Charleston Conference™
ISSUES IN BOOK AND SERIAL ACQUISITION
November 4 - 7, 2015

When You Come to a Fork in the Road, Take It (15th Annual Health Sciences Lively Lunch) *
November 6, 2015

This year's no holds barred Lively Lunch is hosted by Rittenhouse. Speakers:

Jean Gudenas	(Moderator), Head of Collections Management, Loyola University Chicago Health Sciences Library;
Ramune K. Kubilius	Collection Dev / Special Projects Librarian, Northwestern University, Galter Health Sciences Library;
Cunera M. Buys	E-Science Librarian, Northwestern University Library;
Elizabeth Lorbeer	Library Director and Chair of the Department of the Medical Library, Western Michigan University, Homer Stryker School of Medicine

**The Lively Lunch theme was inspired by a saying of Lawrence Peter "Yogi" Berra (May 12, 1925 – September 22, 2015)*

Developments

News and trends that occurred or were noted since Charleston Conference 2014
(compiled by Ramune K. Kubilius)

Anniversaries; retirements; mergers & acquisitions; data set, OA & peer review system initiatives, challenges...

2015 anniversaries

Karger: 125th Anniversary Projects, Events and Publications

<https://www.karger.com/Company/AnniversaryActivities>

- **Karger 125 – Connecting the World of Biomedical Science:** This richly illustrated Festschrift chronicles the company's development and contributions in the service of medicine and science since 1890. Available as a hard cover and as a free cover-cover PDF.
- **Publishing Highlights 1890–2015:** Take a guided tour through 125 years of medical and scientific publishing! The 80+ milestone publications delineate the history of the publishing house while also illustrating the development of medicine and its subspecialties over time.
- **Karger eBook Archive Collection:** More than 2,400 pre-1996 books, a third of which are out of print, are newly available online. This completes the digitizing of the entire Karger book and journal contents since 1890.
- The **Karger Gazette Anniversary Issue** explores the STM publishing business in the digital age, offers short portraits of Karger's journal and book series editors as well as interviews with three renowned scientists about their careers and how they define progress.
- Interview '**Managing Knowledge Ever More Important**' with the CEO Gabriella Karger on the strong Swiss franc, the new Karger Fund for scholarships to study Academic Management at the University of Basel and her fascination with the founder of modern anatomy, Andreas Vesalius.

Sage: 50 years of independent, academic and educational global publishing.

<https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/celebrating-50-years-of-independent-academic-publishing>

At NLM

October 15, 2015:	NLM selected Ex Libris Primo Discovery and delivery solution (will replace LocatorPlus).
June 16, 2015:	PubMed attained a major milestone when the 25 millionth journal citation was added.
April 2015:	NLM's Emergency Access Initiative (EAI) activated to support healthcare professionals working on the response to the earthquake in Nepal.
March 2015:	After decades of extraordinary service to the NIH as the Director of NLM, Dr. Donald Lindberg retired.
February 2015:	New Working Group to Chart the Course for the NIH National Library of Medicine.
December 17, 2014:	PubMed Commons Journal Clubs launched.

Retraction: Hindawi Publishing Corp., a New York- and Cairo-based group that oversees 437 academic journals, is now reviewing 32 published papers to investigate possible fraud, Retraction Watch reports.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/speaking-of-science/wp/2015/07/08/fraudulent-peer-review-strikes-another-academic-publisher-32-articles-questioned/>

DataBridge: a one-stop shop for data sets that would otherwise be lost to the public after the papers they were produced for are published. UNC Chapel Hill, North Carolina A&T State, and Harvard Universities, funded by the NSF three years ago
<http://chronicle.com/blogs/wiredcampus/scientists-open-repository-for-dark-data/57125>

NPG: Nature Partner Journals <http://www.nature.com/partnerpublishing/>

a new series of online open access journals, published in collaboration with world-renowned international partners, eg.

- The npj Biofilms and Microbiomes Community was launched in July 2015 as an interactive online space...
- *npj Breast Cancer* published in partnership between the Breast Cancer Research Foundation (BCRF) and Nature Publishing Group (NPG)
- npj Parkinson's Disease published in partnership with the Parkinson's Disease Foundation (PDF).

May 2015

Merger of Springer Science+Business Media & majority of Macmillan Science and Education: new company to be called Springer Nature

http://www.researchinformation.info/news/news_story.php?news_id=1904

Nature survey of Nature's recent survey of some 21,000 authors: of those surveyed, 25% reported that, "they did not know their funder's requirements with respect to open access."

http://figshare.com/articles/Author_Insights_2015_survey/1425362

&

Researchers Remain Unaware of Funding Agency Access Policies

http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2015/08/20/researcher_remain_unaware/
<http://blogs.cornell.edu/publicaccesshelp/>

eLife Lens (<http://lens.elifesciences.org>) improves the reading and use of scientific articles by making it possible to explore figures, figure descriptions, references, and more without losing your place in the article text. (As of 2015, offers access to all content published by eLife, and has been piloted by six publishers through HighWire)

April 2015

ProQuest has signed an agreement to acquire Coutts Information Services from Ingram Content Group

<http://www.proquest.com/about/news/2015/ProQuest-to-Acquire-Coutts-Information-Services-and-MylLibrary-from-Ingram-Content-Group.html>

Elsevier updates its article-sharing policies

<https://www.elsevier.com/connect/elsevier-updates-its-policies-perspectives-and-services-on-article-sharing>

HW: launch of its latest product, Stackly (Stackly.org), a web-based toolset for content collection, organization, storage, and peer-to-peer collaboration.

<http://library.stanford.edu/news/2015/04/highwire-launches-stackly>

The total number of institutional or funder OA policies worldwide is now 663 (March 2015), over half of them mandatory

<http://eprints.soton.ac.uk/375854/>

March 2015

The new Contributor Role Taxonomy, or CRediT Taxonomy

The Wellcome Trust: working with technology company Digital Science, publishers, research funders and universities to introduce a new way of classifying the roles of individuals in academic research...give credit where it is due, reduce author disputes and remove disincentives to collaboration and the share of data and code.

<http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/News/Media-office/Press-releases/2015/WTP058938.htm>

Textbooks: Trends, Alternatives & Experimentation

Liz Lorbeer
Western Michigan University
School of Medicine

Textbooks

- Will students willingly buy textbooks? No.
 - Suffer academically by not having access.
 - But, they do buy other resources to pass tests and remediate.
- Pressure to keep costs down
- Role of the library
 - Creating goodwill

We'll Create Our Own Textbook!

- Open Textbooks & Apple iBooks
 - Financial incentive
 - Institution as publisher
- Wikis
- Peer-Review. Who's checking content?
- Student: We want the textbook that helps us pass the test.

Copyright & Fair Use

- *Who's the cop at your shop?*
 - *Need an institutional militia to prevent infringement*
- The Compromise
 - Course materials only reside on the Intranet
 - Making students swear never to distribute

Food for thought

- Print vs. E.
 - You'll always have students who prefer print
 - Most report no preference
 - Know thy self.
- Annotations
- Class notes & lectures
- “Must have textbook”
 - If the instructor wants them to have the book, purchase on their behalf and charge as cost of attendance.

Disciplinary Perceptions of Data and Data Management Practices

Pamela L Shaw¹ MSLIS, MS and Cunera M Buys² JD, MS, MSLIS

Galter Health Sciences Library¹, Northwestern University Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute (NUCATS)¹,
Seeley G. Mudd Library², Feinberg School of Medicine¹, Northwestern University^{1 & 2}

Brief Background Highlights

- NSF requires data management plans since 2011 [1]
- NIH has a data sharing policy since 2003 [2]
- White House OSTP released memoranda calling for data sharing plan requirements for awards from federal agencies with more than \$100 million R & D expenditures [3,4]
- Published study shows differences in data sharing or reuse among different academic disciplines [5]
- Academic researcher dissatisfaction with long-term data storage, funding, infrastructure and instruction in data management [5]
- Libraries becoming involved in research data management [6]

Methods

- Survey conducted by the Northwestern University E-Science Working Group (ESWG), a collection of representatives from Northwestern libraries, research computing, information technologies and the Office of Sponsored Research
- Survey questions adapted from survey materials shared by other academic institutions
- Survey constructed in Qualtrics, consisting of 21 questions in the following categories:
 - Researcher demographics
 - Types and size of data
 - Data storage
 - Data retention
 - Data sharing
 - Data management planning
 - Training or assistance needed
- Survey was distributed via email link to over 12,000 Northwestern faculty, staff and students across all academic schools and disciplines
- Survey results analyzed with Atlas.ti text analysis package and with Qualtrics built-in cross-reference functionality
- Link to the completed report with appendices:
https://www.library.northwestern.edu/sites/www.library.northwestern.edu/files/images/5-27-14%20final%20report%20ver%202_psEdit.pdf

831 responses; 788 completed the survey (response rate of 6.4%)

Representatives from 159 different departments responded to the survey, with the department of chemistry the largest respondent

Data Types

The numbers in the "Don't know" category of this chart suggest that the individuals who may spend the most time generating and working with data (research staff and graduate students) may not have as clear a concept of the cumulative data storage needs for projects

Future Data Storage Size Needs by Status

How long are data stored?

- Many researchers prefer to retain raw data and published data indefinitely, citing the value of raw data for new analyses, longitudinal studies or replication of results
- The time span of 5-10 years was also commonly selected, often cited as required by NIH funding mandates

Sharing before and after publication

Method of sharing

Willingness to share

- 54.6% of responders indicated that they share data by personal choice, others share because of funder requirements or recommendations
- Those who do not plan to share their data cite protection of human subject privacy, protection of their intellectual property rights and beliefs that others would not be interested in their data.

Storage location by school

Disciplinary Perceptions of Data & Data Services

Respondents from the schools of education and management requested information on accessing **sources of data** more than any other schools

Responses from humanities were low and many humanities researchers did not perceive their output as “data”, despite the fact that text files compose the largest category of data collected among all researchers.

Schools most likely to have **data management plans** were schools of education (69%), journalism (60%) and medicine (59%). Schools least likely to have DMPs were law (0%) and management (23%)

Limitations of Survey Design

- Department designation
 - Respondents were given a text box to supply department name, instead of a list of options to select from. This made coding the responses for correlation statistics by department virtually impossible with our limited staff resources. As a result, our plan of “disciplinary” analysis was not easily implemented.
- Contact follow up
 - Several respondents indicated that they would be willing to be contacted for a follow up interview, but only 2 provided contact email addresses.
- Term usage
 - The survey asked about data needs for each new “grant”. Not all respondents had grants, so the word “project” would have been a better choice.
- Missing questions
 - Questions about sensitive data were left out of the survey, but would have provided valuable information on practices in managing data privacy.

Barriers to Good Data Practices

- Poor storage choices
 - Users are storing data on potentially unstable computer hard drives
 - Lack of choice in long-term storage options at the university level, and user misunderstanding of current university storage options for long term use
 - NUIT is investigating options for long-term storage
- Lack of organization
 - Text analysis indicated that “frustration” and “disorganization” were a common theme in text responses from all user communities
 - This is an opportunity for libraries and IT to provide training and consultation in file naming, metadata and file version control practices
- Lack of knowledge
 - Respondents at all levels indicated interest in library and NUIT guidance on all levels of data management, from federal requirements to local storage and analysis services.

References

- National Science Foundation. NSF Data Management Plan Requirements. Available from: <http://www.nsf.gov/eng/general/dmp.jsp>
- National Institutes of Health. NIH Data Sharing Policy. Available from: http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/data_sharing/
- White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Scientific Research . Available from: http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/ostp_public_access_memo_2013.pdf
- White House OSTP. Memorandum update. Available from: http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/OpenAccess_March-2014.pdf
- Tenopir, C., et al., Data sharing by scientists: Practices and perceptions. PLoS One, 2011. 6(6): p. e21101.
- Soehner, C., C. Steeves, and J. Ward, e-Science and data support services: a survey of ARL members, in International Association of Scientific and Technological University Libraries, 31st Annual Conference 2010: Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Additional Resources

- Buys, C. M., & Shaw, P. L. (2015). Data Management Practices Across an Institution: Survey and Report. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, 3(2), eP1225. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1225>
- Read, K.B (July 2015). Starting the data conversation: informing data services at an academic health sciences library. *J Med Lib Assoc* 103(3); 131–135. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.103.3.005>
- Surkis, A. and Read, K.B (July 2015). Research data management. *Med Libr Assoc*. 103(3): 154–156. doi: [10.3163/1536-5050.103.3.011](http://dx.doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.103.3.011)

1. National Science Foundation. NSF Data Management Plan Requirements. Available from: <http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/pamphlets/dmp/>.
2. National Institutes of Health. NIH Data Sharing Policy. Available from: <http://www.nih.gov/dataaccess/policy.htm>.
3. National Institutes of Health. NIH Data Management and Sharing Guidelines for the Principal Investigator of Federally Funded Scientific Research. Available from: <http://www.nih.gov/dataaccess/guidelines.htm>.
4. NIH Data Commons. NIH Data Commons website. Available from: <http://datacommons.nih.gov/>.
5. NIH Data Commons. NIH Data Commons website. Available from: <http://datacommons.nih.gov/>.
6. Association of Scientific and Technical Information. Association of Scientific and Technical Information. Available from: <http://www.asti.org/>.

Future Data Storage Size Needs by Status

Figure 1 is a bar chart showing the distribution of storage types used by participants. The x-axis lists various storage types, and the y-axis shows the percentage of participants. The legend indicates three categories: Personal storage (e.g., hard drive, external drive) in dark blue, University storage (e.g., network drive, cloud storage) in light blue, and Other (e.g., USB flash drive, external drive) in grey.

Storage Type	Personal storage (e.g., hard drive, external drive)	University storage (e.g., network drive, cloud storage)	Other (e.g., USB flash drive, external drive)
Personal storage (e.g., hard drive, external drive)	~45%	~10%	~10%
University storage (e.g., network drive, cloud storage)	~10%	~45%	~10%
Other (e.g., USB flash drive, external drive)	~10%	~10%	~45%

Department respondents

Department respondents gave a list but to supply department names. Instead of a list of options to select from, this made coding the responses for correlations statistically problematic, virtually impossible with our limited staff resources. As a result, our plan of "department" analysis was not feasible.

Contact follow up

Several respondents indicated that they would be willing to be contacted for a follow up interview, but only 2 provided contact email addresses.

Terms usage

Several respondents indicated that they needed for each "term" list all the "sub-terms", "sub-definitions" and grants, so the word "project" would have been a better choice.

Missed questions

Questions about sensitive data were left out of the survey, but would have provided valuable information on practices in managing data.

Expanding Limits with Get it Now

Gail Y Hendler, MLS; Jean Gudenas, MLIS; Jeanne Sadlik, MLS
Health Sciences Library, Loyola University Chicago

What we did and why:

- The Health Sciences Library investigated whether unmediated access to the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) Service would be an alternative method of building a burgeoning all-electronic collection by providing fast access to needed content that would also improve customer satisfaction, while providing significant cost-savings for the institution.

At a glance:

- 103 titles initially selected for unmediated access
- Title selection criteria:
 - Faculty recommendations
 - Journals requested more than 5 times within the past two years via Interlibrary Loan (ILL)
 - Unsubscribed titles listed as the top 20 subject specialty based on impact factors
- Titles were continuously added from ILL requests exceeding the "rule of five"

How we did it:

- Established deposit account through CCC—money can be continuously added, account balance carried over yearly, and if you decided to cancel service the remaining money will be refunded
- Serials Solutions LinkResolver connected requests to catalog and to PubMed LinkOut to facilitate access and discovery
- Created a [webpage](#) to promote the service and worked with Marketing and Communications department to help spread the word
- Used SurveyMonkey to solicit customer feedback
- Expanded the service as new titles became available, or requests from faculty or ILL

10 Month Review of Get it Now Service:

- 183 total requests between April 2014—February 2015
- 71 unique journals requested
- 114 unique requestors
- Average turnaround time was under 10 minutes, even on weekends

- Each publisher usually has a set cost for articles. The graph above shows the cost of publishers that had at least 2 journals requested through Get it Now and the average cost of Get it Now for those 6 publishers.
- The 3 graphs below represent direct comparison of the cost of an article through Get it Now with the cost of an article from the three most frequently requested publishers.

What we learned:

- Preliminary data supports the use of Get it Now.
- The service has also aided collection development decisions by documenting actual use

What we are going to do next:

- Continue documenting cost-savings over time for analysis
- Initiate unmediated Get it Now service to offset copyright costs for customers

Survey Results:

- In addition to a link on the Get it Now instructional webpage, an email was sent during October and January to those who had used the Get it Now service
- 30 responded to survey
- Over 54% of respondents learned about Get it Now through the Library website. Next highest was colleagues at 16%, then email and interlibrary both at 12%
- All would recommend Get it Now to others

Selected "how Get it Now supported your work" responses:

- "It was excellent to be able to get articles quickly for a grant proposal I was writing."
- "I was able to get an article quickly, which allowed me to complete an assignment sooner."
- "I was able to rapidly download articles needed for my work as a faculty member."
- What our customers also added:**
- "please keep this service, a library can't own everything and this helps supplement with very fast turn-around"
- "It helped me tremendously with my workflow."

GET IT NOW@The Health Sciences Library

The Health Sciences Library is excited to pilot a new method for delivering articles from unaccessed journals. Using Copyright Clearance Center's Get it Now, you can have full-text PDFs sent directly via email from the journal's listed Contact. Average time to receive an article is less than 20 minutes and the library will assume the cost of 25 articles a week per person. Should you wish to assume the cost for additional articles, we will be happy to assist you.