

JIBS Scopus Enhancement Group

The Maughan Library, Kings College, London, Monday 6th July, 2015

Present:

Cameron Ross (Elsevier)
Jennifer Bronson (Elsevier)
Michaela Kurschildgen (Elsevier)
Eric Swanson (Elsevier)
Sarah Taylor (University of Bolton, Chair)
Emma Stuart Edwards (Bath University, Minutes)
Clare Langman (Aston University)
Mano Jacob (Imperial College London)
Klara Finnimore (King's College London)
Patti Biggs (Crick Institute)
Lynne Meehan (University of Liverpool)

Apologies:

Stephen Pearson (University of Manchester)
Cath Dishman/Sarah Robbins (Liverpool John Moores University)
Ian Rowlands (Leicester University)
Martin Gill (University of Huddersfield)
Dawn Holland (University of Hull)

1. Welcome and introductions

As there were many new members the group introduced themselves to each other.

2. Minutes and matters arising from September meeting

It was noted that no formal minutes were produced from the meeting held in Sept 2014 at.

Cameron informed the group that Charles Martinez has left Scopus and now works for IET.

3. Scopus update (slides to be distributed with minutes, although some slides may be removed)

- Scopus coverage now includes 5000 publishers, not just Elsevier products, as many would believe.
- 3500 clients in the UK and Australia (it was felt this growth is possibly due to the REF).
- THE rankings and QS rankings will use Scopus for citations data.
- UK 3rd largest customer, with 120 institutions.
- Commercial includes companies, like Unilever.
- 82% of NESLI customers have Scopus. Anecdotally Liverpool heaviest users.
- Analytical usage increasing e.g. citations data, Elsevier can provide breakdowns of individual institution if required.
- Since 2013 increase in e.g. Pure (CRIS).

Clarified that Scopus database underpins Scopus, SciVal, Atira, Pure and Mendeley.

Cameron asked if anyone uses Altmetrics, or the Thomson Reuters Converis CRIS system, and what the difference was. No one from the group has this. Cameron also asked how Elsevier can make rankings better and there was discussion around break down by institution.

Roadmap summary

Cameron outlined current and future projects:

- Content archives and citations only up to 1996. Now starting to fill back all journals to 1970. About 1/3 way there. Let them know if content is missing e.g. the odd year. They have bibliographic records back to 1823. Starting with Elsevier products, then Springer, then smaller publishers. This will be completed by 2016.
- Looking into grant opportunities, where funding coming from.
- Scholarly metrics e.g. Facebook like showing in Mendeley. Mendeley accounts for 20-30% of researchers [in the UK?]. They hope to synchronise this further in future. Showing you suggestions for who you should cite, work with.
- Integration with other products – e.g. Scopus and EndNote, if Thomson Reuters will work with them.

3.1 Interface changes

Eric gave an overview of a user case looking at key features of Scopus. It was noted by the group that the perceived main user was a researcher. The group raised awareness that a significant number of Undergraduates were also being trained to use Scopus.

Eric gave an overview of other changes:

- 2014 new look and feel work now completed, includes single sign on capabilities, one click export, Chinese characters, ORCID ID and enhanced author search.
- 2015 update look and feel of analysis will change due to SciVal integration, cited references, backfilling (as above), in-product marketing, guided tutorials.
- Switched to Agile working, so full release each month. Due to come - my list function, SciVal and Scopus integration, accessibility enhancements, comprehensive altmetrics module and OA indicators.

The article level metrics module was demonstrated. Including data from Mendeley, blogs, tweets, mass media (newsflow recently added). Feedback from the group was given. Most liked the dynamic nature and “health warnings”. It was noted that the “citations in full” tab was different to others, which needed to be clicked and it was felt this distorted the information.

Looking to develop an API for ScienceDirect, so it can be plugged in to an institutional repository.

Informed about A/B testing. Whereby a number of instructions are deployed a small change and feedback from this informs the next stage of testing. The group expressed concern about the timing of this e.g. if handouts / guides prepared for a training session and the look / feel of the database changes before the workshop this isn't helpful. Suggestion to inform institutes when this is happening via the JISCmail lis-eresources list.

Action: Elsevier to look into JISCmail lis-eresources list.

3.2 Search engine migration

Moving from a vendor controlled product to an open source engine under Scopus control. Features that will be affected included lemmatisation, synonyms, spelling, and ranking order.

The group suggested the end of year (e.g. Sept-Nov) was not an ideal time for such a major change. June/July were suggested for major updates, especially if it's likely to affect search results so dramatically.

3.3 New features prioritisation

Cameron suggested a number of new features and asked for feedback on which order to prioritise these:

- It was suggested that data would be a priority. The ability to re-use and track.

Given that ESPR Data Management rules are imminent. Getting researches to store data somewhere safe e.g. Pure, rather than on personal drives is crucial.

- Suggestion for Patents information in Scopus. Scirus used to point to patents. It's nice for students to have one point of entry e.g. patent information linked to article. Also in simple form for UG/PGT level. Only University of Bath have access to Derwent Innovations Index (WoS patents database).
- The third suggestion was about funding and grant opportunities and how institutes keep track of this. The group suggested Research Support Offices would have more understanding of this area.

There was discussion around improving affiliation profiles e.g. normalising data in author submissions.

4. Queries from member sites

Emma asked if Scopus could be recorded in screencasts for use in demonstrating to students,

Action: Emma to email Michaela after the meeting to confirm this in writing.

Clare queried the coverage of the abstracts agreement with EBSCO Discovery Service (EDS).

Action: by Elsevier

5. Action points for Elsevier from group members

See **action points**.

6. Questions from Elsevier to group members

Elsevier have increased the full record export ceiling to 2000 with choice of fields and 20,000 for a bulk export. They asked why this was requested so much. The group suggested both an increase in systematic reviews and compliance reporting for the REF could be reasons for requests for larger numbers of records.

Elsevier asked how we promote products. The group said that as well as researcher, UG and PGT students see the product in workshops and when dealing with enquiries. Scopus over WoS for some subjects, as Scopus only peer-review. A discussion around materials being produced for students followed. Students prefer branded, unique and "how to" guides as opposed to general information or marketing.

Action: Group members to share any examples of guides they have produced or screencasts so the marketing team can see what is required.

Action: Elsevier to provide a template "how to" guides where an institute can add their own branding and make changes according to subject/group.

Michaela mentioned that the team are happy to provide training, either to library staff or students and to contact them to arrange this.

7. Date and place of next meeting

TBA.

It was suggested the meeting in April 2016 would be held in the Elsevier London Offices.