Outcomes:

1. To get reactions and comments on the study results to date from experts and develop deeper synthesis of results and an understanding of their implications for publishers and libraries.
2. To get a sense from experts about the significant issues facing e-journals in the next 5-8 years.
3. To identify further areas for research and follow up studies for resolvable issues that are not yet resolved.

Workshop participants included eight experts from the fields of non-profit publishing, academic libraries, primary aggregators of online scientific content, and information design, as well as members of the eJUS project from HighWire and IFTF. The workshop was held at IFTF’s offices in Menlo Park, California.

8:45 AM  Welcome and Introductions.

We started the day by asking each participant to put a stake in the ground and talk briefly about what he or she sees as the biggest enablers and barriers to e-journal adoption in the next 5 to 8 years.

Enablers

- Ubiquity of shared, standard protocols, especially for younger people
- Extending library services across time and place
- Benefits to libraries of re-allocating space and reducing facilities’ costs
- Stability of infrastructure
- Range and scope of coverage
- Richer user environments
Integration of data sources – e.g. using one search argument across different information sources
Quantification of enhanced scientific productivity
In 5 years e-journal use will be second nature – new cognitive processes passed on by younger scholars to their students?
Content enablers – Assured, reliable archives
Technology enablers – i.e., extending user access to mobile environments
Business enablers – pricing tracks
Libraries allowed to cancel print
Electronic editions become the edition of record for purposes of archiving

Barriers
Management of gray literature and peer review. Some scientists are not publishing in peer-reviewed journals because it takes too long, or the scrutiny of peer review is being rethought.
Information navigation within an outdated model of the library. This outdated model thinks of information as precious, rare, and in need of protection.
Too much information – users are inundated and this will only get worse.
Information loss (of formal literature) because of archiving issues.
Too much gray literature
Too many features and not enough useful tools
Poor evaluation systems (impact factors and citation analysis are goofy; inaccurate descriptors and bad titles are especially annoying to users)
Lack of vision on the part of libraries
Fragmented e-environment – e-journals and other e-media
Publishers are trying to be in both paper and online environments at the same time
Fragmentation of data sources – lack of integration for cross searching

9:45 AM – 11:30 AM E-Journal Study Results

Part I: Usage Patterns and Value

Part II: Impacts on Scholarship and Scientific Media

The IFTF team gave two short presentations that provided experts with a sense of the major findings from the research to date. The presentations were not meant to be exhaustive of all findings but was intended to highlight points for discussion with the
group in order to enhance interpretation of data and raise key issues. See powerpoint presentations. Some key points from the discussion of results is presented below.

Questions, responses, debates, surprises – highlights from experts.

- Librarian wanted more in-depth knowledge about the institutional context of the study’s users, to help answer: What kinds of institutional support matter? Are there things we should be doing as libraries that we’re not?

- Peripheral vision and the ability to search across multiple domains is central to inter- or cross-disciplinary fields. Do we have the right tools to support it?

- The transformations in e-journals will be driven by:
- kinds of tools being developed to analyze content in new ways – that let people extract knowledge from articles
- what kind of science is funded. Where’s the money going? Not just individual peripheral vision, but a collective peripheral vision.
- Changes in the standards by which people obtain and promote tenure
- Clinical infrastructure changed by patients having more information.
- Might be interesting to think about the evolution of the scientific journal itself, as a form of scientific record. What if it’s just a phase of a century or so? What would the next stage be?

- Do e-journals privilege community more than traditional print journals? There are new opportunities to be grasped in terms of identifying communities of practitioners who are mutually relevant.

- Brand will only become more important. Now we have to figure out how to ensure that every grain of content is branded by the AHA, for instance.

11:30 AM Challenges and Choices for Publishers and Libraries.

In the session prior to lunch, we discussed implications of the findings for libraries and publishers. Specifically we talked about the challenges and choices that libraries and publishers will face in the future.
- Figure out how to use one search argument across multiple info sources.
- Libraries should also help users navigate multiple environments and meta-data sources; enable users to use info modularly; help users navigate complex images and graphics.
- Sustaining cost increases from publishers
- Increase the visibility of the library as part of the distribution chain. It becomes a co-branding issue. If libraries are only pass through scenarios, they’re left out of the equation. (question for libraries: What do you need to do to avoid becoming simply a “pass through”?)
- How to share digital resources across institutional boundaries?

12:45 PM E-Journals In 2010: New York Times Cover Story Vision

After lunch we asked participants to create a New York Times cover story for the year 2010. The premise was that e-journals would make the cover of the Times, but participants had free rein to decide in what capacity and context. In addition to coming up with a headline, they were asked to write about “who’s in the news,” “related stories,” and “innovations and breakthroughs” associated with the story. The purpose of this exercise was to facilitate a practical discussion of what e-journals will look like in 2010, what evolutionary paths may unfold and what key issues will libraries and publishers need to resolve along the way.

2:00 PM Implications and Wildcards for Library and Publisher Services.

To wrap up the day we spent the last sessions discussing key insights and implications from the day. We also identified wildcards that could possibly disrupt the evolution of electronic journals.

- What are the implications of robots/agents producing knowledge from vast stores of data, detecting patterns that a human couldn’t?
- Who is responsible for content when everyone is a pass through? If public search engines get into the scientific literature there could be bad consequences.
- Not all articles are equally valuable – we need to re-adjust researchers’ expectations and needs to get their work published – which would mean a re-thinking of how tenure is evaluated.

Some wildcards:

- Period of copyright protection
- Life + 75
- Price pressure
- Internet terrorism – huge disruption
- “Author pays” model takes hold
- Portable display technology innovations
- Ubiquitous, mobile broadband

2:30 PM   Wrap up and Final Thoughts

- Rights to information: The more content you have, the better off you are – if you make it accessible and you exploit it. But you need the rights to it, and these rights are getting locked up behind commercial publishers’ walls.

- Commodification of information: The profit and loss model of commercial publishers is changing the way journals are evaluated. Prohibitive spending patterns drive money away from some journals to others.

- How do nonprofit publishers avoid giving away information to commercial competitors and not getting anything back?

- Libraries: should affirm the role of high quality information. Their value lies in providing licensing, what info we link to, and bringing intelligence to these choices.

- When institutions make decisions, they make them for others as well – ripple effects of large institutional decisions. “When there’s an e-, get rid of the p-” … and assume that someone, somewhere else, will still keep hard copies.