Group 6
Open access citation index

• What’s wrong with the SCI?
• What are we going to do about it?
What’s wrong with the SCI?

Because of it’s power it has some pernicious side effects:

• A relatively small group of people decides which journals are to be included. There are somewhere between 24,000 (Harnad) and 40,000 (Garfield) journals. 7,000 or 8,000 are included in SCI.

• Scientometrics: a beautiful quantitative result is being used extremely mechanically.
What are we going to do about it?

Start a working group
Define:
- Task
- How the group is going to operate
Discussion (1)

Topic: Scope of the material involved (extension)

Start with a subsection:
• By region (like China, which has its own tools)
• By subject (one or two disciplines)
• By category (dissertations, repositories)

Possibility: European dissertations in 2 disciplines?
How can we extend the coverage?
Discussion (2)

Topic: Measuring

What are we measuring: quality, impact?

There seem to be 2 agenda’s:
• New measurement, better visibility
• Extension of SCI: “too ambitious, too complicated”
Discussion (3)

Questions raised:

• How to position our activities towards existing tools?
• Can measuring be automated?
• Can we restrict ourselves to “the essential part of science”?
• Who are the users: scientists or managers?
• Should we restrict ourselves to Open Access?
Diverging

Some want:

• An inventory and assessment of measurements that already exist
• A measure for those publication channels that are not in SCI
• To bring additional value to open archives and open access journals
• To bring additional value to the whole spectrum of scientific knowledge
The mission of the working group should be:

- How do we contribute to improving research by assisting, analyzing, evaluating research?
- Part of this:
  - Get a kind of feeling of the quality of open archives and open access journals
  - Project: collecting metadata about citations from all OAI compliant journals; compare results of open access journals with those of “toll journals”