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Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose

• Fiesole conferences *always* informative & useful; updates & new elements
  • Revealing changing professional practices among librarians & publishers
  • Reminding us that there is a widening spectrum of types – of libraries, librarians, publishers, & interested, if not innocent, bystanders; there is no average...or is there?
  • ~20 years on, so much has changed, but so much of that change is derivative
  • Constants: network effects; data (bigger, more varied); constantly improving ease of analysis, use, presentation; hand wringing; dis-intermediation; dependence on libraries & publishers as service providers, cultural agencies, handmaidens to researchers & teachers; marketplaces;
  • Variables: modes of interaction & access; senses of potential (BIG DATA); increasing engagement across all disciplines with digital possibilities – research & teaching – thus new demands & requirements on librarians and publishers
  • Librarians lack visible concern for overhead costs (time, money) & sustainability; most publishers vitally concerned with money (costs & profit) & efficiency (matching fundamentals to workflow efficiency) & business models (licenses, OA, APC, purchases)
• Data.bnf.fr
• Linked data in D Nb
• SHARE-Virtual Discovery Environment
• Text & Data Analysis
• AI & Machine Learning – Yewno
• New forms of peer reviews publications from university presses
Missing elements

• Return on investments
  • For profit publishers constantly calculating
  • For university presses (not for profit, but formal) concern for sustainability (dependence on subsidies & in some cases endowment earnings)
  • For OA operations – is there a sense of total investment & ROI?
  • ROI could be financial, could be reputational, could be “contributions to commonwealth of knowledge”
    • First books; “important books with limited audiences”; supported projects (long term, multi-vols)
  • Where bibliometrics -- New Benchmarks and Methods of Assessment for the 21st Century Research Library, project underway

• Digital Humanities & Computational Social Sciences – development, support, publication; consideration of the different contexts for humanities & social sciences vs those of STEM disciplines

• GIS + other geospatial collections & services supporting nearly all disciplines
Methods

• Top down or bottom up at various levels – national & organizational
  • BUT why not both?

• Network effects – note findings of Flecker & Dempsey analysis of collection overlap among 1st five Google Book Project libraries – finding 51% unique holdings across logical collection (NB lack of bureaucratic overhead); multi-nodal, informal results

• Collection development in larger research libraries – beyond formal publications: government & NGO documents; media objects; tech reports, grey literature & ephemera; Websites (why not undertaken by libraries of other categories)

• Usual services, but what of teaching/modeling “information heuristic”, a lifelong skill for students becoming citizens & career professionals

• Data deluges, data refuges, discerning trends, thematic &/or conceptual analysis (LitLab example)

• Pointilistic studies (e.g. Treharne analysis of Salisbury copy of Magna Carta) still and always essential & meaningful

• Preservation – LOCKSS model for copies & preservation applications – avoiding single points of failure (so worries about Internet Archive as single point of failure)
Analytics

• Circulation statistics could lead to epidemiological results – damage or correct focus? Single language foci or research resources in numerous languages from numerous sources in support of local research programs (e.g. area studies, topical studies)

• On average in 5-10 years, all titles acquired or licenses, circulated internally or externally are circulated

• After 10 years of operations, Stanford Digital Repository (digital library & archive platform based on Fedora, Hydra) supporting 33% of Stanford professors

• Helpful taxonomy of interested/committed parties in scholarly communication

• Ethnographic approach gaining insight on initial career step for new PhDs

• Stanford holds ~1.3M e-books; 2.2M ”uses” annually; unknown for 65K e-journals

• In 2015 Stanford authors published 13,000 articles. If APCs average $1650 per article, required investment to instantiate OA would be $21,450,000, nearly all of our consolidated library materials allocation
So...what next?

• Retail services + mass offerings continue
• Innovations in support of DH & CSS via focused support, experienced & communicative specialists, community developments (IIIF & Mirador & similar)
• Image recognition and analytics
• Continuing work on ROI algorithmic analysis as a distributable model but will librarians & their masters concerns themselves with ROI empirically derived?
• Overwrought overhead in collaborative approaches among libraries by category & national associations; define projects & methods to 95% level, over determination, little flexibility, *en masse* projects with little or no assessments of ROI
• Too little focus on “just do it” & risk taking