

# NISO Alternative Assessment Potential Action Items



Potential Action Items						
	Very important	Important	Moderately important	Of little importance	Unimportant	Rating Count
1. Develop specific definitions for alternative assessment metrics.	<b>54.3% (63)</b>	33.6% (39)	8.6% (10)	0.9% (1)	2.6% (3)	116
2. Agree on proper usage of the term "Altmetrics," or on using a different term.	<b>32.8% (38)</b>	30.2% (35)	21.6% (25)	12.1% (14)	3.4% (4)	116
3. Define subcategories for alternative assessment metrics, as needed.	16.2% (18)	<b>39.6% (44)</b>	36.9% (41)	4.5% (5)	2.7% (3)	111
4. Identify research output types that are applicable to the use of metrics.	35.1% (40)	<b>44.7% (51)</b>	14.9% (17)	2.6% (3)	2.6% (3)	114
5. Define relationships between different research outputs and develop metrics for this aggregated model.	24.8% (28)	<b>39.8% (45)</b>	30.1% (34)	3.5% (4)	1.8% (2)	113
6. Define appropriate metrics and calculation methodologies for specific output types, such as software, datasets, or performances.	37.7% (43)	<b>40.4% (46)</b>	20.2% (23)	0.0% (0)	1.8% (2)	114
7. Agree on main use cases for alternative assessment metrics and develop a needs-assessment based on those use cases.	25.6% (30)	<b>35.9% (42)</b>	29.9% (35)	6.0% (7)	2.6% (3)	117
8. Develop statement about role of alternative assessment metrics in research evaluation.	<b>34.2% (39)</b>	32.5% (37)	20.2% (23)	8.8% (10)	4.4% (5)	114
9. Identify specific scenarios for the use of altmetrics in research evaluation (e.g., research data, social impact) and what gaps exist in data collection around these	32.8% (38)	<b>36.2% (42)</b>	20.7% (24)	7.8% (9)	2.6% (3)	116

scenarios.						
10. Promote and facilitate use of persistent identifiers in scholarly communications.	<b>59.5% (69)</b>	23.3% (27)	12.1% (14)	1.7% (2)	3.4% (4)	116
11. Research issues surrounding the reproducibility of metrics across providers.	29.3% (34)	<b>41.4% (48)</b>	21.6% (25)	6.9% (8)	0.9% (1)	116
12. Develop strategies to improve data quality through normalization of source data across providers.	<b>41.7% (48)</b>	39.1% (45)	13.0% (15)	4.3% (5)	1.7% (2)	115
13. Explore creation of standardized APIs or download or exchange formats to facilitate data gathering.	32.8% (38)	<b>39.7% (46)</b>	20.7% (24)	3.4% (4)	3.4% (4)	116
14. Develop strategies to increase trust, e.g., openly available data, audits, or a clearinghouse.	32.2% (37)	<b>33.9% (39)</b>	26.1% (30)	6.1% (7)	1.7% (2)	115
15. Study potential strategies for defining and identifying systematic gaming.	15.8% (18)	28.9% (33)	<b>36.8% (42)</b>	14.0% (16)	4.4% (5)	114
16. Identify best practices for grouping and aggregating multiple data sources.	22.8% (26)	<b>37.7% (43)</b>	31.6% (36)	5.3% (6)	2.6% (3)	114
17. Identify best practices for grouping and aggregation by journal, author, institution, and funder.	22.4% (26)	<b>37.1% (43)</b>	29.3% (34)	6.9% (8)	4.3% (5)	116
18. Define and promote the use of contributorship roles.	11.3% (13)	28.7% (33)	<b>35.7% (41)</b>	21.7% (25)	2.6% (3)	115
19. Establish a context and normalization strategy over time, by discipline, country, etc.	14.2% (16)	29.2% (33)	<b>35.4% (40)</b>	16.8% (19)	4.4% (5)	113
20. Describe how the main use cases apply to and are valuable to the different stakeholder groups.	16.4% (19)	<b>34.5% (40)</b>	30.2% (35)	13.8% (16)	5.2% (6)	116
21. Identify best practices for identifying contributor categories (e.g., scholars vs. general public).	14.9% (17)	24.6% (28)	<b>38.6% (44)</b>	16.7% (19)	5.3% (6)	114

22. Identify organizations to include in further discussions.	15.9% (18)	<b>34.5% (39)</b>	32.7% (37)	14.2% (16)	2.7% (3)	113
23. Identify existing standards that need to be applied in the context of further discussions.	22.4% (26)	<b>42.2% (49)</b>	24.1% (28)	9.5% (11)	1.7% (2)	116
24. Identify and prioritize further activities.	26.3% (30)	<b>36.0% (41)</b>	21.9% (25)	11.4% (13)	4.4% (5)	114
25. Clarify researcher strategy (e.g., driven by researcher uptake vs. mandates by funders and institutions).	16.7% (19)	<b>32.5% (37)</b>	29.8% (34)	14.9% (17)	6.1% (7)	114
<b>answered question</b>						<b>118</b>
<b>skipped question</b>						<b>0</b>

# NISO Alternative Assessment Potential Action Items



**Potential Action Items: Please rank at least five of the following potential action items in priority order with 1 being highest priority and higher numbers indicating lower priority.**

	1st Priority	2nd Priority	3rd Priority	4th Priority	5th Priority	Rating Average	Rating Count
1. Develop specific definitions for alternative assessment metrics.	<b>55.6% (30)</b>	20.4% (11)	1.9% (1)	11.1% (6)	11.1% (6)	2.02	54
2. Agree on proper usage of the term "Altmetrics," or on using a different term.	26.7% (8)	<b>43.3% (13)</b>	13.3% (4)	3.3% (1)	13.3% (4)	2.33	30
3. Define subcategories for alternative assessment metrics, as needed.	0.0% (0)	36.4% (4)	<b>45.5% (5)</b>	9.1% (1)	9.1% (1)	2.91	11
4. Identify research output types that are applicable to the use of metrics.	16.7% (7)	<b>31.0% (13)</b>	26.2% (11)	19.0% (8)	7.1% (3)	2.69	42
5. Define relationships between different research outputs and develop metrics for this aggregated model.	16.7% (3)	16.7% (3)	<b>27.8% (5)</b>	16.7% (3)	22.2% (4)	3.11	18
6. Define appropriate metrics and calculation methodologies for specific output types, such as software, datasets, or performances.	21.4% (9)	14.3% (6)	23.8% (10)	<b>31.0% (13)</b>	9.5% (4)	2.93	42
7. Agree on main use cases for alternative assessment metrics and develop a needs-assessment based on those use cases.	24.0% (6)	4.0% (1)	16.0% (4)	20.0% (5)	<b>36.0% (9)</b>	3.40	25
8. Develop statement about role of alternative assessment metrics in research evaluation.	13.0% (3)	13.0% (3)	<b>26.1% (6)</b>	21.7% (5)	<b>26.1% (6)</b>	3.35	23
9. Identify specific scenarios for the use of altmetrics in research evaluation (e.g., research data, social impact) and what dabs exist	17.4% (4)	13.0% (3)	<b>30.4% (7)</b>	26.1% (6)	13.0% (3)	3.04	23

in data collection around these scenarios.							
10. Promote and facilitate use of persistent identifiers in scholarly communications.	<b>24.4% (10)</b>	19.5% (8)	17.1% (7)	14.6% (6)	<b>24.4% (10)</b>	2.95	41
11. Research issues surrounding the reproducibility of metrics across providers.	11.8% (2)	<b>35.3% (6)</b>	29.4% (5)	17.6% (3)	5.9% (1)	2.71	17
12. Develop strategies to improve data quality through normalization of source data across providers.	<b>21.4% (6)</b>	<b>21.4% (6)</b>	<b>21.4% (6)</b>	17.9% (5)	17.9% (5)	2.89	28
13. Explore creation of standardized APIs or download or exchange formats to facilitate data gathering.	3.8% (1)	26.9% (7)	19.2% (5)	19.2% (5)	<b>30.8% (8)</b>	3.46	26
14. Develop strategies to increase trust, e.g., openly available data, audits, or a clearinghouse.	0.0% (0)	11.1% (2)	<b>33.3% (6)</b>	27.8% (5)	27.8% (5)	3.72	18
15. Study potential strategies for defining and identifying systematic gaming.	10.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	20.0% (2)	<b>40.0% (4)</b>	30.0% (3)	3.80	10
16. Identify best practices for grouping and aggregating multiple data sources.	14.3% (2)	7.1% (1)	14.3% (2)	28.6% (4)	<b>35.7% (5)</b>	3.64	14
17. Identify best practices for grouping and aggregation by journal, author, institution, and funder.	0.0% (0)	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	<b>42.9% (3)</b>	28.6% (2)	3.86	7
18. Define and promote the use of contributorship roles.	0.0% (0)	40.0% (2)	<b>60.0% (3)</b>	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	2.60	5
19. Establish a context and normalization strategy over time, by discipline, country, etc.	25.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	25.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	<b>50.0% (2)</b>	3.50	4
20. Describe how the main use cases apply to and are valuable to the different stakeholder groups.	0.0% (0)	9.1% (1)	18.2% (2)	<b>36.4% (4)</b>	<b>36.4% (4)</b>	4.00	11
21. Identify best practices for identifying contributor categories (e.g., scholars vs. general public).	0.0% (0)	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	<b>66.7% (4)</b>	0.0% (0)	3.50	6

22. Identify organizations to include in further discussions.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	<b>100.0% (1)</b>	0.0% (0)	4.00	1
23. Identify existing standards that need to be applied in the context of further discussions.	<b>33.3% (2)</b>	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	<b>33.3% (2)</b>	<b>33.3% (2)</b>	3.33	6
24. Identify and prioritize further activities.	0.0% (0)	33.3% (2)	0.0% (0)	16.7% (1)	<b>50.0% (3)</b>	3.83	6
25. Clarify researcher strategy (e.g., driven by researcher uptake vs. mandates by funders and institutions).	12.5% (1)	0.0% (0)	25.0% (2)	12.5% (1)	<b>50.0% (4)</b>	3.88	8
<b>answered question</b>							<b>96</b>
<b>skipped question</b>							<b>22</b>

# NISO Alternative Assessment Potential Action Items



Further comments are very welcome!

**Response  
Count**

14

**answered question**

**14**

**skipped question**

**104**





**Page 2, Q1. Further comments are very welcome!**

1	Thank you for your efforts of this important work!	Aug 29, 2014 11:12 AM
2	I believe that one of the major stumbling blocks regarding wider use of research metrics is a lack of practical examples of where their use has really made a difference - it tends to be perceived as too theoretical and distant. Hence my prioritizing the use case-type areas above.	Aug 26, 2014 12:20 PM
3	Excellent initiative! I would like to join the steering committee on behalf of Springer.	Aug 26, 2014 8:28 AM
4	There is demand at my institution for metrics other than simple "counts" of hits on social media, blogs, etc.	Aug 25, 2014 6:45 AM
5	Investigate the role of altmetrics for institutions. We at an institutional level find it hard to know what to do when researchers start to use different models. What should we do at top level?	Aug 25, 2014 2:09 AM
6	I listed the scholarly communication identifiers aspect as important. However, while reading the white paper, it became clear that some of the potential action items expand beyond altmetrics to scholarly communication more generally. It seems like there is a divide in the 25 potential action items between things that address altmetrics and things that address how we want scholarly metrics to work in general. I am wondering if it might be better to separate these out or to ensure that other organizations with similar goals regarding identifiers are brought in. The two are linked, but it could be that these are two different groups with overlapping agendas. My second comment is about how I ranked the 25 items in Q1. It's not that I don't think data quality and best practices for use are unimportant. I believe that the other aspects of altmetrics must be addressed before building a system of best practices for the data -- namely, we need to know what types of research are applicable, improve the use of identifiers, link the current work to the body of standards literature that already exists, and determine who is actually going to drive this change. These things will have a deep impact on the data quality priorities and best practices finessing that may happen in the future.	Aug 21, 2014 2:03 PM
7	It is important to consider whether there is a special relationship between altmetrics and open access and if so, along what guidelines such relationship develops. In addition, it is worth analyzing synergies and(or complementarity with "traditional" metrics and what role each should have in the new landscape. Ethics is a factor to rank high in the debate so that the future model will not be gamified easily. There is a need for an international consensus in scientific assessment exercises and the development of open metrics and tools. Last but not least, the roles of commercial providers should be clear within the new landscape from the outset, inasmuch as the role of funders and research performing organizations.	Aug 18, 2014 3:20 AM
8	Glad NISO is getting involved in altmetrics -- it's a very important, high growth area.	Aug 15, 2014 9:34 AM
9	I think it's critical that we can start to define rules about data processing etc here as with people comparing these metrics from different sources it will be impossible to be able to rely on them for any meaningful analysis due to differences in data collection and processing.	Aug 15, 2014 4:05 AM

**Page 2, Q1. Further comments are very welcome!**

10	Developing standards is critical in this area since we are relying more and more on social media to convey scholarly interest and research. Since the COUNTER definitions are interpreted differently among vendors, I am hopeful that NISO will be able to nail down some hard and fast criteria that goes beyond what COUNTER is supposed to do. I believe that Altmetrics will give us a more consistent measure of use.	Aug 12, 2014 7:43 AM
11	I had a hard time understanding what all of these choices meant. However, it was easy for me to pick the top three priorities from my perspective. Thank you for doing this!	Aug 12, 2014 6:40 AM
12	I think, and many persons think, we are in the very early stage to settle the issue of altmetrics. We have to help people develop (or reinvent) the system of scholarly communication itself with various types of research outputs and media (beyond scholarly journals), with suitable identifiers. I believe real implementation of altmetrics would come later.	Aug 11, 2014 5:48 PM
13	There are certain statements above that seem either synonymous with, or co-dependent with, other statements, so prioritizing from this particular list is difficult.	Aug 11, 2014 2:54 PM
14	Include facts on correlation between citations and altmetric counts (latter by category).	Aug 11, 2014 11:17 AM