I thought that what I was going to say was reasonably radical before the symposium, but I heard from and talked to a number of people at the conference who were of a similar mind. Some were already trying things similar to some of the suggestions I am making in this short presentation. I was very impressed with my colleagues from the OA presses of ANU, Adelaide, Sydney and Monash Universities. The downloads they are getting from their monograph presses are very impressive. I was also really impressed and truly inspired by what ANU's Crawford School of Public Policy were doing to combine links from short form journalism to deeper research. You can find out more about UTS ePress here: http://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/
The traditional model for academic publishing is both broken and unsustainable

This is pretty self-explanatory. Parker Higgins works for EFF. If you like this you might also like these articles (the first of which is particularly poignant regarding this broken system of publishing):

* Lip-Syncing to the Academic Conversation  
(Although it is an unsustainable model, I agree with the author above that it is actually perpetuated by institutions and individuals who are more concerned with their own reputation that the furthering of knowledge.)

* Academic Journals: The Most Profitable Obsolete Technology in History  
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jason-schmitt/academic-journals-the-mos_1_b_6368204.html
But are we at risk of becoming in a world?

Examples abound around us. We continue to do what we’ve usually done … ignore them.

This is an extreme analogy, but we are at risk of ignoring the ways new(ish) technologies now facilitate the transmission, availability and sharing of knowledge and culture. The means have changed yet we still seem to be obsessed with text and print-based formats. I don’t think we should be. We should be exploring different ways to share scholarly research. Examples can be found everywhere on the internet and in digital media, even in games and new spaces like makerspaces. I think ignoring them is like pretending they do not exist or that they do not matter. If we do this for much longer we will not matter.
Publishing is different now. Maybe think less about “containers” & more about facilitating interaction and debate.

We are still obsessed by “containers”; we are applying out-dated concepts to a new world where those concepts and their rules are much less relevant and perhaps not even appropriate. In doing this we ignore the potential offered to us by new technologies, faster global access, a diversity of voices and opinions and perspectives that could be offered (in different ways) and we risk limiting debate to those of us who are lucky enough to be members of relatively exclusive institutions who have access to this knowledge. It could become a circular argument amongst the privileged few … or even an echo chamber.
Last year, like millions of others, I subscribed to the Serial podcast via NPR (US). Podcasting isn’t new technology, but what Serial did was breathe some new life into it with a bit of imagination and maybe it was at a time when people wanted just the one thing to concentrate on (with their ears and not their eyes)? So it was hugely successful. It was essentially a serialised story of one journalist’s investigation and there were many other factors that contributed to its success (a strong emotional pull, serialisation, voice, real protagonists, popular culture, cultural diversity in our society, etc.), but I think there is something for us to learn in all of this. Perhaps what we do is still too “two-dimensional” and maybe we could be a lot more imaginative and experimental in how we serve it up. We are still tackling scholarly publishing like print publishing yet we are well into the digital age and could be re-examining the potential of outlets like the simple podcast. Maybe we can look at publishing unfinished work (as a lot of academics have in creative writing online); much shorter publications; freemium models (like Radiohead do with their music); and the publication of non-text content, like audio, video, images and games. As I heard a colleague from another university tell me recently: “That would be new business for us. We could not do [try] it because we’ve never done it before.” Of course not.
The wonderful Brooklyn Museum keep trying new stuff, analysing it and then moving on. They don’t get bogged down. Now they’ve released a bunch of their collection images and data (I assume all public domain works) so that others can use them and re-use them and mash them up with other images and data in ways that those within the Museum may not have imagined. I think it is brilliant.

If we want to we could also do the same with our OA presses so others could help us to disseminate or index them or maybe even do other things with them that we cannot even dream about right now. Hell, our content could be used by aggregators like the Huffington Post or Zite or even Flipboard. Wouldn’t that be crazy good!
marketing, spoon-feeding & pushing (not pulling)

... vice thinking “if we build it they will come”

We offer a “for further reading” widget to the conversation.com/au (again). If they fail to respond (again), we offer to www.theguardian.com/au or www.abc.net.au/ or ...

Maybe in addition to making our content easily discoverable on the web and offering APIs and hoping that others will find them attractive or useful, we need to try and be more proactive. Previously I’ve talked to folks from The Conversation about a widget that UTS Library (ePress) can offer them which would allow for links to deeper research readings from any of their articles to OA content from any Australian research repository or OA university press. UTS Library IT people will arrange for some OAI harvesting to be done from anyone who wants to participate and we will host that database of metadata that the widget would search before sending the interested parties back to the original OA research source. So far they’ve been too busy, too distracted or too disinterested to even try this. So we will try again and if they’re not interested, we will approach someone else like the Guardian Online or the ABC. Someone is bound to see the potential of this. Eventually.
A few weeks back (in really 2015) I went to this fantastic performance of Vivaldi’s *The Four Seasons* by the Australian Chamber Orchestra. They do things differently and continue to provide us with a contemporary “window” into what might otherwise be a stuffy old world of chamber music. In this concert they mixed up the four parts of the original work with some contemporary music performed by the Tawadros Brothers (who also joined in on some of the Vivaldi). It really worked. So, maybe we could try the same thing by mixing in some humanities and some engineering in a multi-disciplinary journal, or by combining research publications along those lines. We can also try to make our work more accessible to lay audiences by eliminating some of the tiresome scholarly discourse in shorter versions. Or even get some of it reinterpreted by populist guest editors or curators occasionally, if only to draw attention to its existence. Would steps like this really mean the end of the world as we know it?
I love Banksy’s work and sometimes his simple messages are much more powerful than anything we ever publish. I think we have a lot to learn from him and others like him. They know how to touch the human spirit within us all. I’m not sure we understand this at all. Nor do we value it.

Anyway, what he is saying above is that it is OK to experiment and make mistakes as long as you continue to learn from them and that is really how we operate and at UTS ePress. We will continue to operate in that way.
I am surrounded by clever and enthusiastic people at UTS Library. They are encouraged to speak their mind and share their thoughts and most are not afraid to do it. I love that we can all work like this. But I still have to go and ask some of the quieter people what they’d do. Sometimes they are still too shy to share. Then I have to make sure that I listen to them: to their whole idea and not just the first bit that I found really exciting. And then I try to make sure that they know I listened. Not surprisingly, I find that many other people do not think like I do, and that they’d approach challenges with a different perspective to me. This can be really valuable, especially when they have a deeper level of knowledge or experience or technical skill in a particularly relevant aspect of the challenge or potential solution.

So what I’m really saying here is that sometimes it is best to stop talking and try listening.

The other aspect of this is that I think a lot more can be achieved (at least in this whole area) by doing than we can ever achieve by endless discussion, debate, the development of frameworks, attempts to agree on standards and protocols, and contemplating budgets and costs upfront.