library at a relatively new medical school is selecting and acquiring course materials as well as running the bookstore. Experiments and initiatives? Use of Inkling and Apple iBooks, institution as publisher, and the use of Wikis for course materials. Points to consider? Copyright, student adoption and other issues.

Buys highlighted work she and **Pamela Shaw** (Biosciences & Bioinformatics Librarian, Northwestern University's Galter Health Sciences Library) did as part of **Northwestern University's** E-Science Working Group. Survey results were presented in a poster at **Medical Library Association 2015** annual meeting, entitled "Disciplinary Perceptions of Data and Data Management Practices." Libraries help researchers understand funders' data sharing requirements and know their constituents' disciplinary repository options when there are no institutional repositories that can accommodate data sets. Knowledge of institutions' data management policies is key. Additional assistance can be offered. Opportunities to learn more in this arena abound and data sets can and are becoming part of libraries' collections.

Before the floor was opened for questions and discussion, moderator **Gudenas** shared highlights of **Gail Hendler's** and her 2015 conference poster, "Expanding Limits with Get It Now." Can access to material be sufficient and provide cost-savings over ownership to a title? She shared the steps her library took to supplement document delivery solutions, identifying a group of 100 high demand, non-subscribed journals, to make available through Get it Now (**Copyright Clearance Center**), opting to make it an unmediated service. This solution was not set up lightly and incorporated considerable analysis.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2015
AFTERNOON CONCURRENT SESSIONS 1

50 Shades of eBooks — Presented by **Victoria Koger** (Eastern Kentucky University); **Laura Edwards** (Eastern Kentucky University)

Reported by: **Jennifer Culley** (University of Southern Mississippi University Libraries) <Jennifer.Culley@usm.edu>

Although held in a small room, there was a good crowd for the ***50 Shades of eBooks*** presentation by **Koger** and **Edwards**, both from **Easter Kentucky University**. The presentation was just as described. They touched on their library's issues with eBook use, an apparent common issue with those in the audience. They discussed patron issues with different formats and platforms, as well as various vendor restrictions.

continued on page 84

To help address some of these issues they have created coping strategies in their library. One of these strategies was to create a guide for helping patrons use the eBook collections. This guide can be found at the following Website: *http://libguides.eku.edu/OnlineResources/eBookGuide*. The guide is easy to use and follow. This session was very informative and it helps to know many other libraries have the same struggles and obstacles with eBooks.

Data That Counts — Presented by **Jo Lambert** (JUSP Service Manager); **Lorraine Estelle** (COUNTER)

Reported by: **Connie Stovall** (University of South Alabama) <cstovall@southalabama.edu>

Estelle initiated Friday afternoon's session with appreciated levity. Specifically, she pointed out the sessions' "magenta theme," as evidenced by her outfit and her cohort's current hair color. **Estelle** then began in earnest by providing a **COUNTER** overview, highlighting its history of setting standards in developing credible, consistent journal usage statistics, and summed up by emphasizing **COUNTER's** international, community-driven approach.

Lambert discussed how the standards operate in practice as tools. With **JUSP**, members utilize a single interface as opposed to visiting multiple publisher Websites to retrieve statistics. Additionally, the tool depicts data visually and assists institutions with understanding their place in scholarly communication.

Likewise, the newer IRUS-UK makes available standardized statistics for IRs and enables researchers to view their impact and compile annual reviews data. **Lambert** added that keyword searching allows vanity searching, too, a comment that sent a ripple of chuckles through the room despite the typical post-lunch lull.

Lastly, the presenters reiterated benefits of connecting libraries, shared usage statistics management, and avoiding effort duplication. Challenges center on eBook usage data. While they intend to provide such services, it was pointed out, with understated humor, that standards are lacking at the publisher level. A thoughtful discussion ensued, with one person, perhaps relatively new to the subject, asking what anyone in the United States new to usages statistics wants to know: does an U.S. equivalent exist? Like the rest of us, she was disappointed with the answer…

The Unknown Path – Evaluating Electronic Resources for Access-Based Collection Development — Presented by **Laurel Crawford** (University of North Texas); **Erin Miller** (University of North Texas)

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

After introductions and acknowledgement of **Henley** (former Contracts Assessment Librarian), **Crawford** provided an overview of the traditional structure of collection development and the factors that led to its review. As a result, the librarians at **University of North Texas** revised their decision process to include the following four features: team approach, holistic collection sculpting, areas of emphasis, and evaluation over decision. These required evaluation, negotiation, transparency, and thorough documentation of the process. The evaluation covers ten areas: feedback, trials, access, content and scope, special concerns, license/contract, usability, and vendor communication. All areas (except for license/contract and usability) are reviewed via a three-part rubric (Excellent, Medium, and Poor). One section of the session I really appreciated were the guidelines for setting up a trial and how to promote it. Concerning license/contract, the library has a Contracts Assistant. **Crawford** discussed the checklist used in evaluating the license. Concerning usability, students test the resources using a checklist. Three items for better student evaluations included definition of library terms, provision of sample questions/ sample terms, and installation of Chrome Mobile Emulator. **Miller** started as Electronic Resources Librarian as this process was underway and appreciated the opportunity to manage this rubric. Audience members included librarians and representatives from publishers. There was constructive discussion and both presenters were able to respond to all comments. While this rubric was developed for materials prior to purchase, they will revise the rubric to evaluate materials currently subscribed.

Where do we go from here?: Navigating through the Deluge of Research Information — Presented by **Robin Champieux** (Oregon Health & Science University); **Jason A. Clark** (Montana State University Libraries); **Kamran Naim** (Annual Reviews)

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

Three speakers provided three perspectives. Current day researchers are challenged by the impossibility of being experts, articles are doubling each decade, **PubMed** is adding two new articles (references) per minute, etc. **Naim** maintained that part of the informational ecosystem is harvesting the wisdom of scholars — it's an honor for them to be invited, provides recognition, and for the audience — provides a guide into the primary literature. **Clark** pointed out that finding machine processes is another technique — applying the open data project to research services. This includes making a recommendation engine of screen scrapes resulting in related articles, linked pages and resources. Understand the sharing economy seen inside social networks. Examples of betas, APIs were given. **Champieux** talked about graphing the literature. Institutions like hers pose questions-what are we publishing, what are linkages between people and their research, what is the impact of the work? Leveraging the power of the graph can pull together disconnected data, the relationships (e.g., mentors and mentees) over time. Build and use: database APIs, integrated semantic frameworks of VIVO, attributions, taxonomies, faceted searching technologies.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2015
AFTERNOON CONCURRENT SESSIONS 2

Avoiding Pitfalls of Special Collection Digitization — Presented by **William Bennett** (Smithsonian Archives); **Ray Bankoski** (Gale, Cengage Learning); **Joan Stahl** (The Catholic University of American) ; **Natraj Kumar** (HTC Global Services, Inc.)

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

This session, hidden in the schedule on Friday afternoon, proved to be a worthwhile "mini-seminar," informative for those responsible for collection management of rare items in Special Collections or at institutions early in the trajectory of digitizing items in those collections. Speakers offered standards, tips, and best practices. **Stahl** aptly observed that special collections are gaining prominence. Digitization projects at many libraries are probably done in-house, often for exhibits, and plans for systematic digitization may be less frequent (though the desire may be there). Acquisition of a donated collection of former ambassador **Olivier Lima's** papers pushed the matter to the forefront at **Catholic University**. **Stahl** outlined reminders about the digitization plan — the why (preservation or access), the issues of space, attention, marketing, audience, labor (appreciate the staff-intense nature), the scope (entire or in phases)… "It takes a village," she reminded. **Bennett** addressed challenges that can be overcome, since there is never enough time, money, or people. This area is important to cultural heritage and a clear vision of priorities is important, as is communication with stakeholders. Batch process whenever possible, he advised, and make sure that scanner operators are trained to handle special collections materials. **Bankoski** continued this thread by advising that conservators train

continued on page 85

Media-Centered — Have Fun Storming the Castle!

Column Editor: **Winifred Fordham Metz** (Media Librarian & Head, Media Resources Center, House Undergraduate Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Phone: 919-962-4099) <freddie@email.unc.edu> *http://www.lib.unc.edu/house/mrc*

Column Editor's Note:** The use of media in the classroom is ubiquitous. Visual theses are on the rise. Academic interest in and classroom use of film and global cinema is growing at an exponential rate. Resultantly, the importance of a rich and varied media resources collection is essential to academic institutions, public libraries, and K-12 media centers. It takes a lot of work, development, and research to maintain and grow a collection like this. Resources that aid in this process are invaluable… — **WFM

Over the last couple of years, I have utilized this column to discuss several essential components of Media Librarianship ranging from content (documentaries, feature films, collecting resources and the festival circuit), pedagogy and copyright to nuts and bolts information on streaming media and distribution to keeping attuned to the current media delivery landscape. If I were asked to identify a foundation or common thread running through each of these discussions, it would have to be collection development. Why? Because it always comes back to the stuff. Streaming and distribution are about providing access to and (in part) preserving the stuff, copyright is about protecting the stuff, and pedagogy is about teaching, researching and ultimately producing more stuff. That will, in turn, need to be collected.

Now, do not get me wrong — I am in no way suggesting that Media Librarianship can be distilled simply and solely down to collection development, but I do believe it to be central scaffolding for core components comprising the work. I use media in almost every class I speak to and almost every instruction session or presentation I give. It is extremely rare for me to complete a consult without illustrating some point with a scene from a film or documentary or referring to a media clip online. No matter if I am in the classroom, media production lab, curating a screening or advising a project, the work ultimately always ties back to the collection.

So, collection development and careful curation remain key.

This is certainly something that has been underscored for me time and again and most recently in a myriad of interesting consults with grad students conducting summer research and with faculty prepping their syllabi for new classes. In one particular series of consults, where I was walking a couple of graduate students through the process of crafting a visual thesis for their media project and outlining how to storyboard or rough out their initial ideas, we kept returning to the collection — not only for research content but as a means for me to illustrate examples of clear theses, effective interviewing techniques, and to begin introducing ideas about good camera placement, sound quality and editing choices. A week later, when a faculty member came to me for help providing samples of media to contextualize a number of themes he will be presenting in a new class in the fall semester, we successfully mined the collection to meet a few of the themes, found some relevant docs available freely online to address a couple more, and uncovered a subject area gap needing to be explored. While each of these consults required me to actively engage a rich range of skills — their success depended on my utilizing both the collection and my collection development expertise. Happily, these consults also yielded an almost simultaneous organic review of the collection — reflecting areas of content wealth and highlighting areas needing development — allowing me to not only apply but sharpen that expertise.

It's a Prestigious Line of Work, with a Long and Glorious Tradition.

When I heard that one of the central themes for this issue of ***Against the Grain*** surrounded ***Adversity** in Collection Development*, things like budget, access and delivery, and copyright sprang to mind — but they were each soon eclipsed by the notion of complacency.

Let's sit with that for a minute.

By complacency, I am talking more of the sense-of-security/repose/equanimity use of the term, not so much the self-satisfaction/smugness

continued on page 86

And They Were There
from page 84

scanner operators, and he discussed common types of scanners. He argued the merits of JPEG vs TIFF, resolution issues, consideration of the end purpose, and the recommendation for a "master file" and one for presentation. Put files in logical folder structure, he advised, and don't randomly number. **Kumar** discussed the purpose of metadata, and advised that decisions should be made based on a sampling, that some decisions may need to be made on the fly, but that there should be a team for identifying variations, and that "90% clear vision is best." (**Marty Tannenbaum** from **Innovation Document Imaging**, was involved in original plans for this session, but did not attend). Questions ranged: about duplicating (or not) what has already been digitized, about item notes, about human eye and DPI, and about reduction ratios.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2015
AFTERNOON PLENARY SESSION

Hyde Park Debate. Resolved: Altmetrics are Overrated — Presented by **Rick Anderson, Moderator** (University of Utah); **Maria Bonn** (University of Illinois); **Derek Law** (University of Strathclyde)

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

As moderator, **Anderson** stayed out of the fray. The opening poll of this entertaining debate about altmetrics was close: I agree (20) vs I disagree (15). **Law**, the eloquent scholar from Scotland, argued that with altmetrics, what's measurable becomes more than what is important. Altmetics eliminate judgement in favor of what can be measured. Comparing altmetrics to metrics is akin to comparing medicine to alternative medicine. Other arguments: crowd sourcing is populist, a third of tweeting papers are not academic, and pseudoscience can be raised to the level of science, bad science can get high scores, manipulation is possible.... **Bonn** argued that all metrics are overrated, yet, in order to hear the stories, narratives are rich, and, yes, she desired all tales and numbers. In the next round, **Law** mentioned the spider web in the old house of **James Thurber's** 1937 "Tales of Our Time." There is no safety in numbers or anywhere else, he argued. Altmetrics focus on what is measurable more than what is important. Don't blame the bricks for the shoddy house, and remember the Trojan horse. Audience comments included — what does it mean to have impact, it can be said that metrics are power, and yes, altmetrics are over-rated because there is a presumption that there is one dominant tool. "Political agendas will drive altmetrics," argued the ultimate winner, **Law** (more attendees joined the ending poll and the gap between "yes" and "no" was larger).

*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 2015 sessions are available online. Visit the **Conference Website** at **www.charlestonlibraryconference.com**. — **KS***