

10<sup>th</sup> Fiesole Collection Development  
Retreat Wrap Up  
“Scholarly Communication on the  
Network: Collecting and  
Collaborating Where our Users Live.”

Tony Ferguson

University of Hong Kong Libraries

29 March 2008

# Goal of My Presentation

We are all used to having people ask us when we return from a conference: “Well, how was it? Was it worth it? Did you learn anything useful to us?”

**My goal is to assess the value of the conference in 3 ways:**

Compared to a list of “critical failures” of digital libraries, how has our Retreat helped us prepare to go back into the battle?

Compared to the stated goals for the Retreat, how did we do?

Did I personally come away with any good ideas to copy?

Method No. 1

**COMPARED TO A LIST OF “CRITICAL  
FAILURES” OF DIGITAL LIBRARIES, HOW  
HAS OUR RETREAT HELPED US PREPARE  
TO GO BACK INTO THE BATTLE?**

Peter Brantley, Executive Dir. of DLF recently  
listed “Critical Failures” of Libraries (Educause  
Review, March/April 2008)

“not done a good job of redefining  
ourselves in the world today” [we don’t know what  
we are doing, we are lost]

“not provided truly active support for learning”

“not engaged . . . in public debates around important  
public issues . . . for libraries”

“not actively innovated”

“we often underperform” – don’t understand needs;  
don’t collaborate with other IT forces; don’t  
cooperate with each other; and we don’t take  
responsibility for doing better.

\*\*While this list deals with LIBRARIES, for this

# So, how have we done?

Area	Addressed?
Define ourselves – defining/debating important issues	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Thomas on <b>experiences with IT</b> and libraries in a <b>legacy print library</b></li><li>2. Beckett on our need to forget our book storage legacy and to provide seamless access to <b>digital “stuff”</b></li><li>3. Bilder on the key issue of our time: providing <b>“trustworthy” information</b> from the glut of information on the web</li><li>4. Adding value to what is written has to be our goal. Pabbruwe.</li><li>5. Mabe, Rabow, Lowry, Gargiulo and Torhell on <b>Open Access</b> and whether it can enable us to provide our readers with access to research findings</li></ol>

# How have we done?

Area	Addressed?
Produce innovations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Healy on using web 2.0 to build <b>collaborative communities</b>.</li><li>•Pabbruwe on how <b>pattern recognition</b> software could be used in art, music, etc.</li></ul>
Information about needs assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Keller on the importance of understanding researcher needs, what is being published, and of using very knowledgeable book dealers like Casalini to find and supply the right materials</li><li>•Nicholas suggests that ebooks fit users' needs but we know too little about how they use them and organize them accordingly – two studies done/being done to figure this out: <b>Superbook and JISC National E-Book Observatory studies</b>.</li></ul> <p>People want information fast, checks are</p>

# How have we done?

re	Addressed?
ation about collaboration with ITC forces and each other	Niggemann on European efforts to <b>digitize 6 million</b> items by 2010
ation about taking responsibility for these important	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>•Mouw on the <b>critical</b> nature of <b>digital preservation</b></li><li>•Pabbruwe noted this was a place for library and publisher cooperation</li><li>•Jenkins on the <b>UK Research Reserve</b></li></ul>
led information about how to be active learning	Hughes on <b>use of Facebook to help readers</b> figure out how to use their

ethod No. 2

**OMPARED TO THE STATED GOALS FOR  
HE RETREAT, HOW DID WE DO?**



# What were the stated goals?

Today's networked digital technology offers us new ways of extending and enhancing the scholarly communications process. Together we'll look at the following and rethink what we have been doing:

- New distribution channels

- New supply chain principles

- New economic models

# New distribution channels

Thomas on **how our traditional library ways** of deciding who gets access and how they get access to information (ways enabled by vendors and publishers) can **get in the way** of dealing with today's students who expect information to appear once the topic is typed into the box.

Healy on how **like minded people are forgetting libraries** and developing communities where they can ask questions and get the information they need/want.

Niggemann on Europe's response to Google's distribution of gazillion books direct to the homes of our library patrons.

Mouw's sense that **readers are walking away from printed** books.

O'Connor's sense that readers still want print but digital will do in a pinch.

Hughes on **making it easy** to get to the UC system's 98 million items.

Pabbruwe noted that publishers early on understood that **automation would generate profits** just took a while to figure out how to do it and for

# New supply chain principles

Carden's critique of how print and digital supply chain's compare and that the **system is not broken** and doesn't need to be discarded.

McGinty's view that **disintermediation is needed** to allow publishers to get into closer contact with authors and readers and meet needs in a better fashion.

Beckett's view that **libraries** have lost their reason for being and **need to get on to providing seamless access to digital stuff.**

Keller on the **need for smart vendors like Casalini**

# New economic models

Bilder's critique of the need for us to prove that **our digital stuff is more trustworthy** than the other people's stuff or our economic model will collapse

Mabe's critique of OA: **Sure you can dump the commercial/societal journal publishing model if you are an idiot:** to make it work it will cost our institutions more (gold). The delayed access and self archiving models depend upon researchers to do new things – no evidence they are or will change their habits.

Rabow and Gargiulo talked about how **Europe is still doing OA.**

Lowry talked about how **OA is working for his journal.**

Pabbruwe noted that **we are in a period of experimentation** – too early to know what will shake out in the end (which end will keep moving forward). On OA: When it isn't fun/profitable: **publishers will figure out where the next "sweet spot" is located.** When someone else can do it better, copy them. Content is still king.

Method No. 3

**DID I PERSONALLY COME AWAY WITH  
ANY GOOD IDEAS TO COPY?**

6 IR's should at least consider consolidating with each other and asking for UGC support to make this possible.

Should reconsider putting citation information in the abstract even when we lack the full text.

Should put more effort in recruiting more grey literature from our campus community for our IR.

Should brainstorm on how to build

the level of legitimacy/esteem which our library

is able to take advantage of the desire for

high quality information.

Should explore creating a closed facebook to make

users aware of our resources/ how to use our resources.

CUHK's 8 universities should consider building a Chinese

open access information portal for local benefit.