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Questions
• What activities are undertaken by and within research libraries to advance digital scholarship and scholarly communication?
• How are they organized and presented on library websites?
• Who delivers these services?

Outline
• Scope of the field
• Trends and developments
• DS service models
• UK practices

Exploring the emergent library specialty of scholarly communications librarianship
Scoping the Field of Digital Scholarship

Product or Process?

“any element of knowledge or art that is created, produced, analyzed, distributed, published, and/or displayed in a digital medium, for the purpose of research or teaching”

(Foot in Hswe, 2006, p. 6)

“the use of digital tools, data, methods, authoring, publishing, and stewardship to support teaching, research, and learning”

(Brenner, 2014, p. 3)

“Participate in emerging academic, professional and research practices that depend on digital systems”

(Jisc, 2014)
Scholarly Communication

“the system through which research and other scholarly writings are created, evaluated for quality, disseminated to the scholarly community, and preserved for future use. The system includes both formal means of communication, such as publication in peer-reviewed journals, and informal channels, such as electronic listservs.”

(ACRL, 2003)

> Open Access (Singleton, 2011)
Scoping the Field of Digital Scholarship
Trends and Developments in the Field

- Development of support offered and expansion of service portfolios
  - moving upstream and downstream to provide full-cycle scholarly assistance and guidance for research, learning, teaching, and other creative work

- Responding and contributing to policy development and roll-out
  - research data planning and sharing, open access archiving and publishing

- Growth in specialist positions, organizational units, physical spaces
  - assistants, coordinators, directors, heads, librarians, managers, officers, centres, commons, committees, hubs, labs, offices, teams, working groups

- Intersections of scholarly communication and information literacy
  - copyright literacy, data literacy, digital literacies, primary source literacy

- National association-led initiatives to advance local SC practices
  - ARL/ACRL Institute, DS support profiles, OpenCon, RoadShows, toolkits
The five-year period 2018-2022 promises to bring radical changes to the research landscape.

Scholarly Communication
Digital Skills & Services
Research Infrastructure

Working Groups
- Architecture Forum
- Copyright & Legal Matters
- Digital Humanities & Digital Cultural Heritage
- Innovative Metrics
- Leadership Programmes
- Open Access
- Research Data Management

Research Libraries 2022
- Innovative Scholarly Communication
- Digital Skills and Services
- Research Infrastructure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digital Scholarship Areas of Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digital Scholarship Areas of Practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Altmetrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- APCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ASN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Author IDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bibliometrics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Content hosting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Copyright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CRIS/RIMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Data citation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Digital preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Digitization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DMPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DOIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ETDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Funding mandates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grant writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Institutional repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- IPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Journal publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Licensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maker spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mediated deposit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Metadata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Monograph publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multimedia production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Open access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Policy compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Publication ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- RDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Software development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Subject archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Text and data mining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visualization tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Website development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pitt ULS Service Portfolio

Digital Scholarship Services (est. 2015)
- Research data management
- Data acquisition and analysis
- Mapping and geographic information systems
- Digital curation and stewardship
- Metadata, vocabularies and linked data
- Multimedia and web-based scholarship
- Digital Scholarship Commons (workshops, projects, digitization, hardware and software)

Office of Scholarly Communication and Publishing (est. 2011)
- IPR, copyright and fair use
- Author rights and responsibilities
- Electronic theses and dissertations
- Subject-based repositories (6)
- D-Scholarship (institutional repository)
- Journal publishing service (40 titles) and hosting service (55 titles)
  - PKP major development partner
  - 750 books digitized (I/P and O/P)
- OA advocacy and author fee fund
- Scholarly impact – PlumX partner
High-level four-tier model for digital scholarship services at New York University

(Vinopal & McCormick, 2013)
Digital Scholarship Service Models

Visual summary of three-level service delivery model for digital scholarship @Pitt (applied to RDM)

Level 3 – Specialist RDM Service Providers
Explicit job responsibilities: understanding of local, national and global RDM landscape; collaborating with RDM stakeholders at Pitt and in region; expertise in one or more specific aspect(s) (e.g., DMP, metadata, data storage)

Level 2 – Advanced RDM Service Providers
Volunteer RDM team members – points of contact for disciplines: aware of relevant funder requirements; understanding of disciplinary research workflows; familiar with DMPTool, and subject data repositories and practices (e.g., file formats and naming, data storage and documentation)

Level 1 – Basic RDM Service Providers
All public-facing university library staff – first point of contact for reference questions: basic understanding of RDM, drivers, research lifecycle, and how RDM applies to cycle; familiar with ULS RDM web resources; knowledge of RDM services, staff, and who to contact.

(ULS RDM Working Group, Version 5, 2016; see also Mattern, Brenner & Lyon, 2016)
Trends and Developments in the UK

- Major focus on open access (policy compliance, APCs, and CRIS)
- Widespread provision of research data services and support, often in partnership with other professional services
- Recent growth in launch of library-managed OA university presses but not much evidence of journal hosting services
- Few formal DS centres or services and limited evidence of library engagement in digital humanities
- No evidence of library leadership or participation in university OER/open textbook programmes and projects
- Offerings and specialist roles more likely to be badged as research services, OA and RD, but also some DS/SC titles
- Several examples of good practice for librarians in other countries
Examples of Good Practice (UK)
Management of the room is based on UK Data Service concept for handling sensitive research data (‘The 5 Safes’)

http://blog.ukdataservice.ac.uk/access-to-sensitive-data-for-research-the-5-safes/
Examples of Good Practice (UK)

(Sewell & Kingsley, 2017)

(2017) Examples of Good Practice (UK)
Examples of Good Practice (UK)

Partnering with academic units, other professional services, other academic libraries and the community
Conclusions

• US services are longer established and more advanced in areas such as library publishing and digital scholarship
  – They are also more likely to use the title “scholarly communications” for their organizational units and specialist library staff
• UK libraries are concentrating resources and providing more in-depth support for open access to research (for the REF)
  – They have developed several practices that could usefully be adopted by their US peers to strengthen their support for scholars
• Management structures vary but few are wholly centralized
  – Many libraries operate a hybrid model based on functional and subject/disciplinary specialists, some use hub-and-spokes models, and a few are extremely diffuse with multiple diverse staff involved
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