Against the Grain

Volume 25 | Issue 2 Article 35

April 2013

# And They Were There-Reports of Meetings

Ramune K. Kubilius
*Northwestern University*, r-kubilius@northwestern.edu



Recommended Citation
Kubilius, Ramune K. (2013) "And They Were There-Reports of Meetings," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 25: Iss. 2, Article 35.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.6494

**From the University Presses**
*from page 62*

***AH: Do you think it's a good idea for university presses to get involved in initiatives to create open access and/or less expensive textbooks for undergraduates?***

**PB:** Again, I don't think one size fits all. Some presses have been publishing textbooks for a very long time and almost every press publishes books that are used as concurrent reading in undergraduate course. Florida and others have been involved in open access textbooks. Setting up the infrastructure to publish textbooks may or may not be productive depending on the individual situation, but university presses have always provided materials to students at reasonable prices and no doubt will continue to do so in varied ways.

***AH: Thanks. One last question — how will you define success as AAUP's Executive Director?***

**PB:** Great question. The answer is I'm not sure yet. But revitalized relations with other constituencies in the university would be one way. We also need to help **AAUP** members better promote themselves and the value they bring to the university ecosystem, especially within their own community. We need to get to the point where a situation like the one that occurred at the **University of Missouri Press** last year would never occur again and where it would never occur to an administrator that closing a press would be a good idea. Instead, presses should be regarded as central to the university's efforts to engage successfully with the revolution in scholarly communication.



# And They Were There

## Reports of Meetings — 32nd Annual Charleston Conference

### Issues in Book and Serial Acquisition, "Accentuate the Positive," Francis Marion Hotel, Courtyard Marriott Historic District, Addlestone Library, and School of Science and Mathematics Building, College of Charleston, Charleston, SC, November 7-10, 2012

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* ***Charleston Conference*** *attendees who agreed to write short reports that highlight sessions they attended at the 2012 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,* ***http://www.katina.info/conference****, for the online conference schedule from which there are links to many presentations, handouts, plenary session videos, and plenary session reports by the* ***2012 Charleston Conference*** *blogger,* ***Don Hawkins****. Visit the conference blog at* ***http://www.against-the-grain.com/category/blog-posts/charleston2012/****. The* ***2012 Charleston Conference Proceedings*** *will be published in partnership with* ***Purdue University Press*** *in 2013.*

*In this issue of* ***ATG*** *you will find the second installment of 2012 conference reports. The first installment can be found in* ***ATG v.25#1, February 2013****. We will continue to publish all of the reports received in upcoming print issues throughout the year. —* ***RKK***

**THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2012**
**CONCURRENT SESSIONS 1**

***A Conversation with Technical Services Librarians and Publishers: A Workshop on Process Enhancement*** — Presented by **Jane Bethel** (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency); **Margaret Hogarth** (Claremont University Consortium); **Beth Hoskins** (Duke University Press ); **Mark Johnson** (Moderator-High Wire); **Alexis Manheim** (Stanford University); **Audrey Powers** (University of South Florida); **Albert Sciamann** (SAGE Publications); **Anneliese Taylor** (University of California, San Francisco); **Barbara Walker** (Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology)

Reported by: **Caryl Ward** (Binghamton University Libraries (SUNY)) <cward@binghamton.edu>

*What are your pain points?* **Johnson's** provocative question opened the panel's discussion. Librarians from five different types of institutions outlined major concerns in their interactions with vendors and publishers. Insufficient communication, lack of product knowledge, and the availability of accurate statistics topped the list.

Publisher representatives **Hoskins, Sciamann**, and **Walker** graciously responded with their suggestions for best practices in problem resolution. They stressed that two-way communication is essential for

*continued on page 64*

good service. Whether working on an issue involving a university press, large commercial publisher, or small society, each panelist recommended using a dedicated contact person or the customer support network within the publisher or agent's organization. **Sage's** support structure chart outlined the path that information takes within that organization. **Walker** spoke about the problems that can ensue when payments are delayed. The panelists agreed on the importance of accurately identifying the journal or product in question (a basic but surprisingly common error) and suggested having key information points at hand before making contact. These include publisher/subscription agent; subscription term; annual cost; URL; publisher/provider license contact; library technical contact. This session was informative and effective in offering concrete advice on service improvement.

***An Open and Shut Case: Making Access to Content Easy, Affordable, and Sustainable*** — Presented by **Beth Bernhardt** (UNC Greensboro); **David Parker** (Business Expert Press)
***NOTE: Adam Chesler*** *spoke in place of* ***David Parker****.*

Reported by: **Margaret M. Kain** (University of Alabama at Birmingham, Mervyn H. Sterne Library) <pkain@uab.edu>

**Chesler** and **Bernhardt** spoke on issues surrounding the eBook purchases by libraries. Both librarians and publishers agree that their approach to eBooks needs to be aligned so they do not alienate or confuse users. Digital rights management [DRM], is an important topic for both sides, but each side disagrees about the application. Traditionally, publishers view DRM as a means of protecting possible lost business revenue, while libraries view DRM as a detriment to access. Some publishers are trying to take another approach to DRM by using the digital eBook product as a basis for their business model rather than just a digital copy of the print product. By shifting the publisher's business model, the focus moves away from sales of individual print copies and individual users to sales to the library market as a whole. Smaller publishers making this move find that sales of individual eBook titles is not feasible, but by bundling the eBooks into collections they are able to deliver a lot of content at a fairly low cost per eBook. Since eBook publishers are quite diverse in their practices, products, and platforms, **UNC Greensboro** continuously tries to develop ways to guide their users through the process of finding eBooks. The continuing challenge is to move beyond DRM and develop purchase models that work for both libraries and publishers.

***Article Level Metrics: Analyzing Value in the Scholarly Content*** — Presented by **Richard Cave** (PLoS); **William Gunn** (Mendeley); **Elizabeth Lorbeer** (Lister Hill Library of the Health Sciences - University of Alabama at Birmingham); **Michael Margotta** (Maverick Publishing Specialists); **Heather Piwowar** (ImpactStory, Duke, and UBC)

See ***ATG v.25#1, Feb. 2013,*** for Conference Altmetrics session reports by **William Gunn** (Mendeley) <william.gunn@mendeley.com>

***Beyond Implementation: Making Your ERMS Work for You*** — Presented by **Andrea Langhurst** (University of Notre Dame); **Stacey Marien** (American University); **Kari Schmidt** (American University)

Reported by: **Elizabeth Hill** (MLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <vehill0@email.sc.edu>

**Langhurst** began the session by explaining how CORAL, an open source ERM developed by the **University of Notre Dame** in 2009, has affected how workflows are managed at that university. CORAL has changed where information is stored and how it is shared between departments. In particular, it is a more organized system for keeping track of licensing agreements. Instead of being emailed individually and kept in a Windows file, agreements and information can be kept in one place, and accessed by multiple people as needed.

At the **American University**, CORAL was implemented soon after an "explosion of eBook orders" in 2011 to replace the paper-based system they had previously been using. **Marien** and **Schmidt** described how workflows have been improved through the variety of options available through CORAL, including customizable workflows, alerts, and individual queues of tasks. The implementation of the system has resulted in a more efficient workflow system and better communication between tech services and collection managers. **Schmidt** also stated that customizable workflow utilities like these are essential in the next generation ILS environment.

***Developing a Cross Institutional E-Book Strategy*** — Presented by **Colleen Major** (Columbia University Libraries); **Boaz Nadav-Manes** (Cornell University Library)

Reported by: **Roxanne Peck** (UCLA Library) <rpeck@library.ucla.edu>

The program began with background about the goals of 2CUL to combine technical services functions. Both institutions looked at eBook workflow for ways to integrate and streamline. Different workflows, different ERMs so it's not clear how much can be combined at this time. There is still a lot of work to be done. The big takeaway from the presentation is the importance of constant and transparent communication. As **Nadav-Manes** suggested, write up ideal scenarios and then come together at table for discussion and negotiations. Integration needs to address not only technical services but also access services and collection development at each institution. Another important component of 2CUL is taking a proactive approach to influence vendors. A team consisting of different department members was started at **Cornell** just one year ago. They investigate new vendor platforms and come up with a set of questions before a vendor visit. The ultimate goal is to get vendor to deliver services that 2CUL needs instead of settling for a patchwork system between the two campuses.

***Distinctive Collections: The Space Between "General" and "Special" Collections and Implications for Collection Development*** — Presented by **Daniel Dollar** (Yale University Library); **Gregory Eow** (Yale University Library); **Melissa Grafe** (Yale University Library); **Julie Linden** (Yale University Library)
***NOTE***: ***Melissa Grafe*** *did not present in this session.*

Reported by: **Amy Lewontin** (Northeastern University) <a.lewontin@neu.edu>

The panel of collection development librarians from **Yale** brought some much needed "re-thinking" of some past practices about the nature of collection development, making a case for a place between our general collections and our special collections, that of the "distinctive collection. **Eow** began by describing the research libraries at **Yale** as operating as a "loose decentralized system with a proliferation of digital resources." **Eow** then introduced **Dollar**, the Director of Collection Development at **Yale**, who talked about the recent financial crisis as one of the "external shocks" that had forced an examination of the way **Yale** allocated resources, moving to a more centralized purchasing model for e-resources (for cost containment among other reasons) and towards more automation of workflows. There was an interesting mention of a new book, *The Atlas of New Librarianship*, by **David Lankes**, that an important library skill will be "economic in nature." The unique aspect of this presentation brought forward by the panel was the idea of the "distinctive collections" that required more care and subject expertise than the general collection but do not require the same kind of "care" as our unique archival ones. **Linden** discussed a case study of one aspect

*continued on page 65*

of distinctive collections, where she brought forth the idea that it is an exciting time for librarians who can work with researchers on data management plans, assist with the acquisition of data sets, and work with metadata related to statistical sources. The panel did an excellent job of bringing forth the nature of "distinctive collections." This may be something towards which many libraries, especially academic ones, may now be putting much of their energy.

***e-Content Discovery: Approaches, Methods, and Tools to Improve Findability*** — Presented by **Becky Albitz** (Bates College); **Robert Faber** (Oxford University Press); **Martha Sedgwick** (SAGE Publications Ltd); **Marc Segers** (iFactory); **Katrin Siems** (De Gruyter)
*NOTE: **Marc Segers** did not present in this session.*

Reported by: **Ann E. Merryman** (MLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <merrymaa@email.sc.edu>

Making content discoverable is an important objective not only for academic publishers but for librarians as well. The four institutions represented by the panelists have addressed the issue in various ways, and the presentation was developed to foster discussion among participants around common goals, and to find ways for libraries and publishers initiatives on content discovery to operate in conjunction.

**Albitz** from **Bates College** spoke first, and provided a general framework for the remaining presenters. **Sedgewick**, **SAGE Publications Ltd.**, spoke next, beginning with a review of six **SAGE** products, and also discussing technical advances such as the "semantic thumbprint" which matches up semantics within a group of articles. **Faber** of the **Oxford University Press** spoke about discoverability and linking being key to the library field, and he was followed by **Siems** who presented five reasons to invest in findability: growth in global research, speed of online searches, usage as a precondition for buying, new business models being based on quantity of usage, and authors now requesting visibility.

***Ebook Availability Revisited: A Quantitative Analysis of the 2012 Ebook Aggregator Marketplace*** — Presented by **John McDonald** (Claremont University Consortium); **Jason Price** (Claremont Colleges Library)

Reported by: **Cody Walters** (MLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <waltersw@email.sc.edu>

In this revisit of **McDonald** and **Price's** 2008 study, the two found that the eBook market was indeed growing by leaps and bounds. The presentation attempted to poll the audience using a text messaging service for topics such as "how much has the market switched to eBook" and, "what is the percent in which eBooks have grown since 2008" but the service did not work and instead the audience was polled by a simple hand raise. The study also showed the parity that is being created in the eBook market between **ebrary** and **EBSCO**. The Presenters also pointed out the cost discrepencies between buying collections and single titles. The presentation was concluded with harrowing news about the roles **Google** and the **Hathi Trust** scanned book movments could play in the eBook market. A graph was shown and **Google's** scanned book plan would easily eclipse any other attempt at a similar project.

***Great Expectations: New Organizational Models for Overworked Liaisons*** — Presented by **Steve Cramer** (UNC Greensboro); **Michael Crumpton** (UNC Greensboro); **Amy Harris** (UNC Greensboro)
*NOTE: **Michael Crumpton** did not present in this session.*

Reported by: **Nancy Birch** (University of Guelph-Humber) <nbirch@uoguelph.ca>

**Cramer** and **Harris** from the **University of North Carolina Greensboro** began their discussion of new organizational models for overworked liaisons with the growing list of the activities that a liaison librarian is asked to fulfill. The premise of their presentation was the question: is it realistic to assume that a liaison can execute effectively on such a lengthy list of responsibilities? To answer this question, **UNC Greensboro** struck a task force and it was charged with benchmarking various models in other libraries and recommending new organizational models based on what was learned.

Organizational models from **Utah State**, **Villanova**, and **Johns Hopkins** were explored. The recently implemented model at the **University of Guelph** (Canada) was also mentioned. From their research, **Cramer** and **Harris** have developed two possible models to put forward. One model organizes liaisons in subject teams and the other, by functional specialities. The session ended with questions from the audience and an acknowledgement that **UNC Greensboro** is still working on some issues including the handling of collection development and the implementation processes once the model is selected.

***Knowledge Unlatched: Can We Change the Face of Scholarly Book Publishing?*** — Presented by **Frances Pinter** (Knowledge Unlatched); **Hazel Woodward** (Information Power)

Reported by: **Sheri Ross** (St Catherine University) <svtross@stkate.edu>

**Knowledge Unlatched** is an initiative whose time has come. According to **Woodward** of **Information Power**, an increasing number of scholars need to publish their works, while an increasing number of publishers find scholarly monographs in the social sciences and the humanities a poor investment. Having posed the problem, **Woodward** then, introduced a solution — **Knowledge Unlatched** — a revolutionary means of publishing scholarly works within a sustainable business model, while simultaneously providing free point of use access to all. This solution has the potential to launch scholarly works across space and time so that publishers can maximize their efforts, reaching long tail readers not accessible through traditional channels.

The innovator of this model, **Pinter**, explained that she has been collaborating with publisher and library partners to refine the business model. The current idea is that a consortium of libraries would select titles from a catalog offered by participating publishers. Selected titles would be edited and made available as a flat file in an open access repository. Publishers would then have an opportunity to add levels of value to the product and market it. Participating libraries would receive substantial discounts on the value-added editions if they choose to purchase or license them. The intellectual content is freely available to all. This is a win-win-win initiative.

***Lives in Books*** — Presented by **David Earle** (Associate Professor, University of West Florida); **Carol Feltes** (University Librarian, Rockefeller University); and **Michael Zubal** (Bibliographer, Zubal Books)

Reported by: **Cat Faircloth** (MLIS Student, University of South Carolina) <faircloo@email.sc.edu>

This was an extremely interesting and informative session, discussing the speakers' various interactions,

*continued on page 66*

appreciation, and love of books. Each panel member introduced themselves and gave themselves a title reflecting their place in the world of books: **Earle** is the "interpreter", **Feltes** is a "facilitator," and **Zubal** describes himself as a "broker." These epithets proved very accurate assessments as they related their book-related interests and explored subjects ranging from how books transform lives and the differences between the print culture of the past and the digital culture of our future, to bibliomania and the debate over what people actually read vs. "best" lists. Questions of whether a book is art or artifact and whether the idea of the book has changed over time challenged the audience to reevaluate their opinions and reflect on their own "lives in books."

***Negotiating Tactics: Secrets from Both Sides of the Table*** — Presented by **Amelia Brunskill** (DePaul University); **Matt Dunie** (Data-Planet by Conquest Systems, Inc); **Mike Gruenberg** (Gruenberg Consulting)

Reported by: **Kathleen Spring** (Linfield College, Nicholson Library) <kspring@linfield.edu>

Negotiation is of great interest to both librarians and vendors; this session provided strategies from both perspectives. **Brunskill** acknowledged the time commitment required by negotiations, especially with regard to preparation, but the advantages of negotiating can include substantial pricing discounts, changes to interlibrary loan terms, and access for additional user populations. According to **Brunskill,** there is always an opportunity for negotiation, and she exhorted attendees both to know what they want from the negotiation at the outset and to believe that their business matters.

**Dunie** and **Gruenberg** focused on understanding the components of a negotiation, noting that very little skills training in this process is available to librarians. Because the electronic resources market is a big industry with high profit margins, **Gruenberg** stressed that libraries have a lot of leverage and should approach the process by identifying objectives, a timetable, a team to aid in the negotiation, and a strategy.

A lively Q&A period followed the formal presentations, which delivered as advertised. The one drawback to this session was the size of the room, which was not nearly large enough to accommodate the number of attendees.

***New Scholarly Communication Technologies in Action*** — Presented by **Alex Wade** (Microsoft Research); **Timo Hannay** (Digital Science)

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

Perhaps some in the audience, who work with researchers, were familiar with "spam algorithmics" or "research accelators," but when it came to "data explosion," audience members could definitely relate to **Wade's** observation that most researchers are not taught data management. Quoting **Jeff Dozier**, "it's everyone's job and no one's job." Data-centric activities involve "doing with data," not finding a set. He mentioned projects such as In Situ (to track data provenance), Data Up (to move data from a spreadsheet into a repository). Then he moved on to other examples of tools that help authors tell a story, interactively visualize, publish, share. The purpose of these is to allow for moving parts that can be referenceable, reusable, retrievable. **Hannay** described three projects: SureChem (to link diverse information sources); Lab Guru (provides content in context), and FigShare (integrates research and literature). Discussion with the audience was lively, moving from the challenges of identifying the uniqueness of authors, to learning software, crowdsourcing, the coming soon "claim" features of ORCID. One comment near the end probably resonates well beyond just this session: "Each project needs time to succeed on its own."

***PIE-J: Recommended Practices for the Presentation and Identification of E-Journals (served ala mode)*** — Presented by **Edward Cilurso** (Taylor & Francis LLC); **Steven Shadle** (University of Washington Libraries)
***NOTE: Stacy Stanislaw** presented on behalf of **Edward Cilurso**.*

Reported by: **Elyse Profera** (Taylor & Francis Group) <elyse.profera@taylorandfrancis.com>

This was an informative presentation during which **Shadle** introduced some of the new working standards **NISO (National Information Standards Organization)** is preparing to finalize and roll out amongst the library community. Standards included best practices to follow with respect to: journal titles and citation information, title changes and title history, ISSNs, enumeration and chronology systems, publication information, content accessibility, and preservation of content digitized from print. Some best practice highlights included: keeping the journal title's naming convention consistent throughout when displayed in various places throughout an online platform, implementing title changes at the beginning of a volume or publication year, ensuring that each separate title of a journal over time has its own ISSN, using original enumeration and chronology scheme when posting content on the Web, and providing clear presentation of all volume numbers, issue numbers, and publication dates.

The second portion of the presentation **Stanislaw** told the history of **Taylor & Francis Online (TFO)** and all of the past platforms **Taylor & Francis** used prior to the rollout of **TFO** in June 2011. She showed **TFO** screenshots and pointed out examples of **NISO** best practice standards which the **TFO** platform did a great job at complying with and which standards were not adhered to. Highlights included: **TFO** always provides the full journal title in a prominent, clear, and consistent manner on all online pages. **TFO** also makes a good attempt to provide journal title history including the full journal title, publication date range, and ISSN for the current title and the immediately preceding or succeeding titles.

## THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2012
## CONCURRENT SESSIONS 2

***And the Workflow Says: Conducting and Using a Workflow Analysis for Positive Change*** — Presented by **Emily Campbell** (University of Michigan-Ann Arbor); **Rafael Escobar** (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor)
***NOTE: Rafael Escobar** did not present in this session.*

Reported by: **Debra Hargett** (Wingate University, Ethel K. Smith Library) <dhargett@wingate.edu>

**Campbell** presented her overview of a six-month workflow analysis on the ERDM units at the **University of Michigan Library** in preparation for an ERM implementation. She highlighted a study of the units collectively. Each included individuals set to retire, which meant their institutional memory could retire. The analysis provided an opportunity to manage changes in staffing and work flow prior to the integration of an ERM system. Advisory and Data-Collecting groups were formed, each charged with proposing improvements for the units. Among their findings of sparse documentation, deskbound information, and lacking communication, a need for unity and cohesion between the units was discovered. **Campbell** shared charts, diagrams, and a matrix containing the recommendations made, processes identified, and overall outcomes. She emphasized fostering communication and transparency for stakeholders to positively embrace the changes. Although the library has yet to decide upon an ERM system, work flow processes and areas of responsibilities are now documented. As tools, these documents should aid in creating generalized work units with overlapping areas, rather than operating as specialized self-contained units. More importantly, the analysis can be used to ensure the library, in the wake of staff reductions, can maintain a high volume of e-resources for users.

*continued on page 67*

***Collection Development Policies are Sooooo Twentieth Century......Or Are They?*** — Presented by **Victoria Koger** (Eastern Kentucky University)

Reported by: **Anne K. Abate** (Library Discount Network) <anne@librarydiscountnetwork.com>

This interactive session started out with a series of questions to the standing-room-only audience regarding collection development policies and when they were written or revised. The speaker outlined why a written policy is still necessary. This moved on to a very well moderated group participation session with the audience on the use of their collection development policies. Topics covered included the reasons for having a policy, why policies can prove useful, if a separate electronic policy is necessary, and how to adjust a policy to fit new needs. The speaker also provided example policies and outlines of what should be included.

***Do You Have Any Good Books to Read? Popular Reading Collections in Academic Libraries*** — Presented by **Faye Christenberry** (University of Washington); **Anne Davis** (University of Washington)

Reported by: **Rob Tench** (Old Dominion University) <ftench@odu.edu>

Popular book collections are alive and well in colleges and universities, according to **Christenberry, Davis**, and the many attendees of this fun and engaging program. In response to student demand, librarians at the **University of Washington** set up a separate popular collection in 2009 by relocating favorites from existing holdings. The collection soon developed legs and is now the home of approximately 1,400 volumes in all genres except romance. Circulation is high, demand is strong, and more titles are being added on a consistent basis. The service is so popular that funds are allocated for separate popular collection purchases, a formalized weeding policy is in place, and usage trends are tracked regularly. Features include an emphasis on fiction, hardbacks, and series books! All volumes are cataloged. Both staff and student recommendations are encouraged. Participants shared experiences about their popular collections — many use book rental programs from **B&T** and **McNaughton**. All attested to the popularity and steady growth of their popular collections and agreed it is a service well worth funding and maintaining. As **Christenberry** and **Davis** adroitly pointed out, research indicates that reading for pleasure correlates strongly with academic performance.

***Don't Forget the Little Publisher, Part Deux*** — Presented by **Anne McKee** (Great Western Library Alliance); **David Myers** (DMedia Associates, Inc.); **Stuart Silcox** (Swets); **Tom Taylor** (Dragonfly)
***NOTE**: **David Myers** did not present in this session.*

Reported by: **Amanda Mays** (University of South Carolina, SLIS) < maysal@email.sc.edu >

In this lively session, we learned that direct grass root marketing and co-marketing in effort to create a critical mass are key factors in small publishers getting attention of libraries and institutions. Additionally, **McKee** gave specific advice from her consortium perspective. She said small publishers need to be proactive, reach out to people (consortia officers), do the hard work, tell them why your content is so important, be persistent but not pushy, go to the libraries, see who the consortia members are and see how they're set up. Go to the consortia's collection development committee. Do your homework about the consortia before contacting them. Never assume anything about a consortium because they're all different. Listen to what the members of the consortia say. Anything with a recurring cost is an automatic red flag to the libraries. Don't create your own platform because students can't figure out how to work with new platforms. **McKee** notes, "We really want open access and many members of **GWLA** (her group) have signed the open access agreement. Perpetual access is an absolute need and we won't sign a license without it. Be innovative in the way your pushing the content out to the users — put it on devices like phone, laptop,etc... consortia will help you. They really do like smaller publishers and they're trying to bust up the big deal because it's no longer financially sustainable."

***How Did That Get In There? Streaming Media in the Land of Discovery*** — Presented by **Harry Kaplanian** (EBSCO Publishing); **Scott Spicer** (University of Minnesota); **Aaron Wood** (Alexander St. Press)

Reported by: **Beth Ketterman** (East Carolina University, Laupus Health Sciences Library) <kettermane@ecu.edu>

The session asked the question — how shall we best expose streaming media to patrons? The speakers explored some of the background for this problem, like how the carrier gets more emphasis than the content, how overhead (staff time, staff training, cost) surrounding streaming content is prohibitive, and how the demand for video has increased at a time when we have yet to achieve best practices for discoverability.

**Wood** asked the healthy-sized crowd how our libraries are currently handling discoverability. Responders suggested that, other than adding MARC records to ILS systems when available, the carrier is usually listed in database lists or in video LibGuides. **Spicer**'s presentation suggested that this isn't good enough. **Kaplanian** provided insight into the problem discovery service providers have in delivering/indexing title-level streaming content.

There was no time left for a question and answer session, which would have been helpful in trying to work through some of the unanswered questions posed in the session abstract.

***NISO's DDA Initiative: Cross-Industry Stakeholders Express PDA to Improve the Landscape for All*** — Presented by **Barbara Kawecki** (YBP); **Nettie Lagace** (NISO - National Information Standards Organization); **Michael Levine-Clark** (University of Denver)

Reported by: **Sheri Ross** (St. Catherine University) <svtross@stkate.edu>

Proceeding as expected, **NISO's** Demand-Driven Acquisitions Initiative Committee co-chairs **Kaweck**i and **Levine-Clark**, along with **Lagace**, Associate Director for Programs at **NISO**, discussed how cross-industry stakeholders express "Public Displays of Affection" to improve the landscape for all, wittily easing the community into using DDA as the preferred acronym. The committee is focusing its attention on three primary areas. First, they want to enable library professionals to more effectively and efficiently manage their DDA accounts. The ability to customize the "consideration pool" is a priority. The Technical Issues Subcommittee is working to provide a means to profile items into and out of a consideration set, to ensure the long-term availability of acquirable items, and other technical issues. There is also a subcommittee to tackle access issues. Their primary charge is to improve the effectiveness of end-user discovery, and eventual acquisition. They recognize that two-clicks-equals-a-purchase is not an ideal model. The Access Issues subcommittee is also concerned with constructing a means of selecting between the purchasing and licensing of a given title. The third subcommittee, Metrics, will define the measures of use and referral. If they manage to avoid scope creep, the committee expects to have a recommended practice ready to unveil in the summer of 2013.

*continued on page 68*

**And They Were There**
*from page 67*

***Positively Perplexing E-Books: Digital Natives' Perceptions of Electronic Information Resources*** — Presented by **Amy Buhler** (University of Florida); **Tara Cataldo** (University of Florida)

Reported by: **Margaret M. Kain** (University of Alabama at Birmingham, Mervyn H. Sterne Library) <pkain@uab.edu>

Intrigued by a presentation at last year's **Charleston Conference**, **Buhler** and **Cataldo** began a discussion on their campus about the perception of e-resources. A review of the literature turned up terms like "**Google** generation," "digital native" and "format agnostics." Not finding much data to support and define these terms the presenters decided to dig further. They developed a pilot survey for undergraduate and graduate students, asking questions about the source/type of information they were accessing, with interesting results. Using *Poll Everywhere* the session attendees were in turn asked the same questions students had been asked and the results were compared in real time. Labeling and branding appear to be very important tools that help students identify resources. Most of the students who participated in the pilot project were able to recognize an article in an electronic journal. **Google** was easily recognized as a search engine, but students did not differentiate between **Google** and **Google Scholar**. Based on feedback from students interviewed during the pilot project, the presenters have tweaked their survey and are continuing their research.

***Social Research Collaboration: Libraries Need Not Apply?*** — Presented by **Jose Luis Andrade** (Swets); **Christopher Erdmann** (Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics); **Jan Reichelt (**Mendeley)

See ***ATG v.25#1, Feb. 2013,*** for Conference Altmetrics session reports by **William Gunn** (Mendeley) <william.gunn@mendeley.com>

***The Future of Reading in a Digital Age: What Does It Mean – or Not Mean – For Us?*** — Presented by **Tony Horava** (University of Ottawa)

Reported by: **Fran Gray** (University of Western Ontario, The D.B.Weldon Library) <fgray@uwo.ca>

**Horava** presented highlights of recent reading research and described ways in which reading is being transformed by the shift to digital. He asked us to consider what this shift means for our culture and for libraries in particular. Based on his reading, Horava concluded that reading remains fundamental to what libraries are about and that we must continue to connect authors and publishers with readers. He asserted that reading must become format and platform agnostic as well as portable. He included a discussion of the way in which social media sites such as LibraryThing and Facebook are making reading a more interactive experience. In closing, **Horava** quoted from "Deeper into the machine: the future of electronic literature" by **Hayles**, who wrote "Learning to speak digital calls forth…new modes of attending, listening, seeing…that transform what it means to experience literature ('read' is no longer an adequate term.)" **Horava's** presentation was thought-provoking and engaging. There was considerable discussion related to print reading vs. screen reading, reading in an attention-challenged society and the challenge of the digital divide. Several participants continued the conversation at the close of the session, which was an indication of its success.

***Zen and the Art of Scholarly Publishing Business Models*** — Presented by **Peter Binfield** (PeerJ); **Nawin Gupta** (Association of Subscription Agents & Intermediaries); **Eric Moran** (Sage Publications); **Kristen Fisher Ratan** (PLoS); **Robert Schatz** (BioMed Central / Open Repository)

***NOTE: Nawin Gupta** did not present in this session. The session featured a title change, to: **The Art of Scholarly Publishing Business Models**.*

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

**Schatz** took on the role of moderator and presenter, beginning with a fast overview of the recent history of OA. There is a myriad of models, a pallette and a "mix-up" of players. Initial doubts about OA as "vanity" proved short-sighted. From 60 OA journals 12 years ago, the field numbers approximately 250 now. The **OA Scholarly Publishing Association** now has major publisher members. Outlier organizations do publish without peer review, but editors don't want to damage their reputations aligning themselves with those publications. Per **Fisher Ratan**, **PLoS One** was not started for revenue, and there can be arguments about the "dumping ground" accusation. The growth of **PLoS** is a challenge. Quality is more subjective than first thought since 27% of rejected articles later get published elsewhere. **Binfield** mentioned how quickly **PeerJ** got started with two co-founders, once funding received. In the subscription world, the library is the primary customer, while in the OA world, the author is the customer. The **PeerJ** model focuses on each author, not just the corresponding author. Per **Moran**, **Sage** Open, begun last year, offers a gold OA model for the social sciences, and the experience differs from STM — there is a lower acceptance rate and the funders of authors differ (authors often pay author fees out of pocket). During the discussion the Q&A period, OA "distribution" was discussed — how does the content get to the reader vs. what is the license that allows content to get out; subscription is a "club" model and OA is a "public good" model. There is no desire to reinvent a "Big Deal", and it is more transparent when the models are posted.

*That's all the reports we have room for in this issue. Watch for more reports from the **2012 Charleston Conference** in upcoming issues of **Against the Grain**. Presentation material (PowerPoint slides, handouts) and taped session links from many of the 2012 sessions are available online. Visit the **Conference Website** at **www.katina.info/conference**. — **KS***