We surveyed information managers in STM-focused organizations for this project. Full methodology and description of the respondents can be found in the report, “Jinfo survey - digging deeper into discovery - 2018,” which is available through SpringerNature. For a copy, please contact Caitlin Cricco, caitlin.cricco@springer.com

Analysis on the data was conducted by Elizabeth Trudell and supervised by Robin Neidorf. For further questions about the project, please contact Robin at robin.neidorf@jinfo.com
Welcome to today’s session! Elizabeth and Robin will walk through some of the high-level results of our research following up on the goals, progress and barriers around implementation of discovery systems and projects.

We will also be scheduling a webinar in the fall of 2018 to discuss these results, as well as feedback we’ve gotten since initial publication.
This project picked up on the results of initial research conducted in 2017. In that project, we simply wanted to understand what the term “discovery” means to information professionals. Through that work, we identified three main objectives that information professionals aim for when they refer to discovery. This year’s research examined those objectives in more detail and sought to understand how satisfied information professionals are with their current approaches and options.
We ran the survey in March 2018, and followed up with interviews with several information professionals to better understand the nuances of their responses. More detail about the methodology and survey population can be found in the full report.
This slide shows the spread of industries represented by respondents (n=48).
We enabled respondents to self-select which questions on the survey they would answer based on how important each of these three goals is to them in improving discovery. Respondents rated the importance of a single goal on a scale of 1-10. If they rated a goal at least 7 or higher, they were routed to a page to answer questions about that goal.

The figure here shows the percentage of respondents who rated each of these goals as very important to them – an 8 or higher.
We ran a quick poll through Mentimeter (www.mentimeter.com) to find out from the people in the room during the presentation how important these discovery goals are to them. It’s an interesting contrast to our survey results – at the DPHT conference, the highest rated goal is generating new insights through analytics.

We feel that this is due to the fact that conference delegates are more invested in new applications than the general population we recruited from. Additionally, the delegates who chose to attend this particular session are more likely (we surmise) to be further down the pathway of development and thinking in new ways, and want to know what other possibilities might be.
Progress towards goals - single point of entry

- Goal is to provide easy and effective single point of entry to licensed content
- Goal is of interest to some degree for all respondents
- Solutions used include database vendors, discovery services and in-house systems

Plusses:
- Search interfaces available are user-friendly
- Content providers are seen as good partners
- Information centers deploy traditional online vendors, discovery systems or in-house systems to make progress towards goal

Summarizes our results from survey respondents regarding how they are progressing towards the goal of single point of entry.

- There are many approaches to offering single entry to end users
- Respondents are grappling with adding content beyond traditional database providers: internal document repositories, diverse content feeds, specialized licensed content
These are some of the barriers and challenges they're encountering with that goal:

- Level of frustration with the performance of link resolvers and IP authentication is very high.
- Feel that vendors either don’t understand or can’t resolve the problems.
- Almost as much frustration with increasingly large data sets due to inadequate dup detection and narrowing results.
Progress towards goals - back-end integration

- Goal is to extend “single point of entry” to add content sources beyond licensed content
- Goal is of interest to some degree for 70% of respondents
- Content sources include internal documents or datasets, streams of external content, specialized licensed content

Plusses:
- SharePoint is a go-to platform for internal content
- Technology for back-end integration is available (but difficult to configure) (configuration and making things talk to each other - pain point)
- Goal is (more) feasible for those with IT resources to “do it themselves”

This slide summarizes results from respondents who have a goal of back-end integration:

- Internally and externally generated content sets likely to be captured in different systems.
- More challenging to implement than providing access to published content with structured indexing or metadata.
- Sharepoint is a leading player here, but seems more by default than by intent
And the challenges:

- Consistent metadata seen as potential aid
- Even when offered, APIs or other mechanisms can be difficult to deploy effectively
- Concerns about security of internal information
- Customization and DIY is resource-intensive - strong desire for content providers to develop tools which enable “plug and play” with SharePoint and other platforms
We used Mentimeter again to gauge how the conference population feels suppliers and buyers should partner to resolve these challenges. This word cloud shows the ideas that emerged.
This slide summarizes results from respondents who reported that generating new insights through analytics was a “discovery” goal for them.

Two classes of use:
- Improve data analytics for usage metrics; track impact; justify resources.
- Improve navigation and presentation of results through visualization or meaningful clusters of results.

Still in exploratory phase. Many will put more staff resources into assessing this in the coming year.
Barriers towards progress - new insights

- ‘Big data’ analytics not offered by database providers (ProQuest, STN, Ovid, Questel).
- Tools like VantagePoint are powerful, but require pulling down massive data sets
- Lack clarity on what to expect from vendors and 3rd party tools
- Want content vendors to form partnerships with analysis tool providers

This is a challenging area:

- Use mainly with content analysis tools for specialized content sets
- Not yet much experimentation with tools which could be applied across a general collection of STEM content or used in conjunction with the traditional content suppliers.
- Hope to see vendors form partnerships with software providers to facilitate progress; feel that requests for this have been made to vendors but not much response yet
For each goal, we asked respondents to rate level of agreement with these statements:

- Technology has the right capabilities
- Solution vendors understand our needs
- Technology is viewed slightly more positively, but overall, half of the respondents do NOT agree that vendors understand the needs.
- There is plenty of room for improvement – the red line represents the halfway mark on the 1-4 scale we used, so in general, respondents do not agree that the technology has the right capabilities or that vendors understand their needs.
For each goal, we asked respondents to rate level of agreement with these statements:

- Plan to increase staff investment in next 12 months
- Plan to increase budget in next 12 months

Again, the halfway mark is represented by the red line. We see little intent to increase staff time or budget to working towards these goals.

Agreement with these statements is even lower - raises questions:

- Does this mean that info teams feel they already have adequate resources applied and can achieve goals with those resources?
- Does it mean that budgets are not growing commensurately with the high priorities assigned to these goals?
- It’s okay to experiment with something that turns out NOT to be the right solution and learn from it
As an industry analyst group, Jinfo collects and reports on data that help us identify where we as an industry may need to operate from a more communal basis – where do we really need buyers and suppliers to come together to push everything forward? This topic is certainly one of those areas.

Regardless of which goal you prioritize, there are clearly critical gaps in our ability to move towards effective discovery. These are not challenges that can be fixed by a single vendor or information team – they require collaborative efforts.

Jinfo recommends these approaches, and the Division can serve an important role in helping to make them happen.
For our final poll, we asked session attendees to offer up their suggestions for what’s next. This slide and the next one provide their responses.
What suggestions do you have for next steps?

- PHTD and major vendors need to work together with PHT driving the activities.
- Open partnerships or low cost trials so each party can walk away with a "win".
- Due diligence for strong business case for budget, too many fist. All us.
- Vendors need incentive to collaborate, no? How does that happen?
- PHT — advocate for our data needs with the vendors. Us — articulate what we need.
- Step being so proprietary.
- Can't be customized for each customer — no vendor would invest in that. Needs to be scalable.
Thank you for joining us!

More information

- Request copy of Jinfo Report: Digging deeper into discovery
- SpringerNature webinars coming up: autumn
- Questions and comments on the research? Robin Neidorf, Director of Research for Jinfo, robin.neidorf@jinfo.com, 612-978-7991
- Questions and comments on SpringerNature’s approach to discovery?
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