# Against the Grain

December 2011

# And They Were There: Reports of Meetings -- 2010 Charleston Pre-Conference and Conference

Sever Bordeianu

*University of New Mexico*, sbordeia@unm.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg

Part of the Library and Information Science Commons

## Reports of Meetings — 2010 Charleston Pre-Conference and Conference

Column Editor: **Sever Bordeianu** (Head, Print Resources Section, University Libraries, MSC05 3020, 1 University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM 87131-0001; Phone: 505-277-2645; Fax: 505-277-9813) <sbordeia@unm.edu>

*The Radically Different Future of Collection Development*
— 2010 Charleston Pre-Conference, November 3, 2010

Reported by: **Judy Luther** (Informed Strategies)
<judy.luther@informedstrategies.com>

The **University of Utah** and the **Council on Research Libraries (CRL)** co-sponsored a full-day workshop at the **30th Annual Charleston Conference** to explore the disrupted scholarly information environment and to provide participants an opportunity to discuss the dramatic changes taking place and the impact on their organizations. Four speakers representing different perspectives (a private university, a public university, a consortia director, and an industry consultant) challenged participants to imagine scenarios outside of their normal operation.

**Rick Anderson, Moderator** (Associate Director for Scholarly Resources & Collections, University of Utah)

Known as a library innovator, **Rick Anderson** described the changing environment in light of the library's mission to provide information to its users when and where they need it. Standard factors such as limited print runs, interlibrary loan, big deals on digital collections, bibliographic instruction, and redundant cataloging appear less "sane" than article-level purchases and crowd-sourced ready-reference tools (e.g., **Wikipedia**), promoting greater ease of use (in place of traditional bibliographic instruction), patron-driven acquisition (PDA), print-on-demand (POD) and shared cataloging.

The **Google Books** digitization project has resulted in the creation of the **HathiTrust** archive, which is projected to include 14 million volumes by 2012. With books in digital form it's possible for libraries to offer patrons a more active role in selecting books to buy, and for publishers to deliver print upon request. **Wikipedia** serves as both a discovery engine and an A&I tool linking to other resources.

Library staff have worked with evolving processes from ordering books online through a vendors' system such as **GOBI**, the use of electronic InterLibrary Loan (ILL), the development of Electronic Resource Management Systems (ERMS), and now PDA. In parallel users have adapted to integrated library systems (ILS), linking to full text through a knowledgebase, the World Wide Web (WWW), new discovery tools such as **EBSCO Discovery Service & Summon**, and course management systems that put the library in the students' space.

Libraries are involved now in maximizing the accessibility of content by streamlining the users' experience from discovery to delivery. Simplifying discovery puts more emphasis on intellectual engagement with content and less on the struggle with finding tools — it's less about the process of finding content and more about what the user has found. The emerging information environment can be more integrated with fewer silos and the library can function as an agent to facilitate the users' access to what they need from an ever-increasing fund of content.

**Greg Raschke** (Associate Director for Collections and Scholarly Communication, North Carolina State University)

Extensive analysis conducted by his staff made it clear that the library's acquisitions strategy was not economically sustainable and that they needed to lower costs. **Greg** concluded that *"Libraries must change, and it will be hard."*

Like all print-based collections, the ones at **NC State** have been based on speculative buying in an effort to meet the faculty and students' need for content. They are now moving from this supply-side, just-in-case model to a demand-driven, just-in-time model to meet their users' needs. There is tension between the custodians of scholarship and those enabling a digital environment in which there is less tolerance for low-use collections. **Greg** observed that the library is more used and vital than ever and described it as "use-based and user-driven."

Data analysis is the key to responding to increased pressure for accountability. Almost 50% (half) — of materials acquired for their collection was not used in the first two years, and ten years later 25% was still unused. The library has altered its approval and firm order plans accordingly, lowering their book expenditures. In one analysis they mapped library expenditures to grant receipts for PhD programs looking for anomalies. The challenge is to be precise, and they run the risk of missing data; if the analysis is not sufficiently nuanced, niche disciplines can end up being hurt. The library's analysis indicates that the two strongest indicators of use are full-text downloads and citations.

**Ivy Anderson** (Director Collection Development & Management, California Digital Library – CDL)

From the perspective of a large statewide consortium **Ivy** challenged participants by asking *"Do we have a future?"* Information is ubiquitous, libraries are threatened with disintermediation, and there is declining use of the physical collection. Her response was to affirm that the role of libraries is to *"uniquely manage the general and generally manage the unique."* To illustrate, **Ivy** described several collaborative initiatives – two that support retrospective management of existing print collections and others that address prospective management of digital collections.

The **Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST)** is supported by a **Mellon** grant for planning and implementation of a distributed shared print repository program, and aims to consolidate journal backfiles at major library storage facilities and selected campus locations. Libraries will be able to dedupe their collections while securing future access. Sixty libraries are interested in this sustainable model which has a shared governance structure. (More information at *http://www.cdlib.org/services/west/.*)

**HathiTrust** (*http://www.hathitrust.org*) is a digital book collaboration on a network scale that enables libraries to retrospectively manage their print books. The transition from print to digital for books is more complicated than the one for journals, in part because the cost to dedupe and service books on a title-by-title basis is higher than for journals with multiple volumes under a single record. While libraries still value their book collections and additional user studies are needed, a recent survey within the **University of California** system revealed that libraries are already buying fewer and fewer print books.

Consortia support collaboration by licensing eBook packages, facilitating shared approval plans and storage facilities, and coordinating the activities of bibliographers. Complementing these efforts are new initiatives for born-digital content that may be locally created in a variety of formats.

The scholarly life cycle is expanding to include data sets as an important byproduct of published research. For example, the **Deepwater Horizon Archive** (*http://www.noaa.gov/deepwaterhorizon/*) was developed in partnership with **Louisiana State University** and includes images from their Earth Scan Laboratory. This data is now included in the **National Oceanic & Atmospheric Association** Website. Another example, **Data ONE** (*https://www.dataone.org/*), is the **Data Observation Network for Earth**, an NSF-funded project designed to provide an open, persistent, robust, and secure distributed framework for science data.

**Dan Hazan Hazen** (Associate Librarian of Harvard College for Collection Development, Harvard University)

Although **Harvard** is older than the U.S. government and consistently tops the list ranking member libraries of the **Association of Research Libraries (ARL)**, **Dan** acknowledged that the world is changing for them as well.

Diminished institutional support for collections means that the burgeoning output of (and demand for) information resources is beyond any institution's capacity to meet individually. At the same time, collections have been devalued as alternative means of access have emerged and new metrics focus on outcomes rather than inputs.

The question of whether collections, as traditionally understood, really matter can lead to an existential crisis. Faculty tend to rate library collections as insufficient; in light of current (and almost certainly ongoing) financial constraints, how can the library possibly address such concerns?

He observed that libraries have moved from an environment of scarcity of information resources that were collected "just-in-case" in order to support faculty research to an era of plentitude in scholarly resources. The primary drivers of this development have been both economic (aggregations, monopoly, open access) and technological (enabling collaboration, making search across an aggregated collection more useful, new business models).

As an example of "radical cooperation" **Dan** cited **2CUL** (*http://2cul. org*), a collaboration between **Columbia** and **Cornell University** libraries by which they work together to achieve collecting efficiencies and streamline their operations. The challenges and opportunities include addressing complex questions about how to balance specialization, comparative advantage, and economies of scale.

**Judy Luther** (President, Informed Strategies)

Drawing on experience in both publishing and academic libraries, **Judy** observed that when books and journals are digitized the unit of sale often shifts from a single title to a larger digital collection while the unit of use shifts to a subset of a title — either a journal article or book chapter. For many information seekers "size matters"; large digital collections, like large libraries, are perceived as more likely to produce useful results.

The shape of content is beginning to change dramatically. One need only look at **Elsevier's Article of the Future** (*http://bit.ly/opDaxK*) to see new ways of displaying and navigating content. Increasingly, the ability to easily save, share, or manipulate content can influence its value. Content can be its own source of connection, as is evident with **Library Thing** or **Kindle's** ability to let groups of individuals collectively view their markup of an eBook.

A wide range of innovative mobile reading devices (tablet PC's, **iPads**, **Kindles**, **Nooks**, etc.) combined with a growing corpus of digital eBooks is changing how we use information. Instead of "leaning forward" to read on the screen, we can "lean back" with a mobile device for an immersive reading experience. Within five years readers of their content will expect it to be readily available for easy consumption on their preferred device.

In 2010, keynote speakers at different publisher meetings told the audience that their competitors weren't each other but **Google**, **Apple**, and **Amazon**, whose deep pockets and global reach dwarf the resources available to the average publisher.

### Emerging Themes

Following the presentations, the workshop's roughly 60 attendees broke into four groups to anticipate different future scenarios for academic libraries and to discuss how each might affect the way libraries operate. Multiple scenarios were discussed from incremental to dramatic changes. Several broad themes emerged from the day's discussions.

**Increased Accountability** — Expanded analysis of usage data is motivated by a need to validate the library's budget within the institution and to ensure that library users are being well served. As core resources are increasingly acquired centrally (via regional and national consortia, for example) and patrons begin driving more and more local choices, librarians will want to examine data on activity at all levels: within the discipline, the institution, and the region.

**More Collaboration** — Increased reliance on shared holdings through collectively-licensed content and joint storage facilities distributes the work and the expense of managing access, offering users the benefit of a much larger collection.

**Changing Containers** — Greater functionality of content is enhancing the users' experience and blurring the lines on content formats. The container for scholarship is being redefined to include data from the continuum of research process. With less space devoted to physical collections, libraries are creating more service areas for their users.

Historically, building collections has been core to the library's value proposition, as it has enabled academic librarians to meet their users' information needs when print publications were scarce. In the digital era, when information resources are abundant, libraries are licensing access to content, which impacts not just the library's processes but the actual role that the library serves. 🐦

---

# And They Were There

## Reports of Meetings — 30th Annual Charleston Conference

**Issues in Book and Serial Acquisition, "Anything Goes!" Francis Marion Hotel, Embassy Suites Historic District, Holiday Inn Historic District, and Addlestone Library, College of Charleston, Charleston, SC, November 3-6, 2010**

Charleston Conference Reports compiled by: **Ramune K. Kubilius** (Collection Development / Special Projects Librarian, Northwestern University, Galter Health Sciences Library) <r-kubilius@northwestern.edu>

*Column Editor's Note: Thank you to all of the 2010 Charleston Conference attendees who agreed to write short reports that highlighted sessions they attended. All attempts were made to provide a broad coverage of sessions, and notes are included in the reports to reflect changes in the session titles or presenters that were not printed in the conference's final program. Slides and handouts from many 2010 Charleston Conference presentations can be found online at http://www. slideshare.net/event/2010-charleston-conference and the Charleston Conference Proceedings will be published late in 2011.*

*In this issue of Against the Grain you will find the final installment of 2010 Charleston Conference reports. The previous installments can be found in ATG v.23#1, February 2011, v.23#2, April 2011, v.23#3, June 2011, v.23#4, September 2011, and v.23#5, November 2011 issues. Watch for reports from the 2011 Charleston Conference in upcoming print issues of ATG throughout next year. — RKK*

## FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2010
*(continued from previous installment)*
### FRIDAY CONCURRENT SESSION 2

***Link Resolvers, Knowledge Bases and the KBART Working Group*** — Presented by **Sherrard Ewing** (Serials Solutions); **Chad Hutchens** (University of Wyoming Libraries)

Reported by: **Wendy West** (SUNY Albany)
<wwest@uamail.albany.edu>

KBART is a working group that brings together all the various stakeholders (libraries, publishers, aggregators, Knowledge base vendors) to create universally acceptable holdings data that would improve the OpenUrl and the metadata supply chain to the knowledgebases. Linker resolvers rely on the metadata within the knowledgebases supplied by content providers. The speakers discussed the role of KBART in the standardization metadata, the difficulties created by non-standardized metadata and KBART recommendations. Phase 1 of KBART's recommendation is to have universally accepted metadata that is regularly updated and distributed. As of January 2010, four content providers are supplying KBART phase one compliant metadata. In 2011, phase 2 would see broad adoption of the phase 1 recommendation and focus on more complex related issues. The speakers suggested that phase 3 might focus on issues related to content types, automated delivery, or institutional metadata. A question-and-answer session followed the presentation.

***The Role of the Acquisitions Librarian in Electronic Resources Management*** — Presented by **Sarah B. Pomerantz** (Adelphi University)

Reported by: **Beth White** (MLIS student at the University of South Carolina) <white3@email.sc.edu>

I thought this presentation was going to be more helpful and more informative than it turned out to be — mostly because the presenter ran through the information so fast, and there was no handout for me to even remember most of what she did talk about. I had to furiously write notes in my notebook — most of which are almost indecipherable due to my haste. From what I read in my notes, this presentation was about a study that the presenter did on how Acquisitions librarians were — or were not — adapting to the trend of having to not only purchase but manage electronic resources. In some cases, the Acquisitions librarian also had the job, but not always, the title of Electronic Resources librarian. Of the librarians surveyed who answered to either or both of those titles, most felt they needed more training in order to cope with the barrage of issues they face with purchasing and management issues. The presenter advised the group to take ownership of their professional development so that they would have the training they needed. (This is all I either remembered from this presentation or managed to decipher from my hurried notes.)

***Four Things University Presses Wish Libraries Knew About Publishing, and Four Things Libraries Wish University Presses Knew About Them*** — Presented by: **Patrick Alexander, Moderator** (The Pennsylvania State Library); **Richard W. Clement** (Utah State University); **Carole Kiehl** (The University of Southern Mississippi); **Leila Salisbury** (University Press of Mississippi); **Joseph Brinley** (Woodrow Wilson Center Press)

Reported by: **Som Linthicum** (MLIS student at the University of South Carolina) <s.linthicum@yahoo.com>

This lively session featured panelists from both academic libraries and university presses, exploring similarities and differences in their respective charges. Panelists emphasized that both kinds of institutions are essentially mission-driven, and that both institutions have faced considerable economics pressures of late. Publishers highlighted the ambiguous nature of their business — at once charged with the dissemination of academic texts based foremost on their scholarly value, yet compelled to remain financially viable and self-supporting. The presses, similarly, noted the contradictions inherent in e-resources and print-on-demand services; publishers, more and more, lack the ability to warehouse large print runs and substantial backlist titles, yet the enhanced accessibility and distributability found in e-resources may potentially compromise the value of their intellectual products. Academic librarians echoed the tensions brought on by diminishing budgets, but, for them, financial pressure brings forth an imperative to gain greater flexibility from their content purchases. Acquisitions must be based on immediate use and need, rather than simply intellectual value. And workloads need to be streamlined at every level, so that greater support is expected from the resource provider. Librarians, similarly, pointed out that they can no longer afford the expenditures associated with new storage, and emphasized the growing necessity of e-resources as a means of maintaining access to intellectual content without the need to warehouse the physical item. Both partners in the debate affirmed their desire to work together to grow their relationship, while remaining institutionally viable in their own right.

## FRIDAY PLENARY SESSIONS

***"I Hear the Train A Comin' – LIVE" session*** — Presented by **Greg Tananbaum** (Scholarnext); **Joseph J. Esposito** (Portable)

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

**Tananbaum** (*Against the Grain* columnist and **Charleston Conference** regular) posed questions related to the scholarly communication crisis and how libraries will support the proliferation of resources. Is this an opportunity or a challenge? Niche publishers are an important part of the ecosystem — what happens if they go away? Does traditional scholarly publishing still matter and what is the tradition (is it a matter of form vs. function?). The future of scholarly communication can be exciting, different, vital, experimental, etc., and it's a matter of moving from talk to action. **Esposito** asked what happens when the train stops? What will publishing be after the apocalypse? Quoting **Niels Bohr** ("Prediction is always difficult, especially about the future.") and reminding the audience that "disrupters do not disrupt themselves," **Esposito** trend spotted through funding, library bypass, supply side publishing, direct marketing, proprietary systems. Co-opt the supply side of publishing, beware and identify who will profit in the new equilibrium. (The point of the "Big Deal" is to push out other publishers.) One **Esposito** pronouncement echoed the rest of the conference: a literate person can read about 7,000 books in a lifetime. Is the music industry a model for publishing? No. Academics' brand — go directly to readers, and mathematicians, for example, do not feel the publisher's brand is needed.

***Creating a Trillion-Field Catalog: Metadata in Google Books*** — Presented by **Jon Orwant** (Google Books)

Reported by: **Anna Fleming** (Northwestern University, Galter Health Sciences Library) <a-fleming@northwestern.edu>

**Google Books** Engineering Manager **Orwant** discussed **Google's** efforts to create and improve its metadata in order to increase discoverability within its growing collection. He showed examples of the challenges the team faces, including normalizing author names, fun with transliterations, interpreting FRBR rules, and disambiguating multivolume or serial publications. Clearly, all this sounded familiar to the librarians in the audience. Factoid: as of 18 months ago, the collection included 15 million scanned books in over 480 languages. **Orwant** also described **Google's** new Digital Humanities Awards to researchers interested in linguistic analysis projects. So far, 12 awards to 23 researchers at 15 universities support projects datamining the **Google Books** corpus. **Steven Pinker** (author of *How the Mind Works*," "*The Stuff of Thought*, and *The Language Instinct*) is a recipient. Stay tuned.

**And They Were There**
*from page 72*

---

### SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2010
### PLENARY SESSIONS

---

*Efficient and Effective Funding of Open Access "Books"*
— Presented by **Frances Pinter** (Bloomsbury Academic);
**Sanford G. Thatcher** (Penn State University Press;
Free-lance Acquiring Editor)

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

---

**Thatcher** served as responder for this session during which **Pinter** provided examples and models of open-access book publishing possibilities from her "previous life" with **Soros**, and her current work at **Bloomsbury**. With core humanities and social sciences funding, the book format would be brought to the public arena.  Calling the European-based  eIFL (*www. eifl.net*) a "whopper of a consortium," she moved on to academics' needs and desires:  independence, branding, editing, marketing, selling, and the "mother-in-law" factor (the magnum opus copy for family).  Publishers are willing to experiment, see themselves as service providers, not gatekeepers, and co-creators of value.  Books are similar to ice cream — "vanilla on HTML," with a cone (print, eBook, **Kindle**, etc.), that can be a sundae (the "enhanced eBook").  Arguing that the Open Access STM journal funding model is not sustainable, she envisioned creation of the "International Library Coalition for Open Access Books (ILCOAB)," to aggregate funds from the library ("make better use of funds already available").  Coalition members would have responsibilities and receive "perks" (e.g., extra metadata), to reduce "free riders."  **Pinter** acknowledged that her proposal involves a conceptual mind shift and principles of merit.  The audience joined the discussion, with questions and suggestions about subscriptions and ads, crowd funding, PDA (patron-drive acquisition), POD (print-on-demand), and having feet in old and new camps...

---

*The Long Arm of the Law* — Presented by **Ann Okerson** (Yale University); **William Hannay** (Schiff Hardin LLP); **Lauren K. Schoenthaler**  (Stanford University)

Reported by:  **Angela Rathmel**  (University of Kansas)
<aroads@ku.edu>

---

After introductory remarks by **Okerson**, **Hannay** presented a most lively and humorous briefing of two cases:  *Author's Guild  v. Google* and *SkyRiver v. OCLC*.  In *Google*, **Hannay** laid out each stakeholders take, a timeline of events, and where things ultimately stand — in the hand of **Judge Chin** to rule on the fairness issue.  **Hannay's** musical prediction: "*It's the boogie woogie **Google** boy of company G*."

**Hannay** then clarified the **OCLC** issue is really two cases in one, with challenges from both **SkyRiver** and **Innovative Interfaces**.  **Sky-River** argues **OCLC's** monopoly on bibliographic data, as well as the service and market to ILL.  **Innovative** claims **OCLC** monopolizes integrated library systems and ILL.  **OCLC** moved to dismiss, citing no complaint of antitrust, but the *Sherman Act* is tricky and not easy to get out of.  **Hannay's** musical prediction (a la *Breakfast at Tiffany's*): "*SkyRIver…cheaper by a mile…*"

**Schoenthaler** gave a lightning quick and equally engaging overview of **Georgia State** litigation and the **Omega Watch** case.  The **Georgia State** case, out of which came the "fair-use checklist," runs through the intricately complex realm of copyright.  New academic exemptions may ultimately be needed.  In the meantime: "rely on fair use, but don't assume without analysis," and "link to content lawfully hosted on the internet."

The **Omega Watch** case — important for libraries to keep an eye on, even though it's about watches — has implications for libraries' ability to lend titles purchased outside the U.S.

## SATURDAY INNOVATION SESSION 1

***Collection Intelligence: Using Data Driven Decision Making in Collection Management*** — Presented by **Annette Day** (North Carolina State University); **Hilary Davis** (North Carolina State University)

Reported by: **Laurel Ivy Sammonds** (Mississippi State University Libraries) <lsammonds@library.msstate.edu>

   **Day** and **Davis** demonstrated three projects that applied data to real-world collection management decisions. In response to a substantial budget cut, data was needed to support journal deselection decisions. The Collections Review Project solicited opinions on journals from faculty using a Web-based interface. Faculty opinions were weighted according to college affiliation and research areas, then integrated with other data such as Impact Factor, cost-per-use, etc. The Collection Views Database was established to demonstrate how the library's collections support the research and teaching needs at **NCSU**. All collections were analyzed by subject and cost, which was integrated with data about departmental size and research output. Results were presented via a Web portal that can generate lists of values, charts, and side-by-side departmental comparisons. Lastly, **Day** and **Davis** described the Journals Backfiles ROI Project, which sought to show an increasingly lower cost-per-use on journal backfiles over time. The initial cost plus annual fees were divided by cumulative use (full-text downloads). This session effectively demonstrated how to harness the power of existing data sets to demonstrate the value of an academic library collection.

***Collaborative Copyright – or Copyright is Not Just a Library Issue*** — Presented by **Jennifer Duncan** (Utah State University); **Susanne Clement** (Utah State University); **Betty Rozum** (Utah State University)

Reported by: **Kyle McCarrell** (Augusta State University) <kmccarre@aug.edu>

   Copyright. Nearly all know it exists, but the practical application of copyright and fair use laws to newly-developed technologies on a college or university campus can frustrate students and faculty. Three librarians at **Utah State University** gave a presentation on how their university, backed by their administration, recognized a need for clarity on this issue and created a committee incorporating many campus units to address this topic. Communicating through a centralized wiki, email, and monthly meetings, smaller subcommittees focused on individual topics such as e-reserves, open content, and author's rights. From the committee's research, Webinars, outreach events, and short "road shows" (15 minute presentations to individual campus departments followed by 15 minutes of discussion) were developed to provide the campus faculty with a better understanding of the issues related to copyright, rights management, and fair use. The presenters gave further information regarding their plans to connect with students, how they plan on enhancing the campus Website dedicated to copyright issues, and how they hope to be a resource for anyone that has questions regarding digital rights.

***How Do I Make These Available?: A Digital Solution to Managing Emailed Serials in a Library Setting*** — Presented by **Kelli Getz** (University of Houston Libraries); **Michele Reilly** (University of Houston Libraries)

Reported by: **Chantal Wilson** (SLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <chantalw@mailbox.sc.edu>

   **Getz**, Assistant Head of Acquisitions, and **Riley**, Head of Digital Services, presented an innovation session dealing with emailed serials.

What do you do with emailed serials? Do you forward the information to interested users? Do you print it out and send it to stacks? These two alternatives have drawbacks. With the former there is not enough control and the latter is not a "green" solution nor does it allow for active links in the email. **University of Houston** librarians, **Getz** and **Reilly**, came up with a digital solution to deal with these emailed serials. Acquisitions set up a departmental email to receive the emailed serials. Once received the emails are turned into PDFs, which are easier to deal with and keep the links active, then sent to Digital Services to be uploaded to the CONTENTdm server. Uploading to the CONTENTdm server puts the content behind the EZ Proxy allowing only authorized users to access the content and it is easy to archive for preservation purposes. Another advantage of CONTENTdm is usage statistics allowing for more informed collection development decisions. There were several questions from the audience about CONTENTdm. An innovative solution to a growing serials challenge.

***Straight Talk*** — Presented by **Elisabeth Leonard** (Western Carolina University); **Erin Luckett** (Readex); **David Birkinshaw** (Emerald Group Publishing); **Matthew Hancox** (Gale I Cengage Learning); **Carol Cramer** (Wake Forest University); **Jeff Williams** (UC San Diego Biomedical Library); **Corey Seaman** (University of Michigan)
   *Note: **Kittie S. Henderson** (EBSCO Information Services) also joined the panel.*

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

   This almost final 2010 session did not quite fit most Saturday sessions' "innovation" theme, but was, as advertised, a session featuring frank discussion, with insights from representatives in the library, publishing, and vendor realms. From a raised dais (similar to debates when journalists interview political office candidates), **Leonard** and **Luckett** "manned" the microphones, posing a variety of questions to which some or all of the panelists responded. (Panelists sat at a long table on ground floor level, so the audience in the back could not see them). Attendees got insights about key "hidden" staff (inside sales), providing them, the outside sales team, with "back at the shop" support. Reps asked librarians: Who does collection development in a library and with whom should a rep meet? Should end users be visited? Responses reflected local variety both in libraries and at companies, but the common relationship themes of "trust" and "partnerships" were raised as expectations on all sides. And in answer to a question about "doubtful reps," panelists had different ways of handling the challenge — some would report concerns to the manager, others would talk directly to the representative, suggesting that perhaps that field was not for them, or would offer constructive criticism...

***Collection Development with Numbers: Mining our Circulation and ILL Data to Understand Patrons' Needs*** — Presented by **Karen Kohn** (Arcadia University)

Reported by: **Russell Grooms** (MLIS student at the University of South Carolina) <groomsr@email.sc.edu>

   The presentation by **Kohn** very closely followed the description provided in the conference program. The session proceeded logically from the first step of identifying goals for the project, to determining what type of data to collect, to analyzing and interpreting the findings. The goals of the project were to analyze the collection as it relates to the curriculum, using quantitative data and to identify what items are being used as well as weaknesses in the collection. To assess the quality of the existing collection (in terms of what items are circulated), **Kohn** looked at two hundred and forty 200-level courses offered at her university and designated call number ranges for the topics covered in each. A comparison of number of items held in those call number ranges to the number circulated provided a rough idea of strong and weak areas. In

a separate analysis, **Kohn** compared the number of items circulated in each department to the number requested through InterLibrary Loan data to determine a "percentage of need met." Two strengths of the session were **Kohn's** awareness of limitations in the data and her emphasis on communicating with faculty to make sense of her findings.

## SATURDAY INNOVATION SESSION 2

*The GIST Gift & De-Selection Manager: Redesigning Gift and Weeding Work-flow in the Library* — Presented by **Kate Pitcher** (SUNY Geneseo, Milne Library)

Reported by: **Kyle McCarrell** (Augusta State University) <kmccarre@aug.edu>

Have you ever been overwhelmed by donations of books and wondered if you really needed to add a certain title? Does the process of deselecting books make you shudder? If yes, a free, open-source tool has been developed by four librarians at **SUNY Geneseo** to aid libraries in streamlining these tasks. **Pitcher** shared in great detail how the Getting It System Toolkit (GIST) helps librarians make informed decisions regarding titles to add and deselect. After downloading the program from *http://gettingitsystemtoolkit.wordpress.com/*, users can set up a flexible conspectus to weigh things like uniqueness, date, and collecting level. Based on this conspectus, the program creates automated recommendations on what to keep and discard. The program also utilizes APIs from places like local or state holdings, **Google Books**, and the **Hathi Trust** to assist in determining if an item should be added or if a digital copy is already available. Part of the toolkit includes the Gift De-Selection Manager (GDM) which allows the library to keep donor information records to monitor what titles were kept per donor. Future improvements for the system include adding an Acquisitions component that could route your ILL requests to your Acquisitions department.

*Used Books for New Collections* — Presented by **Matthew Bolin** (American Museum of Natural History, Division of Library Services)

Reported by: **Pamela Hoppock** (SLIS student, University of South Carolina) <phoppock@yahoo.com>

This useful presentation proceeded as advertised. **Bolin** introduced the **Museum of Natural History** providing history of the library. He briefly talked about the budget, indicating only 5% of the budget is for new monographs and that the budget has been flat for more than a decade. **Bolin** detailed steps taken to stretch the budget. The preliminary steps included: switching journal format to online only in 2008, standing orders cut, revising the collection management policy to allow purchasing of paperbacks. The next step taken was to acquire a purchasing card which allowed: flexibility in purchasing, comparison shopping, and purchasing of older and OoP works. The next step **Bolin** detailed was the establishment of a Swap with a Used Book Dealer. The AMNH Gift Policy was reviewed and revised. Arrangements to sell duplicate and OoS volumes to used book dealer were made. AMNH Library paid in credit.

The results are in:

1) the flat book budget has been stretched by lower cost per book, greater number of purchasing sources (thanks to p-card)

2) better control of workflow

3) discovery of great third-party sources

4) positive feedback from scientists

The speaker and his **PowerPoint** were succinct and interesting. The session ended with an engaging discussion on the benefits of buying used books and how to avoid pitfalls when searching for reputable book dealers.

*VIVO: Enabling National Networking of Researchers* — Presented by **Ellen J. Cramer** (Cornell University)

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

**Cramer**, former nurse practitioner, now computer scientist, kept her small audience engaged by using i>clicker (classroom response) technology. Asking multiple choice questions specific to VIVO (*www.vivoweb.org/*) and some of the "what do you think users would prefer" variety, she gauged attendees' knowledge and got feedback for work now under development in the VIVO network. The session included an overview of what VIVO (*www.vivo.org*) is as a Semantic Web application, and an enthusiastic "sales pitch" about the collaboration opportunities the network promotes and supports, on the individual institutional user, network, and the developer fronts. Data is harvested programmatically from verified sources, but also input manually. Important is the repurposing and reuse of data and the linking and collaboration tools available. Users of the ingested information, actual and potential: faculty, students, administrations, donors, and funding agencies. Experience at various institutions proved again that libraries are (still) perceived as trusted, neutral entities. They can provide: oversight on initial content development, local and national support, training, communication. One session participant from a non-VIVO institution voiced her wish for a "VIVO-Lite" that could be implemented at units of an organization, even though the parent organization is not yet ready for the commitments required of network members.

*Hyde Park Corner Sound-Off and Closing Remarks* — Presented by *Anthony Ferguson* (University of Hong Kong)

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

In past conferences, during one Saturday session, mainstay speaker, *ATG* columnist and soothsayer **Ferguson** was given the opportunity to summarize themes that caught his attention, while the separate "Hyde Park Corner," the last session before the Rump Session, allowed (lingering) conference attendees to provide immediate on-site post-conference feedback. The two sessions "morphed" in 2010, with **Ferguson** being the only featured speaker in the "Hyde Park Corner" time slot, even running past the allotted time (at audience members' request). His observations were divided into two lists: "Genius actionable ideas" and ""Big concepts: no immediate applications." Crediting conference presenters for ideas and often sharing **University of Hong Kong Library**-specific observations, his "just-in-time" list included: a "print and electronic information killer app" (user-initiated document delivery); "just-in-time collection development on steroids" (**Espresso Book Machine**); "clothing on OA" (the **University of California's** e-Scholarship program); an opportunity of everyone to have **Harvard**-like collections without stacks space headaches (**Hathi Trust** + **Google Books**); and the necessity to avoid "free riders" in collaborative programs. **Ferguson** advocated single-discovery interface adoption (it's user-centric) and liked the **UCSD** model of scholarly record stewardship (give away single terabytes of space). The second list was of the "note to self — follow these trends" variety: delivery speed, mobile devices (big but small treatments of serious books is sought), trust, branding, SOAP (OA publishing) survey results. ❦

*Well, this completes the reports we received from the **2010 Charleston Conference**. Again we'd like to send a big thank you to all of the attendees who agreed to write short reports that highlight sessions they attended. Presentation material (PowerPoint slides, handouts) and taped session links from many of the 2010 sessions are available online. Visit the **Conference Website** at **www.katina.info/conference**. — **KS***