October 2016

I Hear the Train A Comin'-Too Much is Not Enough!

Greg Tanenbaum

ScholarNext Consulting, greg@scholarnext.com

sourcing and self-taught students are "lost boys." Tradition is as it should be — marked by adaptability and flexibility. Ranganathan's fifth law of library science still applies: "to provide the right information to the right user at the *right time.*" Audience members were invited to vote online, both at the beginning and end of the debate, and, it turned out, changed their votes from "no" (48% to 33%) to "yes" (52% to 67%) in the end — the traditional research library is dead.

Rump Session – Charleston Conference Resolutions

Compiled from notes taken by **JoAnne Sparks** (Macquarie University) <joanne.sparks@mq.edu.au>

As the last conference session, in recent years, the **Rump Session** has given those "last standing" (still in Charleston) an opportunity to share views about the conference just concluded and provide input on ideas for future conferences. This year, the discussion was moderated by **Katina Strauch** (College of Charleston and Charleston Conference founder) and **Tom Gilson** (College of Charleston, emeritus).

Participants liked the 2012 Web conference schedule, but still want the print program book. **Plenary Sessions** struck a chord: an entertaining lawyer can make a "boring topic" energizing, and it would have been interesting to hear from a provost who may not have been sympathetic to libraries. Traditional values are still relevant and some first-time conference attendees' eyes were opened. Resolutions and lessons learned? Librarians need to be trained to make a case, to recover the buyer role and learn political skills, to be more assertive and less passive, to share information from the conference. Suggested future conference topics included: the implications of SCOAP3, the global issues involved in copyright, and earmarks of a successful institutional repository. Also, some suggested, perhaps the conference should have a New Orleans style funeral for MARC, since it's been declared dead. Some rump session attendees were intrigued by the quote "the train wreck has pulled into the station."

*Well this completes the reports we received from the **2012 Charleston Conference**. Again we'd like to send a big thank you to all of the attendees who agreed to write short reports that highlight sessions they attended. 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***

I Hear the Train A Comin' — "Too Much is Not Enough!"

Column Editor: **Greg Tananbaum** (ScholarNext Consulting) <greg@scholarnext.com> *www.scholarnext.com*

The theme of this year's **33rd Annual Charleston Conference** is "Too Much Is Not Enough!" Normally, the conference theme provides easy fodder for me to generate my November column. I grab a few choice lines from the song and repurpose them to fit specific emerging trends in academic publishing. The artful lyrics of a **Cole Porter** or **George Gershwin** tune carry universal meanings that extend, with only minimal strain, to the world of scholarly communication. This year, however, presents a substantially greater challenge. A primary hurdle is that I am completely unfamiliar with the song "Too Much Is Not Enough" — who sings it, when it is from, and the lyrics are all a complete blank. A quick Web search reveals two possibilities — a 1986 collaboration between the **Bellamy Brothers** and the **Forester Sisters**, and the eighth track on the 1990 **Deep Purple album, Slaves and Masters**. The former, unfortunately, makes the artistic choice to repeat its chorus six times over its three-plus minute running time. I say "unfortunately" because the chorus burrows into the listener's brain as follows:

Too much is not enough
Too much is not enough
Too much is not enough
Of your love, love, love
Too much is not enough
Too much is not enough
Too much is not enough
Of your love, love, love.

…so that holds little promise as column fodder. However, the **Bellamy Brothers** are like **Leonard Cohen** compared to the sledge-hammer subtlety of **Deep Purple's** songwriting. Presumably, *Against the Grain* is a family publication, which makes quoting from these lyrics a challenge. Suffice it to say, the lead singer appears to have amorous intentions of an insatiable (and explicit) nature, hence the title, "Too Much is Not Enough!" It would not be possible for me to apply enough Purell to cleanly extract a column from the **Deep Purple** lyrics.

This is an extremely long-winded way of explaining that I am modifying the "pull a lyric" gimmick for this year's Charleston column. While it would no doubt be an invigorating mental challenge to apply a line like, "Love is the crime, you stand convicted / You keep on coming back for more" to scholarly communication, I am lowering the degree of difficulty. Instead, let's look at four issues in our industry that have generated significant attention in recent months, and that figure to continue to burn brightly in the days to come. These are topics for which too much discussion and attention is truly not enough.

Open Data

The idea that the raw building blocks of science — the data — should be made available for free reuse has gained traction on a number of fronts. Much of the attention pertaining to the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy's memorandum on "Increasing Access to the Results of Federally Funded Research" focused on the expectation that federal research agencies with R&D budgets of $100 million would develop public access for the literature their funding supports. However, the directive also encompasses research data.

It decrees that "digitally formatted scientific data resulting from unclassified research supported wholly or in part by federal funding should be stored and publicly accessible to search, retrieve, and analyze." This is but one prominent development in the realm of open data. The European Commission held a public consultation on open access to research data in July inviting statements from researchers, industry, funders, publishers, and libraries. The result of this consultation may well be policy and financial support for open data as a component of "Horizon 2020," the EU's new program for research and innovation. From a practical standpoint, Dryad has emerged as a viable general-purpose repository to house the data underlying scientific publications. Dryad has integrated data submission for more than 30 journals, making it easy for scholarly authors to share their data with the world in an open manner.

OSTP, Horizon 2020, and Dyrad, are representative of a growing support for open data. Proponents believe that sharing data openly facilitates increased discoverability and reusability, reduces the gaps in the research cycle, and lessens the likelihood that multiple laboratories will be pursuing duplicative research in siloed environments. With the delivery of federal agencies' plans to implement the OSTP directive and the 2014 rollout of Horizon 2020, open data looks to remain in the spotlight.

Article-Level Metrics

Article-Level Metrics (ALMs) are rapidly emerging as important tools to quantify how individual articles are being discussed,

shared, and used. ALMs can be employed in conjunction with existing metrics, which have traditionally focused on the long-term impact of a collection of articles (i.e., a journal) based on the number of citations generated. ALMs offer a new and effective way to disaggregate an individual article's impact from the publication in which it appears. They aggregate a variety of data points that collectively quantify not only the impact of an article, but also the extent to which it has been socialized and its immediacy.

The emergence of multiple business and technology solutions in the ALM space is indicative of the potentially transformative importance of these metrics. ImpactStory, Altmetric, and Plum Analytics are three buzzy organizations garnering attention. Further validating the ALM space is the interest a disparate body of publishers and content providers are demonstrating. From **Elsevier** to **HighWire** to **PLOS** to Nature, organizations are implementing ALMSs as a means to articulate both an article's scholarly visibility and its social visibility. Should these metrics grow more widely used and become easier for research funders, tenure and promotion committees, and others to understand (a charter **NISO** has recently begun to investigate), ALMs could become as ubiquitous as the impact factor.

Metadata

Yep, metadata. Not super-flashy, but super-necessary. Metadata has been facilitating discovery ever since scholarly content hit the internet. Several recent developments have underscored how carefully developed metadata has the potential to make it easier than ever to connect interested parties to the information they need to do their jobs more effectively. One such example is FundRef, a collaborative effort among research funders, publishers, and **CrossRef** to transmit funding source information within published scholarly research. The FundRef registry provides a taxonomy of 4,000 standardized funder names to manuscript tracking system vendors for incorporation into their publication submission processes. Publishers then have submitting authors select correct funders and provide grant numbers. This information then becomes a discoverable metadata element when articles are published. In this manner, FundRef makes it easier to correlate R&D investment with research results.

Another example of new metadata elements facilitating discovery is ORCID. ORCID is a unique, persistent digital identifier that facilitates author disambiguation. Think about querying **Microsoft** Academic Search or WorldCat for publications authored by "**John Smith**" and the difficulties associated with finding the specific **John Smith** in question. ORCID addresses that problem by assigning a unique ID to each registered author — like

a Social Security number, it's yours and yours alone. As authors submit manuscripts going forward, an increasing number of publishers are encouraging them to provide their ORCID number. This propagates through to the published article and makes it easier for search engines, APIs, and other third parties to capture and display disambiguated author publication lists with confidence.

FundRef and ORCID are by no means the only metadata developments that bear watching. I have the good fortune to be co-chairing a **NISO** committee looking to develop open access metadata indicators. Our expectation is that by early 2014 **NISO** will have a recommendation in place for rendering an article's access control and licensing restrictions (or lack thereof) a portable metadata element. This will make it much easier for discovery engines and other third parties to show end users what can be freely read and reused.

Other initiatives ranging from KBART to ISNI to LRMI are also looking at ways to make metadata more valuable. While this, of course, begs the long-term question of how much descriptive information an object can carry and still be functionally portable, for now metadata is having a well-deserved moment in the sun.

Gold Open Access

When Research Councils UK (RCUK) unveiled plans earlier this year to fund £30 million ($57 million) over two years in open access

Little Red Herrings — Is Literacy Still Possible at Our Hyper-connected World?

by **Mark Y. Herring** (Dean of Library Services, Dacus Library, Winthrop University) <herringm@winthrop.edu>

article processing charges (APCs), it marked a major development for so-called "gold" open access. For the first time, a governing body wasn't pushing simply for public access to some version of an article after an embargo; rather, they were exhibiting a preference for "immediate Open Access with the maximum opportunity for re-use." Further, they were putting teeth behind this preference in the form of high-value block grants to institutions to pay for APCs.

Whatever one's feelings regarding open access publishing, the willingness of a major governmental funding body to commit this amount of money is sure to further legitimize the gold open access business model. It should also provide fierce competition as large subscription-based publishers expand their hybrid options in an attempt to capture RCUK money. How British institutions respond to the influx of funds and opportunities could have wide-ranging consequences within the gold OA publishing world. Subscription publishers can potentially offer steep APC discounts that exert tremendous pressure to lower APCs among all publishers. These publishers can, for the time being, afford to operate their OA programs at a loss, cushioned by the revenue stream provided by their subscriptions. This, in turn, could have the effect of pushing out OA publishers that rely solely on APCs. It is therefore quite possible that the RCUK policy, designed to give gold open access a leg up, could end up severely hampering it.

As always with the **Charleston Conference**, there are any number of treats for which Too Much Is Not Enough — the Lowcountry cuisine (particularly shrimp and grits, pimento cheese spread, and pralines), the Georgian architecture, the site of **Anthony Watkinson's** magnificent beard, and the stimulating conversations to be found in the sessions and out in the hallways. I look forward to seeing you there.

Earlier this summer, **Farhad Manjoo,** a *Slate* writer, published a piece about how people do not read well online ("You Won't Finish This Article," *Slate*, 6 June 2013). **Manjoo** opened his piece in hilarious fashion: "I'm going to make this brief, because you're not going to stick around very long." He then launched into a discussion about how little of any online article people actually read. According to his sources (mainly Chartbeat, which studies these things), 38% of all readers "bounced" almost as soon as they landed on the page. The longer the article, the more people leave. By the time readers have to scroll down to read the rest of the first screen, almost half have moved on, many of them to hit the comments page knowing almost nothing of the content of the article they are about to weigh in on. In fact, according to those who study such things, many people who write comments haven't read even a third of what they're commenting on!

This is hardly news to anyone who's written for any length of time, especially online. Commenters often have an ax to grind (as do some reviewers) and nothing, certainly not the truth, will stand in their way. The problem with people not scrolling, or, heaven forbid, clicking through to the next page, is that they get almost nothing from the article (in **Manjoo's** word, "Bupkis"). If there is any good news in **Manjoo's** article, it is

bittersweet: almost all "readers" will look at the pictures or watch an embedded video.

Is this something we should be concerned about? Perhaps it's just too early to tell, but if this trend continues in which online readers read only about 50-60% of the text, what will that do to our collective literacy? Moreover, what will it do to our overall 'informed citizenry' that our type of democracy depends so heavily on? Will we be reduced to dumbing everything down to a picture or a one-minute video? Excuse my mordancy, but are we sacrificing our literacy for the sake of convenience and oh-so-cool devices?

Manjoo isn't the only one to raise this issue, of course. Others have complained about it, beginning with the *Gutenberg Elegies* (**Birkerts**), through *Dumbest Generation* (**Bauerlein**), to *The Shallows* (**Carr**), (and of course to that poster and book someone did a few years back). Most recently, **Morozov** took the Web to task with his excellent *To Save Everything, Click Here: The Folly of Internet Solutionism*.

I know it's a bit out of favor to criticize the Web and all its glory, but it really isn't the world's knowledge so much as it's the world's chatterbox. That's at least two steps from knowledge and one from information. While it does make billions of dollars for various interested parties, it may not be helping us as much as we think. It may even be hurting us more than we know, and certainly more than we're willing to admit.

The Web hasn't been an unqualified boon to libraries either, so much as it has been an inadvertent competitor that routinely causes some people to question both the existence and continued need for them. When you look at rising generations who are spending most of their intellectual lives online, you do begin to wonder if this thing called the Web will replace libraries, not because it's better, but because libraries cost too much to persist. Moreover, they demand a rather expensive bit of intellectual capital to expend. Let's hope we're all not digging our own graves here.

No, I'm not trying to put the toothpaste back into the tube. I am, however, hoping others will at least see that toothpaste is out of the tube and a good bit of it has missed the toothbrush. Our future is as messy as it is murky, but it is a future that we can control if we're willing to do so.

Preserving literacy might well be a good as any place to begin.