

# JISC TILE Project

## Towards Implementation of Library 2.0 & the E-Framework [TILE]

### TILE 02: Recommendations

Proposals arising from the range of TILE Library 2.0 survey, domain and service modelling activity

**David Kay, Ken Chad & Mark van Harmelen for the TILE team**

**22 December 2008**



## TILE Recommendations

The recommendations from across the TILE project (Domain model, Library 2.0 survey, Architectural Proposals) are organized here under the three aspects of the TILE Library Domain Model – ‘Corporation’, ‘Channel’ and ‘Client’ – with a supplementary ‘Underpinning’ category.

The 20 recommendations cover a wide range of activity (from systems to professional development) and timeframes, which are summarized in the following table.

Realm	Recommendation	Timeframe	Area
Corporation	A1 – Business Options	2009	<i>Context Service</i>
Corporation	A2 – Data Analysis	2009	<i>Context Service</i>
Corporation	A3 – Activity Data	Medium Term	<i>Library 2.0</i>
Corporation	A4 – Leading by Example	2009	<i>Exposing data</i>
Corporation	A5 – Leveraging Systems	2009	<i>Core systems</i>
Corporation	A6 – Shaping Collections	Medium Term	<i>Professional</i>
Corporation	A7 – Redefining Roles	Medium Term	<i>Professional</i>
Channel	B1 – Context Search Demonstrator	2009	<i>Context Service</i>
Channel	B2 – Context Service Development	2010	<i>Context Service</i>
Channel	B3 – Encourage ‘Concentration’	2009	<i>Resource Discovery</i>
Channel	B4 – Trusted Channels	2010	<i>Resource Discovery</i>
Channel	B5 – Webscale Service Models	2009	<i>Resource Discovery</i>
Client	C1 – Demand Side Research	2009	<i>Context Service</i>
Client	C2 – Library 2.0 Evaluation	2009	<i>Library 2.0</i>
Client	C3 – Web 2.0 & Search	Medium Term	<i>Resource Discovery</i>
Client	C4 – Reuse of Services	Medium Term	<i>Library 2.0</i>
Underpinning	D1 – Leadership		<i>Professional</i>
Underpinning	D2 – Sharing Library 2.0 Practice	2009	<i>Library 2.0</i>
Underpinning	D3 – Inspiring Developers	2009	<i>Library 2.0</i>
Underpinning	D4 – Models & Boundaries	2009	<i>Professional</i>

The recommendations are detailed by ‘Realm’ in the following sections.

**Note** - Recommendations potentially linked to the further development of the TILE ‘Context Service’ are grey shaded.

## **A. Corporation**

### **Definition of a Corporation**

*An organisation involved in the 'back office' administration of knowledge assets (e.g. originals, copies, licenses, metadata) and / or specific groups of clients (e.g. student records). Corporations within the library domain include all Universities, some JISC Services, National Libraries and publishers.*

### **People told us**

*'In many cases, library services are really only a source, not a target for users'.*

*'The university knows more about 'context' than anyone else.'*

*'Analysis of aggregated user behaviour should deliver many opportunities.'*

### **Recommendations in the Corporation realm**

**A1 - Business Options:** Review the business options for the development of context / activity based services as specified by TILE, one of which might be an 'Open Data' approach to open up ('liberate', 'expose') context data so both community and commercial providers might develop services.

**A2 - Data Analysis:** Obtain and merge library, learning & student registry context / activity data sets from a sample of HEIs, and undertake analytic computational 'desk' work to see if the aggregation and search approaches work in practice, as a precursor to building systems to trial the ideas.

**A3 – Activity Data:** Encourage HEIs, JISC services and projects, when purchasing transaction systems (e.g. LMS, ERM, Repository, VLE), to mandate the collection of activity data (e.g. downloads, views, searches) in procurements. Similarly this should be part of any JISC Resource Discovery project. Furthermore support the community in establishing a common data format and in negotiating such facilities with vendors.

**A4 – Leading by example:** JISC services such as Copac, Intute and SUNCAT need to be part of the 'mashed up' web services environment, exposing metadata and ideally providing a developer environment or sandbox. This direction might be encouraged through current Mimas & Edina projects.

**A5 – Leveraging Systems:** Work with vendors and libraries to share experience, practice and knowledge about making better use of existing systems platforms (notably LMS, ERM, VLE products) as sources for Web 2.0 / Library 2.0 services, most importantly exposing data.

**A6 – Shaping Collections:** Work with SCONUL to build a better understanding of how libraries should define, construct and expose the 'right collection' (physical and digital,

internal and external) for their clients in the context of new Channels and changing Client behaviour.

**A7 – Redefining Roles:** Work with professional bodies such as ALT, SCONUL and UCISA to help institutions address the changing boundaries between the roles of librarians, learning technologists, student records and IT staff and how they might work together to shape and deliver Web 2.0 / Library 2.0 services.

## **B. Channels**

### **Definition of a Channel**

*A means of delivering knowledge assets to Clients, not necessarily restricted to the holdings or the client base of any particular Corporation. Channels in this model include local OPACs, JISC services and ‘webscale’ services such as Amazon & Google Scholar.*

### **People told us**

*‘Back in the days of e-lib programme libraries were leading, now they are playing catch up [in a wider field and a rapidly changing environment]’.*

*‘Users are going to Google et al, so we need put library services into the places where users actually are’.*

*‘It seems the main factor is the network effects generated by the major data hubs ... their value derives from successfully driving those network effects through wide participation, from consolidation of data and from mobilizing usage data to improve their services’.*

### **Recommendations for Channel functions**

**B1 – Context search demonstrator:** Experiment with the Lucene / Solr search technologies, to see if such engines will adequately and economically support the TILE approach to searching aggregated context / activity data sets. This research will not require the development of a user interface.

**B2 – Context service development:** Weigh up the options for medium term investment and strategic partnerships in a national ‘context and contribution service’, subject to the TILE approach or an alternative proving feasible and desirable. Should preliminary activity (see A1, A2, B1, C1) point in this direction, a 2010 start might be envisaged.

**B3 – Encourage ‘Concentration’:** The TILE Library 2.0 survey identified significant use of Web 2.0 approaches for ‘diffusion’ (respondents had mostly deployed blogs, wikis, podcasts & RSS); however there was a lack of ‘concentration’ (providing or contributing to webscale services that maximise network effect). JISC and its partners can help by developing awareness of the possibilities and by backing services and projects that take on this challenge, through such as aggregation, shared services or developments at the library / learning interface.

**B4 – Trusted Channels:** Work with the community to develop understanding of the criteria and considerations (business, service and quality) that will assist in selecting external Channels (both HE and commercial, ranging from JISC Services to global ventures) that might serve HE resource discovery and delivery.

**B5 – Webscale Service Models:** Work with the Resource Discovery Task Force to review the architectures and process models, such as OCLC WorldCat, which may represent benchmarks for ‘webscale’ and financially efficient approaches to resource discovery for the UK FHE community.

## **C. Clients**

### **Definition of a Client**

*An individual (student, researcher, librarian, business or community partner, etc) accessing the information environment (not just libraries, VLEs and repositories but also the wider web world) in the context of an academically or learning motivated workflows.*

### **People told us**

*‘Learners are using tools they already have rather than the institutional tools they’ve been given’.*

*‘Library services enable users to find, locate and access in context of another role/task/activity that the user is performing’*

### **Recommendations in the User realm**

**C1 - Demand side research:** Conduct research to ascertain whether library and other target service (e.g. VLE) users would be inclined to use the facilities proposed by TILE. This requires development of Use Cases and consideration of the ‘direction of travel’ for different client groups. This research should help more broadly in identifying scenarios that will motivate contribution of User Generated Content (using such as reviews, ratings, tags).

**C2 – Library 2.0 Evaluation:** The TILE survey indicated that work needs to be done both locally and across the sector on evaluating whether current Web 2.0 / Library 2.0 services are meeting their objectives and to incorporate such developments within core service review processes.

**C3 - Web 2.0 & Search:** Web 2.0 raises the bar for user expectations of and behaviours towards search and ‘discovery to delivery’ (D2D) processes – in terms of inputs (search terms, system intelligence), outputs (delivery) and ease of use (interface, workflows). JISC services and projects developing user interfaces and workflows should explicitly be tasked to address these usability challenges.

**C4 – Re-use of Services:** Librarians need to be enabled to re-use services at ‘the point of need’; this involves embedding library services in the librarian’s / users’ own space(s) or in  
TILE Recommendations

other services and implies liberation of library data as a resource (e.g. through Open Data services) to be re-used in ways not predetermined by the library or the system vendor.

## **D. Underpinning**

*Supporting people and bringing them together to develop shared ideas and journeys is the major underpinning requirement emerging from the TILE Library 2.0 survey and from interviews with the Expert Reference Group.*

### **People told us**

*'The level of IT competence among academic staff and students varies across the institution, which presents an issue for the development of Web 2.0 applications'.*

*'A service framework is a tool for documenting a shared view of library services in changing environments ... It is a means of focusing attention and organizing discussion ... It does not supply the answers, but facilitates the process by which answers are sought, found, and applied.'* [Dempsey, Henry, Lavoie – 2006]

### **Recommendations**

**D1 – Leadership:** There is a demand for sector-wide leadership in thinking through the challenges (particularly those precipitated by Web 2.0) to how libraries have traditionally been conceived, in evaluating and sharing practical exemplars, in developing webscale initiatives and in the reshaping of the profession. This will require partnership working, involving the British Library, JISC, RIN, RLUK and SCOUNL.

**D2 – Sharing Library 2.0 Practice:** The TILE survey evidenced experimentation with Library 2.0 to be piecemeal and largely driven by enthusiasts, albeit across a large number of HEIs. This does however represent a substantial body of expertise and practice (see the 50+ implementation examples detailed by 30 HE libraries in the survey) that should be built upon through a targeted professional programme. Working with SCOUNL, this might include (a) knowledge transfer events, (b) case studies and (c) action research commissions, perhaps supported by micro-funding (e.g. £5-10k).

**D3 – Inspiring Developers:** JISC should continue to look to 'Pro-Ams' and other open competition formats to demonstrate development possibilities in a public and time bounded manner, as exemplified by Elsevier's recent approach to opening up journal article data. This might involve input from experts in such as CETIS, Open Source Watch and UKOLN as well as awards for the 'winners'.

**D4 – Models & Boundaries:** JISC should continue to develop the articulation of the wider information environment, embracing all the knowledge and information resources required in academic pursuits (library, teaching & learning, e-research) in a Web 2.0 context. Whilst technical work in the international e-Framework may contribute to this process, developing shared language amongst managers and practitioners is the key driver (as illustrated by the long term impact of the e-Lib MODELS project). The TILE Domain Model may provide the springboard for management and practitioner workshops in this area.

## **Footnote on Context & Contribution**

The recommendations relating to ‘creating context’ and ‘enabling’ contribution (notably A1-3, B1-2 and C1) were reviewed at the final TILE workshop (‘Sitting on a goldmine’, London, 12 December 2008), where delegates broadly agreed that

1. The time for testing these possibilities is ‘now’.
2. Working systems built with open technologies on available context data offer the best means of testing the market
3. It would be desirable for a mix of trials to be supported, which might range from national data services to individual HEIs
4. The outcomes of such trials should be triangulated with both professional opinion (e.g. validity of search results from subject librarian perspective) and technical research in to the service considerations