

ACRL Literatures in English Section Midwinter 2013 Combined Reference and Collections Discussion Group Meeting

Virtual Meeting via Adobe Connect, Thursday, January 31, 2013 11:00-1:00 (PST)

Present: Sara Seten Berghausen, Robin Imhof, Aline Soules, Amanda Rust, Arianne Hartsell-Gundy, Chris Ruotolo, Jen Stevens, Joan Campbell, John Glover, Kathy Johnson, Kristina DeVoe, Liorah Golomb, Mary Thill, Michaelyn Burnette, Nancy Foasberg, Naomi Lederer, Tammy Voelker, Michelle ?

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Weeding guidelines for literature collections. Are libraries using the availability of books in Hathi Trust, Open Library, etc. as part of the criteria for deselection? Does anyone have good guidelines to share?

JSTOR: Many of us have discarded these journals. In one case, this is after the 3-5 year window, but in many cases, the print is completely gone.

At U. of Oklahoma, a number of key general interest magazines have disappeared, e.g., Ladies Home Journal. There is no knowledge of how this happened. Many of the lost titles don't really work in a full-text database. One person asked how we could use the "LES Statement of Primary Materials" (<http://www.ala.org/acrl/aboutacrl/directoryofleadership/sections/les/lesstatement>) to prevent such disasters. In another library, all the general interest magazines were moved to remote storage without consultation.

Another issue relates to "gaps." One example is the local paper, where there are gaps until the microfilm arrives and also no full digital surrogate.

A number of libraries are under pressure to "make space" in the library for reasons that are not always library-related—the desire of administration to use the space for other units or patron space. The weeding is not done for collection or use reasons.

One person is working with the dilemma of being required to weed literary criticism from good publishers, leaders in the field, but which has low circulation statistics. A related issue is the pressure to discard such material if the library subscribes to MLA-IB. One suggestion is that some reference books can be weeded if available in e-format (e.g., many Gale series titles).

Another "policy" is zero growth. In one library, much has been sent to storage based on a three-year window of circulation and a criterion related to purchase date. The reason for the purchase date criterion is that if older titles are purchased currently, they need time to be checked out before they end up in storage. It was noted that some authors may be rediscovered, rendering circulation statistics meaningless.

Criteria at libraries in Ohio include:

- a) whether monographs had circulated in the previous ten years

b) whether there were more than ten other OhioLINK libraries that held the title/volume

It was suggested that a space be made on the LES wiki to add criteria for collection policies, weeding policies, etc.

Even the Research I libraries are weeding, e.g., U. Cal, Berkeley, where the bibliographer is reviewing 50,000 titles in PS. The titles can't be stored in the northern storage site if they are in the southern storage site, forcing the bibliographer to withdraw or keep in the collection. Now, the collection is skewed with high use titles and unused titles.

Regarding the consortial "check" for the number of copies held in other libraries, the challenge is that the last person holding the title is obligated to keep it.

It was noted that some disciplines lend themselves more readily to weeding than others, e.g., computer science.

In one library, librarians have been able to make the argument that literature, history, art, humanities should *not* have the same circulation requirements as, for example, the sciences. As a result, there are no "hard and fast" rules for circulation in history.

In one library, much has been sent to storage based on a three-year window of circulation and a criterion related to purchase date. The problem with the latter criterion is that if older titles are purchased currently, they need time to be checked out before they end up in storage. It was noted that some authors may be rediscovered, rendering circulation statistics meaningless.

The issue of browsing was raised. The problem is that with space at a premium, this is likely not to have much influence. Also, in institutions where stacks are filling and storage facilities are soon to be full, there is likely to be a one book in/one book out approach. Also, browsing is not possible when over 2M titles are in storage. One person suggested that browsing was particularly meaningful for undergraduates who do not use ILL for time reasons.

Another issue is whether the university administrators are from science or humanities backgrounds. There was agreement about this.

The issue of in-house stats was raised. Apparently, not all libraries do this, even today. This is important to assess real circulation and use.

The need to weed in some institutions has decreased because of the rise in e-books. A question arose about selecting e-replacements for key print titles and whether those titles are a) available in e-format and b) in/out of copyright. In one case, there was a reference weeding project with a plan to buy online replacements, but a budget shortage resulted in no e-replacements. Some have subscribed to the ProjectMUSE book deal. There was also concern about indexing on various titles, which then requires leafing through the pages to find out about content. Internet Archive Books was referenced: <http://archive.org/details/texts>.

This led to a question about instructing users in the use of HathiTrust or Google Books to browse for keywords and use that as a way to decide whether to request the book from a depository or

ILL. Some are doing that and also putting links on websites. The University of California put Hathi titles in Melvyl (UC consortial catalog) and they are also in the individual Berkeley catalog. This is used to make withdrawal decisions.

Faculty involvement in weeding decisions was raised. In one institute, teaching faculty was not involved when Reference books were shifted. There was a thought that it would be easier to decrease that collection if it were possible to assign “do not circulate” to books in the regular stacks. One person asked if weeding from administrative pressure and consulting faculty was equivalent to going around administration. Another issue is the time factor if faculty is involved. One example was a project to send materials to storage. Faculty was allowed to review those materials and pull flags from the books marked for storage. There was also a sense that it is easier to involve faculty if the librarian is also a faculty member rather than a staff member. It also depends on the institution, the politics, the awkwardness. In one institution, one faculty member offered extra credit to students to go to the stacks and pull flags.

There was discussion on whether the dean/director communicates with faculty on de-selection projects. It depends on the institution. In one institution, there is a general message devised by the library faculty, but liaisons do the communication with their individual areas. One person described a library committee on the faculty senate and efforts to work with them more intensely.

3. Ebook purchases and guidelines: What are you buying and how (individual titles through YBP, consortial purchases, DDA projects)? How are you dealing with incorporating electronic texts into your collections that are really only available on an individual consumer model (i.e. “Kindle Singles”)? --Print vs. Electronic Reference Resources in the Humanities: ... Do you have a format preference/bias? Do your Patrons? What newer e-resources have you found to be good? What should be electronic that isn't yet? What obstacles if any do you find to using a variety of formats in this blended environment? Etc.

ProjectMUSE e-books are integrated with the regular platform, enabling patrons to search for journals and books.

One person tried buying a couple of e-books through Coutts/Ingram but found them difficult for reading.

Searching on the platform is not as easy now.

E-reader format was raised as a problem for libraries. Amazon is being difficult, for example. Some titles are unavailable in a format usable by libraries.

Another issue is that some interesting electronic literature experiments are coming out as “apps.” How can one collect these? One library bought some iPads for that purpose, especially artist books.

Overdrive was raised. One library didn't purchase that, but they purchased the ebrary public library collection at the U. of Michigan.

Dissertations were raised, as was the institutional repository. Questions included: are dissertations/theses being sent to ProQuest *and* to the IR? What about copyright? What happens when dissertations/theses are *only* sent to the IR and no longer to ProQuest? Many are now sending to both. On one campus, which has the second largest IR in the country, access is limited to the university's affiliates beyond the first 24 pages. Students do have some embargo rights for reasons of future publication or patents. Some faculty has said that ProQuest publication of dissertations has hurt their graduate careers since there are still problems with publishing books that have already been published as dissertations. Another person said that there is some research proving that this perception is not accurate. Yet, in another institution, on faculty member said that the journal for which she edited would not print literary criticism that had been included full text as part of a ProQuest dissertation. The concern about non-publication also hurts access when graduate students impose extreme embargoes on the release of their dissertations/theses. Some institutions are still cataloging hard copies of their dissertations/theses; some are not.

One issue with e-book packages is how to search them. One library has ACLS Humanities books, but the subject headings are not visible in the library catalog, only the subject heading "humanities."

Textbooks were raised. There is an Affordable Learning Solutions project on one campus. It funds faculty to create open source, copyright compliant, and ADA compliant alternatives to textbooks (see the library's textbook tips page at <http://library.csueastbay.edu/using-the-libraries/collections/textbooks/> where there is a link to the AL\$ project to date). There is some pushback from the university bookstore which is managed by a commercial enterprise. In other institutions, faculty is encouraged to create hybrid textbooks using library content already available online.

This is also applicable to MOOCs. How do librarians support those? Using open access resources is one way. Some librarians are assembling resources for MOOC instructors, including information on copyright and fair use as well as open access sources they can mine for course materials.

Duplications and consortial collections was raised. The catalog can end up with separate copies for an ordered e-book that, later, appears as a title in the consortial package. If there is a patron-driven access program as well, a third copy can appear. Two of those copies may later disappear, making one librarian not particularly concerned. The "vanishing" issue is a big one, especially when professors plan to use that particular book as a class reading. One library received an ebrary package and, after sampling 10%, there was total duplication in literature except for some 1930s pamphlets. One library vendor has promised not to allow dups, although how that is being achieved is unclear. A parallel was drawn to e-versions of periodicals and the duplication there. The trouble is that the students notice it more in the catalog, although the periodical duplication becomes clear to users when they click SFX or Serials Solutions to find out where the full text resides.

NOTE: At this point, the discussion moved to the next topic, but after that, more e-book discussion was held (see below).

4. New relationships with archives. As more lit/humanities scholars discover the riches of online archives, has this generated a renewed interest in campus or local archives? What are good strategies for building (and promoting) physical and digital collection highlights?

There is increased interest in digital humanities, working with primary sources, either in the institution or beyond it. This has driven librarians to learn more about archives generally. This led to a discussion of how closely people worked with archives and ways in which the regular literature collections and archives were used more closely together. Examples include:

- multiple assignment involving the use of ECCO or similar tools and talking to students about the practicalities of visiting archives
- outreach by special collections
- joint work with art librarians on artists' books, bringing classes and putting on an exhibit
- offering intern positions, sometimes from literature, sometimes from history
- the use of archives as a basis for creating work
- the use of artifacts in special collections in conjunction with the circulating collection instruct first year students on the difference between primary and secondary sources
- the incorporation, by many faculty, of primary sources into the curriculum
- working with local collection and archive materials then going into the community where the authors of those materials lived and worked

This led to a sense that there is a new role for a hybrid "librarian/archivist" and the importance of the few remaining "unique" collections in libraries.

There was a request for good activities or exercises to help students connect with special collections. Ideas:

- classes that help to catalog individual items they discover, research the item as they work
- sessions where students are walked through websites, shown finding aids, etc., and taken to interview the chair of the department
- gathering a selection of items from late mss to early printed books, laying them out at tables, staffing each table with a grad student, librarian, or faculty member, after which students rotated around the tables for mini-lectures and discussion questions\
- requiring all general education classes to use primary sources in order to improve the quality of graduates
- connecting a secondary source, e.g., a book that describes a period when John Muir was "lonely" and then showing them an actual letter written by Muir that states this

Mention was made of the extra work involved in all this; however, it is worth it.

NOTE: At this point, the discussion reverted to **e-books**.

5. Outreach and reference issues around ebooks: How does your library communicate differences in functionality and permissions for different ebook platforms? Does your library subscribe to Overdrive or another service that allows "lending" to individual ereader devices?

There was a discussion of e-book platform issues—so many vendors, so many options. What help can/do librarians provide?

Many students just use e-books as a matter of course, although occasionally, a student laments the lack of a print copy. Libguides are one approach, along with other user documentation and guides for various e-book collections. Here are a list of links:

<http://libguides.lib.muohio.edu/content.php?pid=37051&sid=796724>
<http://guides.library.duke.edu/content.php?pid=289830&sid=2381974>
<http://libguides.colostate.edu/ebooks>
<http://library.northeastern.edu/get-help/e-books-devices>
http://subjectguides.lib.neu.edu/content.php?pid=236943&search_terms=ebooks (help by subject)

There was concern expressed about e-reference titles and content, e.g., a costume encyclopedia that lacked pictures in the e-version.

A primary concern is helping users with downloading content to e-readers and devices.

One suggestion was to put together an infographic.

Most users prefer platforms that mimic the print reading experience, e.g., titles in the Cambridge Companions series.

In one library, they are still just offering e-books through the library catalog, where the user opens the item on a computer screen.

Ebrary and EBSCO both claim to offer download options. Overdrive is a better platform, but lacks academic content. There are problems, though. One person suggested downloading the Bluefire reader for downloadable ebrary books.

One concern with Overdrive is that users are annoyed when books “disappear” at the end of the loan period. Another issue is that downloading an Overdrive book to Kindle is not intuitive; there are several steps. It may be easier on a tablet.

The discussion then moved to selection of e-books and the value of considering content over format when making selections.

6. For libraries with a Research or Information Commons: How do you integrate reference services for digital humanities, technological and group/collaborative projects with "analog" research support?

There are a number of variations on the Research or Information Commons: Center for Digital Scholarship, which helps with digital projects; a Research Commons with a focus on data/GIS, text mining, and group work space; a Student Computer Lab where students can get some technology help (no longer in the library); additional flex space for students and “pop-up” sessions on various themes in those spaces; Information Commons approach; an “Innovative Media” lab in an upcoming, new library.

The liaisons are often the point of contact, but how should people be referred. If there is a question with Dublin Core, who fills that role in the library? The response is often “ad hoc.”

How do we ensure that two tracks don’t develop—new services and old services? How do liaisons continue to be included without being territorial? All the “hot” commodities are the digital scholarship people, data/GIS experts, scholarly communication/copyright experts, archives/special collections. Content librarians need to be in the loop.

NOTE: Discussion then turned to another topic—tracking reference/research questions.

Items mentioned: KnowledgeTracker, internal tools (developed by systems), basic tick/hash marks at the reference desk, LibAnswers from SpringShare, open source Libstats,

LibAnswers is great for gathering the statistics, but no one had experience with the knowledge base portion of the tool. The idea is for subject specialists to create questions specific to their areas and then incorporate those in their guides, in addition to having them available in the knowledge base.

There was also discussion of combined reference/technical support desks. This was done years ago at USC, but there were issues at that time. One person described the combined staffing by a reference librarian and a qualified student assistant for tech issues, which works well.

The discussion moved to documentation and training for those situations. There are always difficulties with consistency when there are multiple students to be trained. Some people had a full-time person devoted to these activities.

The cultural difference between library and IT was raised.

One training model is to gather students and ask them to define good service, then sign off on providing that level of service. In that scenario, students also set agendas and chaired their own meetings.

7. Topics for ALA annual meeting in Chicago this summer 2013

- address learning commons/combined reference desks again
- LES Statement on Primary Sources (date is 1997; what about an update?)
- weeding policy; collections policy generally (why just primary sources or weeding?)
- how to promote new/unusual types of e-resources
- how are people using/promoting Hathi Trust?
- getting faculty on board with scholarly communication issues
- [side note: MLA may be revisiting their statement on preservation.]
- promoting e-books
- altmetrics and other forms of impact factors
- history of the book issues
- what are libraries doing about discarding big runs of Books in Print, PTLA, etc.?

Final note: Please fill out the volunteer form for LES committees.

Minutes by

Aline Soules