Notes from Identifying stakeholders and their values
NISO Altmetrics Initiative Meeting
December 11, 2013

Two types of stakeholders: Stakeholders in the outcomes / stakeholders in the process of making and using the metrics – But the stakeholders often belong to both categories.

University administrators – quantify research output of institutional faculty, prestige across locality/region/etc., attracting funding to their institution, wanting to report upward this type of impact to boards, government, etc. We also want to capture what media are saying about our institutions.

General public – business sector, patients, media, legislators – small business wants to know what to invest in, who to hire, what skills are needed, etc., patients want to know what are the new treatments, separate what is out there within the “noise” --- who to trust, media want to know what topics are hot, trending issues, etc.

Disseminators – commercial and society/association publishers, media – outreach goals, increasing the bottom line so altmetrics could support this by getting more attention and subscriptions for publications, article-processing fees, etc.), reporting for stakeholders that report the needs of researchers in a way that doesn’t conflict with the community, some aggregators choose to curate content and this could affect their decisions, facilitate collaboration among authors and researchers, e.g., faculty services. Demand-driven, patron-driven access issues – maybe altmetrics would affect revenue for these models? Scholarly societies – wanting to know what is happening on their own domains/disciplines.

Libraries – many of the same values as university administrators, interested in outcomes, discovery, acting as open-access publishers, on process side: easy to gather data, getting more comprehensive data, wanting to play a role in this for the institution to increase libraries’ value and relevance on campus.

Funders – Donors, funding agencies, governmental agencies, private philanthropy, nonprofit entities - Wanting to know the impact of work and/or researcher, interested in timing as related to election cycles, reporting cycles. Want to increase their own reputation. Most agencies, even governmental agencies not giving out funding, but perhaps creating or influencing policies, want to get it through their projects’ affects on people, trends occurring in commercialization and research, either basic or as applied or translated out in the real world.
Faculty / researchers – discovery purposes, junior faculty: early indicators of career impact, some want open-access for their own needs and to advance scholarly dissemination, tenure/promotion aspects, and want to take control of prestige a little bit, i.e., “value rests in article itself, not so much the container/journal.” Finding collaborators. Wanting to know what is going on in their disciplines.

Realization expressed: We could create a concept map leading FROM the values TO the pertinent stakeholders, rather than doing it the way we did originally, which was to start with the stakeholders and then talk about each of the stakeholders’ values.

Discussion: With all of these shared values, where is the tension? Do media care more about “buzz” than we do in scholarly / academic realms? Prestige vs. actual public good --- did something really make a difference? Journals vs. article-level – shifting prestige from journal to institution / researcher instead? Will researcher care more about branding themselves?

Question asked: How will altmetrics differentiate among different versions of a work?