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Are you tired of hearing about patron-driven acquisitions yet? PDA and DDA (demand-driven acquisitions) seem to turn up everywhere these days — in conference sessions, vendor visits, and library literature. You’re thinking, how much more can there be to say? You’ve heard so many librarians talk about their institution’s great success with PDA or their abysmal failure. What’s the big picture?

Well, take a look at this Against the Grain issue. It’s not your mother’s PDA.

We’re kicking it off with Bob Johnson and his discussion of the basics of the patron-driven model. He will give you newbies an idea of what matters when considering a patron-driven plan and what to watch out for.

Jason Price, on the other hand, isn’t sold on PDA yet. In his article, he proposes a new model for patron-driven plans that would free the content from restrictive digital rights management (DRM). It may take a superhero to do this, but Jason, the DRM-imator, is up to the task.

PDA seems new and trendy but what happens with a patron-driven collection over time? Peter Spitzform at the University of Vermont has been running a PDA program since before you even knew PDA existed, and he tells us about how the model evolves. He presents data about the University of Vermont’s program as well as an exact measure of the impact of PDA on their collection. Michael Levine-Clark also discusses how to maintain your PDA collection over time and what libraries will need if we want to move more of our collections dollars to demand-driven models. If PDA is here to stay, how do you make sure you have the right content for your users year after year?

How will patron-driven acquisitions affect scholarly publishing? Rick Anderson and Sandy Thatcher have been giving this a lot of thought, and they debate the question in these pages. Rebecca Seger and Lenny Allen also discuss how patron-driven acquisitions affect scholarly publishing, but they present the publisher’s perspective and challenges.

Finally, what could be more challenging than running a patron-driven acquisition program that covers thirty-six libraries? Emily McElroy and Susan Hinken are part of the Orbis Cascade Alliance consortium’s demand-driven acquisitions team, and their article discusses the Alliance’s search for an effective eBook strategy.

Big thanks to all the authors who turned out such great work, and especially to Jesse Holden, my most valued colleague, who reviewed and edited these submissions with me.
From Your (chocolate loving) Editor:

The PTBs (powers that be) say that chocolate is good for you. Dark chocolate. Of course I love milk chocolate. But milk chocolate must be better for you than, say, fried chicken or French fries. While eating chocolate, a group of us have been working on Against the Grain. This issue is guest edited by the amazing Xan Arch who has collected articles from Robert Johnson, Jason Price, Peter Spitzform, Michael Levine-Clark, Rick Anderson and Sandy Thatcher, Emily McElroy and Susan Hinken, and Rebecca Seger and Lenny Allen. We are lucky enough with this issue to have interviews with Phoebe Ayers, and Deborah Kahn. Tony Ferguson is still giving us words of wisdom in Back Talk. Meanwhile Michael Pelikan takes on “mobile,” Bob Nardini talks about competition, Jesse Holden discovers apps, Donna Jacobs discovers cheese and In-
dependent People, Bryan Carson straightens us out on Righthaven, William Rieders looks beyond eTextbooks, Bob Holley mourns the death of the journal, and Scott Smith considers much ado about PDA. Lolly Gasaway has been asked about film snippets and yearbooks, while Steven Douglas and Michelle Flinchbaugh address issues in establishing digital repositories. And, of course this is just the tip of the iceberg! Happy Reading!

Plus, I have to tell you, that a lot of what we didn’t have room to print is in the online ATG, located at www.against-the-grain.com. 

Guess I will take a break now and have some chocolate ice cream. And, for those of you who may happen by, I have acache of all kinds of chocolates in my office. Meantime, have a great summer!

Much Love, Yr. Ed.

---

Letters to the Editor

Send letters to <kstrauch@comcast.net>, phone or fax 843-723-3536, or snail mail: Against the Grain, MSC 98, The Citadel, Charleston, SC 29409. You can also send a letter to the editor from the ATG Homepage at http://www.against-the-grain.com.

Dear Editor:

I’m writing to correct an error in Mark V. Herring’s piece, “Can Open Access Save Us?” from the Dec. 2010-Jan. 2011 issue. Herring makes the point in passing that “by definition, open-access archives and/or journals do not provide scholarly vetting (peer review)...”

This is not at all what open access is, by definition or in practice. Herring quotes Peter Suber, but he should have dug deeper. As Suber writes, “OA is compatible with peer review, and all the major OA initiatives for scientific and scholarly literature insist on its importance.” There are now hundreds (thousands?) of peer-reviewed OA journals. As one example, librarian and scholar Heather Morrison found that PLoS One, an OA journal from the Public Library of Science, published more peer-reviewed articles than any other scholarly journal in 2010.

Katharine Dunn (Projects Librarian, MIT Libraries) <khdunn@mit.edu> http://libraries.mit.edu/scholarly

---

AGAINST THE GRAIN DEADLINES

VOLUME 23 — 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011 Events</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Ad Reservation Camera-Ready</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference Publishing</td>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>06/27/11 07/18/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Conference</td>
<td>November 2011</td>
<td>08/15/11 09/05/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOR MORE INFORMATION CONTACT

Toni Nix <justwrite@lowcountry.com>; Phone: 843-835-8604; Fax: 843-835-5892; USPS Address: P.O. Box 412, Cottageville, SC 29435; FedEx/UPS ship to: 398 Crab Apple Lane, Ridgeville, SC 29472.

---

Rumors from page 1


I guess that it is true after all that all good things come to an end. After 12 years of working with Libraries Unlimited, Ron Maas will be leaving the company due to a reorganization. Ron says he has mixed feelings. He has enjoyed his time working with us as wonderful partners, and he hopes we will cross paths somewhere farther down the road. In the meantime, if you have questions about your work with Libraries Unlimited, be sure to check in with Barbara Ittner <bittner@abc-clio.com> who has been at LU longer than Ron (she started with the company when Ron was 12), and Ron says we are in good hands with her and LU will continue to be a force for positive change in the markets that we all serve. Ron can be reached at <Ronmaas99@gmail.com>, or at his home phone 203-373-9597. If you are on LinkedIn, send Ron a connection, and say something nice. He is way too young to retire!

Just back from a fabulous trip! We had the 13th Fiesole Collection Development Retreat in St. Petersburg, Russia. St. Petersburg is an incredibly historic city. We arrived by train from Helsinki, Finland, to the Finland Station where Lenin arrived in a sealed train to begin the Russian Revolution. We were greeted at the train station by Fred Lynden (once head of technical servives and scholarly communications at Brown and frequent attendee at the Charleston Conference) and his lovely and vivacious wife Irina, who is Deputy Director General of the National Library of Russia. A cruise on the Neva River gave us a look at many famous landmarks and elegant palaces, and I had to pinch myself when we attended a Russian ballet (Onnide) at the Marlinsky Theater. Fred looks great! He could be a poster child for retirement. And so does Irina who could be a poster child for working! Hmmm! Oh! Almost forgot! The Retreat! There were many excellent papers given by a host of international librarians, publishers, and vendors. The current Charleston Report has some of my favorite quotes from the Retreat (see www.charlstonco.com/) but you need a subscription to look at them. Will see what I can do about that! The Casalini Website has many of the papers loaded there for your perusal. Next year’s Retreat is planned for Fiesole, Italy April 12-14, 2012. http://www.casalini.it/retreat/ http://www.theconferencecircuit.com/2011/05/04/fiesole-retreat-may-11-13/...continued on page 14
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Purchasing Options in Patron-Driven Acquisitions

by Robert Johnson (Clinical Services Librarian, USC Norris Medical Library) <robertej@usc.edu>

The Basics

Patron-Driven Acquisitions (PDA) is a model of purchasing in which the librarians set the parameters of purchase and patrons pull the trigger. The material selected by patrons is appropriate to the collection because of the parameters set in place by librarians, and it is important to the collection because patrons themselves select it. This method of collection development can be thought of in many different ways: as a cost saving measure, supplement to interlibrary loan, method to increase electronic content, an alternative to traditional collection development, etc. At UCI, we primarily wanted to know if we could achieve cost savings and still provide robust access to content. Though print PDA options exist, most discussion of PDA centers on delivery of electronic content, which I’ll focus on here. I won’t try to describe which is “best;” mainly because these models are extremely flexible and customizable based on your institution’s needs, and each institution has differing needs and goals that may be met differently by specific vendors. Also, these models are changing and evolving constantly and the options/customizations I mention here may be different tomorrow.

The UCI Libraries investigated PDA beginning in 2009 and implemented a limited PDA pilot in late 2010. We looked at four vendors and developed questions to compare them to one another. In order to create a list of questions to address as many aspects as possible, UC libraries assembled bibliographers from arts and humanities, social sciences, sciences, technical services, and acquisitions. Making sure to include both subject specialists, technical service specialists, and acquisitions specialists was important as we could tackle not only the collection development aspects of this project, but also technical aspects subject librarians would not have thought of (such as the level of cataloging, how easily we could integrate these records into our OPAC, how invoicing works, etc.). We reviewed the available literature and contacted authors to get some first-hand accounts of the process. Then we began examining two years of usage data (both circulation and internal use counts) for material from specific publishers. Armed with this knowledge, we came up with a list of questions to ask vendors (for the full list, see Sue Polanka’s blog No Shelf Required: http://www.libraries.wright.edu/noshelfrequired/?p=415). I expected to see established packages from each vendor, but instead, we were presented with four companies very willing to customize based on our needs. The most important thing an organization can do prior to investigating these models is to determine what it wants out of PDA. Cost savings, ILL alternatives, beefing up electronic content, and/or altering responsibilities for collection development librarians are some reasons for interest in PDA, and each of those reasons will change the customization you seek.

Based on our investigations, here are some issues to consider when setting up a PDA program.

Access

Vendors are offering single-user (one user at a time), multiple-user (some predefined number of simultaneous users, up to unlimited), and even two-user options. Pricing for these models varies: some vendors are charging hardcover price for single-user and 1.5 times hardcover price for multiple/two-user options (depending on how many concurrent users your institution wants). Some pricing begins at 1.5 times hardcover with single-user and increases for multiple/two-user. For institutions trying to provide access to popular or high demand works, multiple-user makes the most sense (lots of patrons wanting access at the same time). For academic disciplines, single-user might make the most sense, as patrons are less likely to cluster at the same time.

Another access concern is the platform, whether that means a downloadable e-reader (which can be difficult to manage if you don’t have a robust IT department) or a handheld device (for example a Kindle, Nook, Kobo, or iPad). A platform is the electronic framework in which the content lives, and some platforms require users to download programs or readers to allow the user to read the content. If the content requires a specific platform, this can cause difficulty when users attempt to access this content from different environments (if their computer doesn’t support Java or Flash, for instance). There are also differences in what...
Before Katina’s call for this issue’s articles crossed my desk I was working on a piece that began by considering Buckeyes — a breed of chicken developed by Nettie Metcalf in Warren, Ohio in the nineteenth century. (I’m also told there’s a third-rate collegiate sports team by the same name in the area, but I’ve yet to verify that.) At any rate, we’ll get back to the Buckeyes in my next contribution.

This issue is devoted to the topic of patron-driven acquisitions. So, for what’s they’re worth, here are my thoughts on the subject.

First, “patron-driven” is not a new idea. For many libraries, patron requests have long been a part of the selection and acquisitions process. Moreover, responsible collection development librarians take their communities into account and seek to build solid, well-rounded collections to anticipate and meet the needs of their constituencies.

Some will argue that it is impossible to predict what people will actually request, and that building collections “just in case” is frivolous in today’s world of limited budgets. I’ll return to the “just in case / just in time” issue shortly.

The current discussions about PDA have evolved from the ability, rendered by technology, of enabling patrons to “discover” potential content that a library has yet to purchase, license, or subscribe to. This in and of itself is all well and good. I have no real argument with the next step, that of allowing patrons to indicate their interest in, and thereby nominating a given item for potential acquisition. Again, all well and good.

I do take issue with the notion, espoused by some, of abdicating all responsibility for selection and allowing the process to devolve completely to those within a given library’s community who are active with this technology. To do so violates many things: the rights of those who are either not engaged with the technology or choose not to make use of it, the library’s responsibility to ensure some balance in its collections, and the validity of those subjects which may simply not be in vogue at present.

Library budgets are woefully inadequate. There is simply no way most libraries can provide everything their customers want. Some effort must be devoted to assigning priority to what will be purchased.

Moreover, PDA by its nature will favor those formats that readily allow its application. Some might argue that if usage of eBooks equals or exceeds that of print, perhaps a library’s budget is most appropriately spent predominantly on e.

Ah, but here’s the rub: not every monographic title is available as an eBook. Most publishers I’ve talked with about this recently (including Oxford University Press, Cambridge University Press, the University of Minnesota Press, the University of New Mexico Press, Brill, Wiley, Taylor & Francis, Springer, Gale/Cengage, and Elsevier, to name but a few) indicate that moving forward they intend to make most books available both as print and e (the most notable exceptions being those titles where permissions, e.g., for illustrations make a digital edition problematic). Moreover, the historical practice of embargoing e-content for some period of time has also largely disappeared; in general print and e are available more or less simultaneously.

However, for the foreseeable future a certain body of the literature is not likely to see the light of day as e. The reasons for this are various, but the fundamental reality is that there is not now, and there will not be for quite some time to come, a complete one-to-one correspondence between print books and eBooks.

This brings me back to “just in time.” Technology is also reshaping the way publishers, as producers of a physical product, go about issuing theirwares. Print-on-demand already satisfies a notable percentage of the call for print books, and it’s a pretty safe bet that percentage will continue to increase as time goes by.

For many publishers the formula these days works like this: the first printing is still produced using offset presses, simply because the per unit cost is substantially lower than POD. Moreover, although POD quality has improved enormously since the early days of the technology, it’s still not equal to what offset can offer. Like many new technologies, POD has gotten cheaper, better, and more reliable. For content that’s just text, good enough is probably good enough.

Publishing has historically been a conservative industry; one that embraced change only when forced to do so. This is changing. The old assumptions about print runs, inventory, and distribution channels have all been challenged and re-written. The idea that a text will be developed but not in fact delivered until someone actually orders it is already with us. For anyone who worries about maintaining an inventory, this is great news.

My concern revolves around the content that is no longer viewed as making commercial sense. Sure, the costs of hosting some data are a fraction of what’s involved with printing, storing, and shipping real books, but the editorial costs are still there. Publishers have to look at everything involved in the cycle.

Some will point out that this process of market de-selection will happen regardless. They’re right. But that doesn’t mean we’re the better for it. To me it heightens the shallow, insubstantial nature of our interaction with so much in today’s world.

But back to patron-driven acquisitions: the idea of giving library users another easy and efficient tool to nominate content for acquisition is great. It’s also a pretty simple affair. Really, at the end of the day much more ado about this is much ado about not much.
do similar tasks — for instance, we have many volunteers that do outreach and press support, and we also have a small team of people at the Foundation who answer press inquiries — we have a culture of working together quite closely, with shared issue tracking systems, mailing lists, and so on. A large amount of “Foundation” work is actually done by volunteer community members, and there is an expectation of transparency and public sharing of information that would be quite radical for many organizations — but we just think of it as the Wikimedia way.

The Foundation has grown from a shoestring organization with no paid staff at the beginning, to now having around 70 employees, but we still feel that we’re barely scraping the surface of what could be done. For a long time, our staff has just scaled to meet the increased technical needs of the projects as they have grown; we are just now beginning to explore doing more outreach work at the Foundation. Our vision is “Imagine a world in which every single human being can freely share in the sum of all knowledge” — that’s pretty ambitious. And we are well aware that Wikimedia only exists because of the work done by the multi-faceted, international volunteer community — the community is the heart and soul of our movement.

ATG: Can we expect an update of your book “How Wikipedia Works” any time soon?

PA: I would love to at some point, but I don’t have any plans (or any time) to update it right now — however, the book is released under the GFDL, which is a free license, so other people are certainly welcome to update it! In addition to my book, there are other newer educational materials available at http://bookshelf.wikimedia.org.

ATG: If you had a crystal ball, where would you see Wikipedia and the Wikimedia Foundation in five years? What would you see your role as then?

PA: We just completed a strategic planning project that mapped out the direction for the next five years of the Wikimedia Foundation and movement, through 2015; this was a massive community effort, with a thousand community members contributing to building the plan. So coming out of that, our goal for the next five years is to radically increase our editing community, particular in areas that are currently underrepresented — for instance, we want to get more female editors, and more editors that are from parts of the world where large portions of the population are newly online, such as India and Brazil.

More editors will lead, we hope, to increasing articles in languages where there are millions of native speakers, but comparatively very little material online (and where the Wikipedia version is still small), such as Hindi and Arabic. More articles means more readers means more editors — it’s a virtuous circle. And finally, we want to increase article quality across all languages.

In five years, I hope that everyone will not only use Wikipedia, but will think of it as a living project that they participate in, have a stake in, and can make better. With the growth of Wikipedia over the last ten years, I have been privileged to have been a part of one of the most extraordinary social movements and reference projects to ever exist, and I would love to share that with everyone.
Adam Chesler

BORN AND LIVED: Born in New York; grew up in the Bronx and Teaneck, NJ; went to college, and lived in the Boston area for 25 years; now reside in Alexandria, VA.

EARLY LIFE: I started wearing glasses and braces in the same year, in third grade — frankly, I try not to think about my early life (however, contrary to popular opinion, that is NOT when I started losing my hair).

FAMILY: My parents still live in NJ; my dad retired as a principal after over 30 years in the Bronx school system, and my mom is still working, as an orthodontist's assistant (probably still paying off the bills from the aforementioned braces). I have a sister and a brother, both teachers in NJ; my sister has four children, the oldest of whom just wrapped up his freshman year at the University of Michigan. My wife Maria is the Head of Acquisitions at the Ralph J. Bunche Library at the State Department. We have two cats, neither of which has contributed a single thing to the betterment of our household, let alone humanity. I'm bitterly disappointed in them.

PROFESSIONAL CAREER AND ACTIVITIES: Started in publishing in 1985, working with medical and life sciences publications at Kluwer Academic Publishers. I moved into electronic products and services in 1997, managing sales, marketing, and customer relations until the end of 2002. After a brief stint at Ingenta, I worked for the American Chemical Society until 2008. Next, I was Director of Content for the American Society for Training and Development. In February 2011, I took on my latest challenge as Director of Library Relations for Business Expert Press, a four-year-old publisher built around the idea that buying eBooks doesn't have to be difficult. Overcoming my optical, dental, and pilary deficiencies, I was elected to the NASIG Board in 2005, where I served as a Member at Large (while my term expired in 2007, there are a couple of constabularies, I was elected to the NASIG Board in 2005, where I served as a Member at Large (while my term expired in 2007, there are a couple of constabularies which may still consider me “at large” but let’s not talk about that, okay?). Have spoken at numerous library and publishing conferences in several countries, and contributed articles to Against the Grain, the Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries, Learned Publishing, and Serials Review.

IN MY SPARE TIME: Crossword puzzles, running (well, jogging, anyway), doing what my wife tells me to do (see below).

FAVORITE BOOKS: All the King’s Men (Robert Penn Warren), Lamb (Christopher Moore).

PET PEEVES: Rudeness and general inconsiderateness; rubberneckers, who should be instantly deposited at the very back of the traffic tie-up they’re causing. Not that I’ve thought about it too much, but it would involve large cranes, a sophisticated winch-and-pulley system, and a colony of bullet ants.

PHILOSOPHY: Happy wife, happy life.

MOST MEMORABLE CAREER ACHIEVEMENT: I’m proud to have been on the CLOCKSS board from 2006-2008 and playing a small part in introducing it to the scholarly community.

GOAL I HOPE TO ACHIEVE FIVE YEARS FROM NOW: To make sure that every academic library supporting business students is buying books from Business Expert Press — and I hope it takes less than five years.

HOW/WHERE DO I SEE THE INDUSTRY IN FIVE YEARS: Well, Casey Stengel said “Never make predictions, especially about the future,” but I’ll go with this: the number of students using personal, tablet-type devices as their primary vehicle for reading and annotation will exceed the number who don’t (I know there’ve been recent studies showing limited uptake to date, but I think it’s simply a matter of time).
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