

LIS JOURNAL PUBLISHING FOR THE DIGITAL AGE: A GLAMR

DISSEMINATION AND PRESERVATION MODEL

ABSTRACT

Professional library journals such as the *Australian Library Journal* and *Australian Academic and Research Libraries*, published for ALIA by Taylor & Francis, currently conform to an outdated print-based journal publishing model whose primary product is four print issues per year. This model does not cater to the ways in which social media-savvy, digitally literate information professionals work, and is in decline: 'Orthodox journals will soon be understood as tombstones: end of debate certificates' (Dunleavy, 2012). We describe a new publishing model for an Open Access (OA) library and information science (LIS) journal that also encompasses cultural heritage, informatics, and the digital humanities. Our model is developed from investigating current literature and developments in open access journals worldwide, identifying relevant features of journals in information-related fields, and observation of social media use by information professionals. Our investigations were based on focus questions:

1. What are the key principles on which a new OA journal should be based?
2. What could a new Galleries, Libraries, Archives, Museums, and Records (GLAMR) OA journal look like?
3. How could it harness the full potential of social media?

4. Should a new publishing model be an online platform, integrating aspects of content management and archival systems for preservation of research and data?

Our investigations to date suggest that a new journal needs to harness technologies used extensively by information professionals that are not widely applied in traditional journal publishing. It should take account of social media such as Twitter and alternative methods of self-publishing such as blogging, thus tapping into a highly networked and digitally literate readership. It should also accommodate more traditional forms of publication such as research papers, articles, case studies of innovative practice, and conference proceedings and their associated social media coverage. It must be based on the principles of open access, fostering communities through collaboration, flexibility to allow experimentation, and collecting and reusing research outputs. For this new model to be sustainable and remain relevant to research and practice, the value of establishing collectives of information professionals who can contribute to and help sustain an OA journal will also be explored. This model should be one that encourages and supports the potential of new researchers, both in academically-focused and researcher-practitioner circles. A new model for an OA journal for social media-savvy, digitally literate information professionals is emerging from our investigations. This new model has considerable potential to be a platform that enables the GLAMR sectors to disseminate messages to wider audiences, especially to younger demographics. It is also a model that could revolutionise how these messages are received, understood, and acted on.

INTRODUCTION

The professional library journals *Australian Library Journal* (ALJ) and *Australian Academic and Research Libraries* (AARL) will merge into one journal, *Journal of the Australian Library and Information Association* (JALIA,) which will be published for ALIA by Taylor & Francis (T&F) from 2017. JALIA will, like ALJ and AARL, conform to an outdated print-based journal publishing model focused on four print issues per year, and it will not fulfill a primary mission of ALIA – open information. As Searle wrote in her submission to ALIA’s call for members to provide feedback on the future of its journals:

As an organisation that in 2015 ran a high profile campaign (www.fair.alia.org.au) for ‘a fair, open, democratic society where information belongs to everyone’, ALIA should demonstrate a commitment to open access to scholarly literature. ALIA can do this by adopting a journal publishing model that:

- Is free for authors to submit their work
- Is free for readers to access journal articles, including the version of record
- Promotes the use of Creative Commons licences, to ensure that re-use is maximised (2016)

The journal model that ALIA continues with JALIA does not cater to the ways in which social media-savvy, digitally literate information professionals work, and is in decline.

We investigate what a new publishing model for an OA journal for professionals working in the GLAMR sectors could include, incorporating the principles of preservation, openness, collaboration, impact, and usability.

WHAT JALIA WON'T DO

In a discussion document, ALIA (2016) provided a summary of features of its current journals and its proposed new journal (Table 1). This summary clearly indicates a 'business as usual' approach with no changes proposed for its new journal that positively impact open access. JALIA will be the same, and have the same associated issues, as ALJ and AARL. Of interest to us are four statements:

1. *Frequency*: no change; this is still expressed in terms of numbers of issues per year, a sure indication that the old print paradigm is the basis of JALIA
2. *Open access*: no change; green open access (which allows self-archiving of a version of the paper but not the final version as published)
3. *Current issues*: no change; 'free access to entire volume after 3 years' is not open access

4. *Format and content*: JALIA appears to offer an expansion from ALJ's and AARL's 'Print and online journal: articles and book reviews' by adding 'further online content e.g. video abstracts, blog' but this is no different from what is currently possible with ALJ and AARL

Table 1. Summary of features of journals published by ALIA (Based on ALIA, 2016).

	Australian Library Journal	Australian Academic and Research Libraries	JALIA: Journal of the Australian Library and Information Association
Year established	1951	1970	1951/new title 2017
Frequency	4 issues per annum	4 issues per annum	4 issues per annum
Subscriptions	Included in ALIA Institutional Membership and by subscription	General subscription	Included in ALIA Institutional Membership and general subscription
Availability	More than 20,000 libraries around	More than 20,000 libraries	More than 20,000 libraries

	the world, through T&F and its partners	around the world, through T&F and its partners	around the world, through T&F and its partners
Open access	Green open access	Green open access	Green open access
Back issues digitised and freely available on T&F website	Complete from 1989 and dating back to Vol 6 1957 (38 volumes of 64)	Complete from 1988 (28 volumes of 46)	Complete from 2017
Current issues	Free access to entire volume after 3 years	Free access to entire volume after 3 years	Free access to entire volume after 3 years
Editors	Ross Harvey (2014-2016)	Gaby Haddow and Mary Anne Kennan (2012-2016)	Gaby Haddow and Mary Anne Kennan (2017 –)
Editorial Boards	7 LIS experts from academic, special and public libraries	9 LIS experts from academic and collecting institutions	To be reconstituted
Authors	Practitioners, researchers, academics	Mainly researchers and academics	Practitioners, researchers, academics
Format and content	Print and online	Print and online	Print and online

	journal; articles and book reviews	journal; articles and book reviews	journal; articles and book reviews; further online content e.g. video abstracts, blog
Peer review (double-blind)	Majority of articles	All articles	Majority of articles
Downloads/citations	More full text downloads than AARL	More citations than ALJ	Strengths of ALJ and AARL
2014 impact factor	0.140	0.424	To be determined

NEW CHALLENGES AND APPROACHES

The model on which ALJ and AARL, and now JALIA, are based no longer meets the requirements of readers, and does not cater to the ways in which digitally literate information professionals work. The audiences for old-model journals are limited and declining, and the costs of purchasing journals and publishing in them are increasing. Willinsky (2016) has likened Elsevier's response to the recent Sci-Hub case, where millions of research papers were released online, to Napster challenging 'an ageing industry trying to maintain a terribly profitable – but outdated – business model'. What the Sci-Hub situation

demonstrates is a response to the 'old economy', 'an impatience with the lingering monopoly pricing of journal subscriptions that causes even Harvard to balk' (Willinsky, 2016). But it would be wrong to write off the major journal publishers as moribund, as Elsevier's purchase in May 2016 of the Social Science Research Network (SSRN) preprint server indicates (Van Noorden, 2016).

The content of a new OA journal is probably the key area where there is potential for change from the old paradigm print-based journal model. It should accommodate a much wider range than the old models allow. It should ideally be a model for everything that GLAMR professionals want to read and access. There must be a place for the kind of material already published in traditional journals: research papers, case studies, and opinion pieces. Any GLAMR journal, we contend, must seek new authors to contribute, and special attention needs to be paid to encouraging their participation and supporting them through the process. Material found only occasionally or not at all in traditional journals can readily be accommodated in a new journal model.

It seems to us no longer useful to separate LIS from other components of the GLAMR sectors. These sectors are increasingly interconnected, driven especially by digital imperatives. A new journal model must therefore encourage all sectors from the field to contribute, to share projects, research, etc. – not just libraries, but galleries, museums, archives, information managers working in business and government sectors, and digital humanities academics and practitioners. An ambitious aim would be for a new journal model to host and

provide access over time to content that GLAMR professionals want to read and access. This model would be a continually evolving one that is able to incorporate new ideas inspired by the capability of new digital tools.

PRINCIPLES OF A NEW JOURNAL

What should a new journal be? What principles in the current research and professional environments should it accommodate?

Our starting point is free access to all, a central tenet of librarianship. We note that *free access* is not the same as *free of charge*, but are guided by Searle's comments that a journal 'is free for authors to submit their work [and] is free for readers to access journal articles', and provides for re-use without charge through Creative Commons licences (Searle, 2016). The American Library Association (ALA) provides clear guiding principles for the core values of librarianship (ALA, 2004), which we use to frame our discussion of principles to be included in a new journal model. From ALA's eleven core values (Access, Confidentiality/Privacy, Democracy, Diversity, Education and Lifelong Learning, Intellectual Freedom, Preservation, The Public Good, Professionalism, Service, and Social Responsibility) we repurpose five for our model:

1. Preservation
2. Openness
3. Collaboration
4. Impact

5. Usability

Preservation

The aim of preservation is to make material available for use and reuse (Oliver & Harvey, 2016, chapter 15). For journal content to be used and then reused in the future it needs to be persistent: that is, available in an understandable form at the time it is requested for use.

Recent scientific publishing (and increasingly humanities publishing) is encouraging the deposit of the data from which the article was developed into a public repository, sometimes one provided by the journal's publisher. In this way, research outputs and data can be reused and conclusions can be verified. An OA journal has the ability to promote this principle and make it happen. The journal itself could operate an open-source repository, one that is format-agnostic, for all of the resources used to develop an article. Not only could this material be stored, it could be made more discoverable by linking to related material. The content does not just have to be current content – it could feature 'From the vault' content such as older conference papers, or presentations and panel discussions that can be used, with appropriate considerations of copyright and IP issues, to inform and enrich current debate about various issues affecting the GLAMR sectors.

Openness

Open Access is being driven by changing expectations from funding bodies, government, academia, and the public, and is particularly relevant to the GLAMR professions with their 'public good' ethos. ALIA itself has a strong open access statement (2015). The OA movement aims at the free and unrestricted online availability of research results: a typical definition is 'free, immediate, permanent online access to the full text of research articles for anyone, worldwide' (EPrints, 2016). Participation in OA initiatives has many benefits: for example, to assist authors to be more widely read, and data creators such as researchers and scholars to maximise their research impact. The Budapest Open Access Initiative states that open access 'will accelerate research, enrich education, share the learning of the rich with the poor and the poor with the rich, make this literature as useful as it can be, and lay the foundation for uniting humanity in a common intellectual conversation and quest for knowledge' (Budapest Open Access Initiative, 2002).

Another aspect of openness is being open to different forms of material submitted. The restrictions of conventional print-paradigm journals no longer represent how GLAMR professionals communicate their interests and research. A responsive OA journal needs to accommodate the more traditional forms of publication, such as research papers, articles, case studies of innovative practice, and conference proceedings; and also other forms – the associated social media coverage of conferences such as Twitter feeds and Storify boards, data, blogs, other social media, and other forms – here the horizon is unlimited.

Reviewing is an important part of maintaining the quality of a journal. Traditional double-blind peer reviewing is increasingly being considered as inefficient (Open Scholar, 2015). Openness principles can also apply to reviewing, to allow more transparency and higher quality of the reviewing process and the published result. The Frontiers Research Topic *Beyond open access* (2012) 'collects visions for a future system of open evaluation', hoping to construct an idea of a future system that 'will derive its authority from a scientific literature on community-based open evaluation'. This vision is useful for GLAMR OA publication, particularly in thinking through issues such as how to maintain quality when using community-based open evaluation. As the Frontiers Research Topic suggests, 'a grand challenge of our time ... is to design the future system, by which we evaluate papers and decide which ones deserve broad attention'. This means contributing to a global effort to redesign the review process for publication. Within the GLAMR sectors, librarians and archivists are well placed to make decisions and guide this process due to their information management and archival skills (Frontiers Research Topic, 2012).

Another approach to openness is to use only open source tools. These are plentiful and new tools are constantly being developed (for example, eLife Continuum (Mulvaney, 2016)).

Collaboration

Current GLAMR work is based increasingly on collaboration: in fact, collaboration is often considered a hallmark of the information professions. An

OA journal should enable the fostering of communities through collaboration, providing flexibility to allow experimentation with new publishing ideas. A possible model the GLAMR sectors could emulate is the open access journal *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics* (<http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/>). Public peer review and interactive discussion makes up its two-stage publication process. Submissions that pass a quick peer review are immediately published and are available for interactive public discussion. Comments and reviews are published with the article. All contributions are archived and citable.

Impact

Journals based on the print-based publishing model typically measure impact by formal mechanisms, predominantly Impact Factor. These have been heavily criticised and alternatives, such as Altmetrics, are in active development. A new OA GLAMR journal could investigate how to apply alternative impact measures.

Every author wants the words, images, or data they create to have an impact. In order to have impact they must be made as visible as possible. Visibility for authors can be built in from the start with an insistence on DOIs and ORCIDs.

Usability

The conventional aims of usability apply to an online journal: it needs to be easy to use and easy to learn. Usability also applies to other aspects of an online journal. One is that it is essential to make the submission of content as

straightforward as possible. Ideally the author should be able to submit material using a straightforward template with a minimum of (and preferably no) learning required. This template should also be usable for the journal editors, in that minimal manipulation is required to format the submission. Models include *Digital Humanities Quarterly* (<http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/>), which has an XML file with markup for submission.

WHAT DO READERS OF LIS JOURNALS WANT NOW?

ALIA consulted with its members about the future of its journal publishing, but the timing of its call suggests that members' submission played little or no part in the ALIA Board's decision. (The final announcement from ALIA about its decision is available at <https://www.alia.org.au/news/14122/journal-consultation-update>). This point was not lost on some members, as a Twitter backlash indicated: for examples see <https://twitter.com/wragge/status/712048810525138945> and <https://twitter.com/wragge/status/712049260716531714>. (The considerable engagement on Twitter of GLAMR professionals is one of the attributes that our new model for journal publishing seeks to harness.)

To solicit the views of the Australian LIS profession about what is wanted or needed in a new professional publishing model, a request was made on Twitter by Jaye Weatherburn on 22 March 2016. Although the number of respondents was very small, the quality and thoughtfulness of their responses, and their standing in the profession, make the response worth considering. Respondents

strongly expressed the opinion that ALIA missed ‘an important opportunity to demonstrate leadership in the open access debate’ by not making the new journal fully open access: ‘freely available online, no embargoes, no APCs, and with licenses (CC-BY) that facilitate reuse’ (Sherratt, 2016). It was pointed out that ALIA's approach to publishing was not consistent with its promotion of freedom of access to information, and that ALIA should be demonstrating leadership in this respect. Two respondents noted that there are many LIS journals that are already fully open access, ‘so it clearly can be done’ (S. Searle, email to J. Weatherburn, 1 April 2016). Searle’s submission to ALIA’s consultation on journal publishing (2016) gives specifics: ‘The Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) lists more than sixty journals worldwide that meet these criteria, including well-respected publications like the Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication and the International Journal of Digital Curation’.

Respondents were asked what content, features, and mechanisms they would like to see in an OA journal (Table 2). In addition to the basic OA requirements (‘freely available with licenses that encourage reuse’), other highly desirable features include: the possibility of experimenting with form beyond PDF; no print version; using web technologies allowing for enriched text, especially linked open data; peer review (preferably open) as a necessity; content focused on Australia; CC-BY licensing by default; a range of metrics including Altmetrics; DOIs; rolling publication in place of scheduled ‘issues’; easy social media sharing of content; and the ability to interact through comments and forums.

Table 2. Content, features and mechanisms in a new OA journal suggested by respondents.

<p>Experiments with form</p>	<p>Demonstrate the possibilities of forms of publication beyond the PDF; 'I'm heartily sick of PDFs'; 'HTML not PDFs'</p> <p>Combining historical narrative with Linked Open Data to create a new form of online publication</p> <p>A GLAMR journal that enabled rich contextual linkage</p> <p>A print version is unnecessary</p>
<p>Uses web technologies</p>	<p>Online version should be published using web technologies with option to download in multiple formats</p> <p>Explore the possibilities of enriched text, in particular making use of Linked Open data to deliver structured metadata and citations, and to define relationships with other online sources</p> <p>Open data integration</p> <p>DOIs, archived links</p> <p>Simple, web-native referencing (hypertext has existed for over 30 years)</p>
<p>Reviewing</p>	<p>Peer reviewed (preferably open; if not open, then double-blind – definitely not single-blind)</p>
<p>Content</p>	<p>Broad (no academic/public/systems/whatever specialisation)</p>

	<p>Clear, active-voice writing</p> <p>Supplementary content (e.g. multimedia and datasets)</p>
Licensing	<p>CC-BY licensing by default, but giving authors options for other licensing</p> <p>A clear explanation of what each license <i>actually</i> means</p>
Metrics	<p>Altmetrics</p> <p>ORCID API integration</p>
Scheduling	<p>Rolling publication instead of less frequent 'issues'</p> <p>A publish-when-it's-ready schedule, or at least a weekly release schedule</p>
Production	<p>Articles submitted and edited in Markdown</p> <p>Editorial process, especially to help new authors refine an idea or polish their work (i.e. not just accept / reject)</p> <p>Publish under a version-control system to allow all versions from submission through to 'final' draft to be viewable</p> <p>Citation support</p>
Links / sharing	<p>Easy social media sharing</p> <p>Live links to cited works and other resources</p> <p>Ability to interact through comments / forums</p>

WHAT TO INCLUDE IN AN OA JOURNAL

Our examination of new approaches, principles, and the views of a small section of the GLAMR community suggest what new kinds of content a new model OA GLAMR journal could include. Such a journal now has no option but to be fully aware of and use social media, 'now a vital part of scholarly communications' (Michael, 2016). Examples of what could be included, with appropriate copyright clearance if relevant, are:

- Conference papers with their associated content: there is nothing new in publishing conference papers, but we have not seen anywhere the publication also of associated online content that has the potential to enhance the narrative and context around such events – such as social network coverage (Storify stories/timelines of conference hashtags). With a new journal model, editors will be able to approach symposia and other gatherings in emerging fields, such as the Citizen Heritage Symposium (<http://www.citizenheritage.com/symposia>), to provide a home for their output.
- Twitter hashtags: conversations that are ongoing in a series. For example, the hashtag #auslibchat has a large participant rate, and the issues covered so far ('Where's my next job?'; 'Let's talk degrees'; 'Innovative outreach'; 'Metadata trends'; 'Inter- and intra-organisation collaboration') have important insights for the profession, and arguably have important ongoing benefits for new graduates and LIS students as a resource. Many new discussion articles can be generated from the ideas raised in this social media peer discussion

(<https://alianewgrads.wordpress.com/2016/01/15/introducing-auslibchat/>).

- Blogs. Blogs relevant to the journal's scope could be pulled in from the AusGLAM blogs feed (<https://twitter.com/ausglamblogs>), as well as being submitted by blog authors through a blog deposit form. Blogs would be moderated by the editors.
- The output of self-paced learning programs like *23 (research data) Things* (<http://www.and.s.org.au/partners-and-communities/23-research-data-things>), and the outputs gathered from community callouts on listservs on various topics. The *23 Things* program, featuring a crowd-sourced model of information-gathering, incorporates Twitter discussion and online Meetup discussion; elements from each of these forums could be transformed and utilised as continuing online resources, such as FAQs about data management, learning modules, and case studies for further learning. An example of a community callout is the *Call for Participation: Contribute a Data Event Narrative* from the JISC Research Data Management discussion list (RESEARCH-DATAMAN@jiscmail.ac.uk). The callout states that 'librarians are increasingly taking part in organizing, planning, and partnering on data-related events, trainings, and workshops. To better capture this knowledge, we started a project to collect data even narratives from different institutions'. While the project organisers intend to publish the case studies gathered from this initiative on the Open Science

Framework, similar initiatives could be undertaken by a new GLAMR journal, perhaps on a smaller scale – say a community initiative, or within an institution or organisational unit. Similarly, audio files, comments, and transcripts from panel discussions and workshops, such as *The library and information professional as practitioner-researcher?: A panel discussion* (LISRA, 2016), could be published.

- Publishing and preserving the various forms that important wide-ranging debates, movements, and protests take in the digital space. One example is the #fundTrove movement, an initiative that currently encompasses a Twitter hashtag, a Facebook page, blog posts, and numerous articles and various coverage in national media outlets. If this content is collated, published, and preserved in a central repository, it could be a valuable ongoing resource for GLAMR professionals advocating to save important cultural heritage organisations from funding cuts.

Table 1 provided a summary of features of ALIA’s current journals and its proposed new journal. We add a column that allows comparison with the new model journal we propose (Table 3).

Table 3. Comparison of features of journals.

	Australian Library	Australian Academic	JALIA: Journal of	New GLAMR OA journal
--	---------------------------	----------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------

	Journal	and	the	
		Research	Australian	
		Libraries	Library and	
			Information	
			Association	
Year established	1951	1970	1951/new title 2017	2017/2018
Frequency	4 issues per annum	4 issues per annum	4 issues per annum	Continuous
Subscriptions	Included in ALIA Institutional Membership and by subscription	General subscription	Included in ALIA Institutional Membership and general subscription	Free. If the model was successful and continued beyond a trial stage, alternative sustainable funding models would be investigated
Availability	More than 20,000 libraries around the world, through T&F and its	More than 20,000 libraries around the world, through T&F and its	More than 20,000 libraries around the world, through T&F and its	We envisage rapid take-up with appropriate promotion through social media and word-of-mouth networks

	partners	partners	partners	
Open access	Green open access	Green open access	Green open access	Gold open access
Back issues digitised and freely available on T&F website	Complete from 1989 and dating back to Vol 6 1957 (38 vols of 64)	Complete from 1988 (28 volumes of 46)	Complete from 2017	Not applicable
Current issues	Free access to entire volume after 3 years	Free access to entire volume after 3 years	Free access to entire volume after 3 years	Free access immediately on publication
Editors	Ross Harvey	Gaby Haddow, Mary Anne Kennan	Gaby Haddow, Mary Anne Kennan	Invitations sent out for guest editors to pitch ideas around themes
Editorial Boards	7 LIS experts from academic, special and public libraries	9 LIS experts from academic and collecting institutions	To be reconstituted	Representatives from each GLAMR sector, business/corporate and government information professionals
Authors	Practitioners,	Mainly	Practitioners,	Practitioners,

	researchers, academics	researchers and academics	researchers and academics	researchers, academics, students, partnerships between GLAMR sectors and journalists to increase public visibility of the information professions' work
Format and content	Print and online journal; articles and book reviews	Print and online journal; articles and book reviews	Print and online journal; articles and book reviews; further online content eg video abstracts, blog	Online digital content
Peer review (double- blind)	Majority of articles	All articles	Majority of articles	Interactive, ongoing peer review through online discussion

				mechanisms, by the GLAMR sectors and the wider public. Investigations of open reviews: such as Pubpeer-style reviews (https://pubpeer.com/)
Downloads/citations	More full text downloads than AARL	More citations than ALJ	Strengths of ALJ and AARL	Not applicable
2014 impact factor	0.140	0.424	To be determined	Not applicable

We provide a summary of the key features of the new OA journal we envisage (Table 4).

Table 4: Features of a new OA journal model.

Aim	To host and provide access over time to everything that GLAMR professionals want to read and access, and to be a continually evolving and innovative model, able to incorporate new ideas inspired by the digital capabilities and tools we now have and
------------	--

	that are to come
Principles	Preservation, Openness, Collaboration, Impact, Usability
Access	Fully open access (freely available online, no embargoes, no APCs, no cost to submit) Creative Commons licences by default DOIs
Content	Ideally, everything that GLAMR professionals want to read and access The kind of material already published in traditional journals (e.g. research papers, case studies of innovative practice, opinion pieces, conference proceedings) Other forms (e.g. associated social media coverage of conferences such as Twitter feeds and Storify boards, data, blogs, other social media, and other forms) Publishing and preserving the various forms that important wide-ranging debates, movements, and protests take in the digital space A proactive approach to acquiring content, e.g. continuing calls for submission ideas for innovative new content
Focus	Encourages all sectors from GLAMR to contribute, to share projects, research, etc. – not just libraries, but galleries, museums, archives, and also information managers working in business and government
Reviewing	Openness principles applied to reviewing; open to developments in other fields (e.g. open science framework,

	https://osf.io/) to inform new directions
Metrics	Applies a range of metrics, including alternative impact measures
Frequency	Rolling publication in place of scheduled 'issues'
Author support	Solicits new authors to contribute, with special attention paid to encouraging their participation and supporting them through the process Submission of material using a straightforward template with a minimum of (and preferably no) learning required
Sharing and interaction	Sharing of content on social media The ability to interact through comments and forums
Other features	Uses only open source tools Provides the possibility of experimenting with form beyond PDF No print version Uses web technologies allowing for enriched text, especially linked open data

CONCLUSION

A new model for an OA journal for social media-savvy, digitally literate information professionals is emerging from our investigations. This new model has considerable potential to be a platform that enables the GLAMR sectors to disseminate messages to wider audiences, especially to younger demographics. It is also a model, we suggest, that could revolutionise how

these messages are received, understood, and acted on. Strasser's vision for the future resonates with us:

What if manuscripts were treated as dynamic objects, rather than static attachments to be shuffled along the process of publication? I envision a workflow where the research objects, manuscripts, data files, et cetera are made web-friendly, machine-readable and interactive at the earliest possible stages. (Strasser, 2016)

We started thinking about this paper by asking four focus questions:

1. What are the key principles on which a new OA journal should be based?
2. What could a new GLAMR OA journal look like?
3. How could it harness the full potential of social media?
4. Should a new publishing model be an online platform, integrating aspects of content management and archival systems for preservation of research and data?

Our model, as described in this paper, addresses all of these questions. The next step is to carry out a detailed investigation into possible business models and current tools that could realise some of the elements of the new publishing model. It should then be possible to publish a limited lifespan pop-up journal incorporating the elements identified in this paper, with all of its outputs curated and preserved, as a proof of concept.

REFERENCES

All URLs were correct at 15 August 2016.

ALA. (2004). Core values of librarianship. Retrieved from

<http://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/statementspols/corevalues>

ALIA. (2015). ALIA open access statement. Retrieved from

<https://www.alia.org.au/about-alia/policies-standards-and-guidelines/alia-open-access-statement>

ALIA. (2016). The future of ALIA journal publishing. Retrieved from

<https://www.alia.org.au/sites/default/files/ALIA%20journals%20future%20-%20March%202016.pdf>

Budapest Open Access Initiative. (2002). Read the Budapest Open Access

Initiative. Retrieved from <http://www.budapestopenaccessinitiative.org/read>

Dunleavy, P. (2012). The Republic of Blogs: A new phase in the development,

democratization, critique and application of knowledge. Retrieved from

<http://iti.lse.ac.uk/events/networkED-seminar-series-05.php>

EPrints. (2016). EPrints for open access. Retrieved from

<http://www.eprints.org/uk/index.php/openaccess/>

Frontiers Research Topic. (2012). Beyond open access: Visions for open

evaluation of scientific papers by post-publication peer review. Retrieved

from [http://journal.frontiersin.org/researchtopic/137/beyond-open-access-](http://journal.frontiersin.org/researchtopic/137/beyond-open-access-visions-for-open-evaluation-of-scientific-papers-by-post-publication-peer-review)

[visions-for-open-evaluation-of-scientific-papers-by-post-publication-peer-](http://journal.frontiersin.org/researchtopic/137/beyond-open-access-visions-for-open-evaluation-of-scientific-papers-by-post-publication-peer-review)

[review](http://journal.frontiersin.org/researchtopic/137/beyond-open-access-visions-for-open-evaluation-of-scientific-papers-by-post-publication-peer-review)

LISRA (2016). The library and information professional as practitioner-

researcher?: A panel discussion. Retrieved from

<http://lisresearch.org.au/the-library-and-information-professional-as-practitioner-researcher-a-panel-discussion/>

Michael, A. (2016). Ask the chefs: What is the role of social media in scholarly publishing?' Retrieved from

<https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2016/07/28/ask-the-chefs-what-is-the-role-of-social-media-in-scholarly-publishing/>

Mulvaney, I. (2016). eLife introduces Continuum, a new open-source tool for publishing. Retrieved from <https://elifesciences.org/elife-news/elife-introduces-continuum-new-open-source-tool-publishing>

Oliver, G. & Harvey, R. (2016). *Digital curation*. 2nd ed. Chicago: ALA.

Open Scholar. (2015). Developing the first Open Peer Review Module for Institutional Repositories. Retrieved from

<http://www.openscholar.org.uk/developing-the-first-open-peer-review-module-for-institutional-repositories/>

Searle, S. (2016). A response to ALIA's consultation on journal publishing.

Retrieved from <http://www.samsearle.net/2016/03/a-response-to-alia-consultation-on.html>

Sherratt, T. (2016). Comment on ALIA journal publishing. Retrieved from

<https://gist.github.com/wragge/0e60134a3641b078dc3d>

Strasser, C. (2016). Preprints: The bigger picture. Retrieved from

<https://thewinnower.com/papers/5010-preprints-the-bigger-picture>

Van Noorden, R. (2016). Social-sciences preprint server snapped up by publishing giant Elsevier. Retrieved from <http://www.nature.com/news/social-sciences-preprint-server-snapped-up-by-publishing-giant-elsevier-1.19932>

Willinsky, J. (2016). Sci-Hub: research piracy and the public good. Retrieved from <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/blog/sci-hub-research-piracy-and-public-good>