ACRL Literatures in English Section Collections Discussion Group Annual Meeting Minutes
Sunday, June 30th, 2013 (3:00-4:00 pm), Hyatt Regency Chicago Hotel, Columbus CD

Present: Robin Imhof (co-chair), Nancy Foasberg, Zara Wilkinson, Jaena Alabi ,Priscilla Finley, Abby Scheel, Sharon Bolger, Gregory Grazevich, Barbara Chen, Kathy Johnson, Laura Fuderer, Judith Arnold, Hazel McClure, Justine Cotton, Michaelyn Burnett, Liorah Golomb, Faye Christenberry, Tammy Eschedor-Voelker, Melissa Van Vuuren, Sara Seten Berhausen

    I.   Welcome and introductions. Announcement that next midwinter discussion meeting would be held virtually (3rd consecutive year).

Topic 1: Faculty collaboration in scholarly communication initiatives.

One librarian did some work with English faculty at her university collaboratively teaching IL to English majors, which can be challenging. Emphasized how important it is for librarians and subject faculty to collaborate on this issue as there's a component in the classroom and in the library. Faculty don't always think about making this collaboration concrete and visible to the students.

Another mentioned a half-day symposium at her university to educate faculty about author's rights. Not all of them knew what they are signing away in their contracts with publishers. They didn't realize they were very restricted in how they can use their own work. Next steps: to explore the institutional perception of "alt-metrics" for faculty who are publishing in nontraditional ways. Some are publishing in open access peer-reviewed journals, while others are involved in even less traditional projects.

One institution has a scholarly communications team who work on the institutional repository. Last year, a couple of departments did presentations on how open access can be high impact. To illustrate, they showed impact factors in nursing and engineering. They also had a service to research faculty members' CVs to see which publications can go in the repository and are working on a way to automate this.

A pilot project with Symplectic Elements was described. This product looks at some databases, starting with STEM, to populate a list of citations for a faculty profile, and then they can confirm, deny or add them to their profiles.

One institution is developing an institutional repository, and the goal is to get selectors to encourage faculty to contribute.

One librarian mentioned that her institution has the second largest IR in the country and that one of her faculty goes very aggressively after the departments to add content. Faculty are happy because they get reports on downloads. They've been doing this for about 12 years, and found that you have to keep working on adding new materials.

[SPARC](#) has some materials on this. So does [Open Access Week](#).

A member raised the issue that we (librarians) should be models for open access when we publish, but many of our journals, such as *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, charges huge fee for open access. This spurred further discussion about two tiered systems if institutions are paying for faculty to make their articles open access. The issue was raised concerning some publishers that allow authors to make their post-prints available after 1 year. Does this also create a second tier? The article they find will be open access, but is that the one they can cite?

In support of the paying upfront model, one member added that content is actually open access--, meaning everyone has access, not just the institution. Some faculty support this model because they know their research will have immediate positive impact.

Topic 2: Ebook marketing and promotion (which morphed quickly into a discussion of ebook challenges in general)

Some strategies on marketing: linking e-encyclopedias in LibGuides and sometimes highlight online resources in sessions. Most users prefer print for contemporary books, although they love EEBO and ECCO. In terms marketing e-books, it may be more the other way around, more attention needs to be paid to promoting print books.

Summary of Ebook concerns expressed:

> Loss of illustrations with ebooks.
> Some departments/disciplines want more ebooks, others don't
> Different platforms have different restrictions as to the number of users and the amount you can download or print.
> Perception about multiple/unlimited access (multiple use is more expensive, but faculty aren't aware of this)
> Misconceptions in general that ebooks are less expensive than print
> DRM from publishers impeding access/downloading
> Concerns about ownership – can one ever "own" an ebook? What if we want to migrate e-titles to a different platform?
> Publishers aren't thinking of curation, just distribution and sale

One library described a cooperative arrangement with Oxford University Press. For a set amount, the library network can have one print book (to share) and e-book access for all libraries. Users are happy with this "best of both worlds" arrangement.

The discussion shifted to demand-driven/patron-driven acquisition. It was generally agreed that it is a complicated business model. Concern was expressed about loss of control and lack of precision leading to the absence of an intellectually coherent collection. Difficulty with profile plans -- ok if we really are getting the books that we would order anyway but are they as effective as a subject specialist? At universities who've adopted the data-driven model of decision-making, library administrators are attracted to DDA because it's easier to measure quantitatively the use of the book collection. Many expressed that the expectations from university administration are that the library uses its funds for ebooks and electronic databases, rather than print books. Point was made that there are still many books (esp. in the humanities)

that are only published in print and therefore not included in DDA availability. Desire expressed to see a study of available e-versions broken down by discipline.

One library is looking at Overdrive because the Paperwhite Kindles are time-consuming. Unclear if many academic libraries are subscribing to Overdrive.

Topic 3: History of the Book in the Digital Realm

Humanities scholars in general feel this pressure on their work. Humanities research projects tend to be long term while research opportunities are very short term. When we are pressured to do this analysis in the here and now, how do we prove the value of cohesion?

Concern that administrators say they want to meet users' needs, but they are only considering today's users. Many research universities have nineteenth century books (and older) meeting users' needs today. What about the future? There may be a very important topic that isn't hot right now but maybe it will be in 5-10 years. Then, with fiction and poetry, making sure --as culture keepers --that there are marginalized voices we are still collecting, even knowing that book may sit on the shelf.

One member expressed that it's dangerous to separate format from content and felt the print book is still the gold standard. The way we engage with information in the text varies if you are reading online vs if you read it in print. The way we retain or think critically about it is different online than it is in print. We have a format oriented to deep thinking, and this (online reading) is a format that encourages distraction.

Another expressed concern about the loss of serendipitous discovery through browsing in the stacks. Online, you don't see materials unless you do the right search.

If English class enrollments are down, and purchasing is based on department metrics, some disciplines will have higher numbers. If we have to buy things for how much they are used, that is unfair to the humanities because people work in such narrow disciplines.

General agreement that the ideal model for electronic and print to coexist would be to allow for a copy of each with unlimited downloads of the e-version (we can dream can't we?).

Topic 4: Updating the LES statement on Primary Sources

General agreement that this needs to be done. No update since document was created in 1997. Next steps involve proposing it to the LES executive committee, then setting up a task force or ad-hoc committee with participation from the MLA representative.

There will be more about developing criteria for weeding literature collections on the listserv. Stay tuned!