Who's Afraid of Repository Rankings? How to Define and Measure Institutional Repository Success
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1) This is a bear. Hopefully your head won’t hurt too much at the end of this workshop.

2) My son told me a riddle before sending me on my way yesterday. I want to share it with you.

3) I think this story is very apropos when you look at the IR repository ranking landscape
WORKSHOP OUTLINE
1. Review landscape
2. Define IR success
3. Decide what to count
4. Decide how to count
5. Set goals
6. Starting point
What do you know about out there?
1. New one
2. Launched in 2014
3. Started in Germany but hope was to roll-out world-wide
4. Looking at the elements it seems like a check-list of features
5. Is success for you defined by having CRIS integration? Do you define it by the deployment of the feature set of the application that you’ve chosen?
6. (Click) read
7. “Look at what is available!”
8. (Click) read
9. “attributes” like somehow they just know what attributes work best
10. Is this the kind of rankings you had in mind?
1) Do you know what DDDD stand for?
2) self-archiving is the goal here
3) Is this what success looks like to you?

http://utas.libguides.com/content.php?pid=396394&sid=354966
1) Integrity: DSpace pointed out that it was over counting IRs version x-y because of faceted search
2) Didn’t care
3) (click) “Not a ranking?”
4) Promote good practices
   1) (click) URL Structure
   2) Meta data only 10% or less
   3) No CRIS system
   4) Repositories without author profiles combining article-level metrics will be excluded
5) Google Scholar visibility only
6) If you do move in “right direction
   1) Explored moving but issue: Google Scholar said “don’t do that”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Portal</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
<th>Links</th>
<th>Scholar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Smithsonian/NASA Astrophysics Data</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CERN Document Server</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NASA Technical Reports Server</td>
<td></td>
<td>278</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HAL, Sciences de l'Homme et de la Société</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HAL, Institut National de Recherche en Informatique et en Automatique, Archives Ouvertes</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Repositório Digital Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul LAME</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Digital CISC</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Universidade de São Paulo Biblioteca</td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Universidade de São Paulo</td>
<td></td>
<td>386</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MIT Institutional Repository</td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Katholieke Universiteit Leuven Linear</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Universiteit van Amsterdam</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona</td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Universidade do Minho</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Urbana</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) Doesn’t count downloads
2) Counts Google Scholar but what if you are doing more than scholarship? Narrow focus (pet peeve of mine)
3)
1. Ask them
2. I think our community is looking for rankings/benchmarking to help tell us what is working.
3. I think rankings should tell us what the marketplace thinks, in this case what faculty, administrators, students, librarians and readers think.
4. That isn’t the way these rankings are set up.
5. Rather, they pre-determine what “works” and measure how well IR are doing?
6. These rankings are more like certifications: it tells us what an expert thinks or what a supplier thinks.
7. Thinking back to the riddle that I opened with: is this the horse you had in your head? Is this the bored you were thinking about?
1. These approaches don’t really align with what we are seeing in the community
2. Rankings of attributes?
3. Rankings on self archiving?
4. Rankings on Isidro’s good practices like URL structure..really?
1. Before we can measure success we need to try to define it so that we agree on the goals for the repository
2. What are your goals?
3. Hand out sheet
4. Explain where it comes from
5. Divide into groups
6. Read the other definitions and pull the ideas you like into yours
7. Think about what is missing (its 7 years old after all)
8. Write one definition per group on your sheet
9. Talk about them together
10. Rank the definitions
Plot on a sheet as a table
1. What do you count today?
2. What have you heard others count?
3. What would you like to count?
4. What do you see on how I am organizing these?
5. Insert the headers and the row titles
6. Talk about which are simple/hard
7. Go back and find breadth, depth and demand from the best definition of success
8. Once we’ve selected simple numbers what would we imagine success looks like?
   Absolute, relative to self, relative to others
9. When would you want which?
10. What do you care most about breadth, depth, demand? Why?
    Could it change? What does it depend upon?
1) First thing we learned...even with the statistics in hand comparing IR programs can be really tricky.
2) It can be tricky because not everyone started their journey at the same time.
3) Some programs caught the morning bus are celebrating their 10th anniversary and others are just getting started.
4) We’ve tried to diminish the impact of timing by benchmarking one year at a time
1) It can also be tricky because IR programs have vastly different goals or destinations if you will, this is especially true if you are just considering their goals for a year.

2) For example, a program building a showcase of undergraduate research will measure success differently than a program to solve data management grant requirements.

3) We’ve tried to do just that by proposing three separate benchmarking factors. IR managers can apply the one or two that applies best.

4) Or don’t use any of them if none fit your goals.
We like benchmarking with percentiles because it allows us to keep performance numbers private. When we use medians rather than averages, because medians are not impacted by extreme highs or extreme lows. Illustrate my point of averages vs. percentiles: Richard Poynder, the blogger who runs “open and shut,” asked me about meta data vs. full text of the community. 71% full text when you take the average. It is 94% full text when you ask what is the IR program at the 50% percentile doing.
1) We chosen to consider three factors:
   1) Growth
   1) Breadth
   2) Demand

2) We chose these after looking at what you cared most about measuring. We looked at the annual reports that many of your produce every year to report on your year.
1) Now let’s dive in. We will start with the easiest one: growth factor
2) Calculates the number of full-text objects added during the calendar year.
2) Removed variable first year because of migrations, it didn’t have a big impact on percentiles
3) Who has the advantage here?
   1) ETD batch upload in second year
   3) Special collection migration
What do you think of the number 1,981
1) Are you surprised? Not surprised?
2) Does it feel about right?
3) Useful?
4) Does it fit with your goals?

Who won’t care about measuring themselves this way?
1) Programs building out an OER program
2) Programs building a data management program
2) Calculates the number of series (collections) getting new content
   1) Measures the reach of the IR and the level of engagement.
   2) This is about campus buy-in or how widely the services the IR are offering are being used
   3) it measure adoption, usage or and activity
   4) excludes first year.
3) Who has the advantage here?
   1) established programs w/distributed workflows (yes)
   2) Smaller move faster
   3) larger institutions with more departments long term
1) What do you think of the number?
   1) Are you surprised? Not surprised?
   2) Does it feel about right?
   2) Useful?
   3) Does it fit your goals
2) Who wouldn’t care about measuring themselves this way?

3) Someone focused on going deep and focusing on serving a few departments with great needs rather than targeting lots of units at the same time
4) For example, if you are focused on showcasing the 25 anniversary of your nursing program. You are going to be more interested in growth over breadth.
1) This one is my favorite
2) Calculates the average number of downloads per object for the calendar year.
   1) Measures the interest and impact of the content.
3) Who has the advantage here?
   1) Original scholarship (journals, conference proceedings, books, ETDs, thesis)
   2) Sites narrowly focused upon scholarship
1) What do you think of the number?
   1) Are you surprised? Not surprised?
   2) Does it feel about right?
   3) Useful

1) Who wouldn’t care about measuring themselves this way?
   1) Someone adding a large image collection or video collection. (We aren’t counting page views and even if we did, there are a lot less of those)
   2) Someone loading lots of primary research, administrative reports or large data sets.
1) Here you see all three factors together
2) This is a real example. Are they successful?
3) What if I told you that this is a repository that has been live for 8 years and spent 2014 starting a new publishing program.
4) The point is that the question can only be answered once you know the plans for the year.

Final thoughts:
1) Not a single school managed to break the 80% percentile across the board...hard to do. Why? Because the factors offset each other. If you go deep, you probably aren't going wide. If you are expanding your mission beyond scholarship and growing a lot, you might see your demand factor take a hit.
2) I'd look at this as three possible ways to benchmark your year and decide which view makes the most sense based upon your goals for the year. Everyone has different plans but regardless of your plans one of these three approaches should provide some insight into how you are performing.
3) If you are up in the 80% percentile in the category that matters most to you then you probably are doing something right. You should tell the rest of us what you are doing so that we can all learn from you.
4) If you decide a benchmark does map well to your annual goal and your performance isn’t what you’d hoped for, we’d love to help you figure out how to get there. We can also connect you with others who have had more success.
5) This is only also a benchmark for a single year. What insights could you get if you had last year’s results to compare yourself against?
Are you interested in using this self-evaluation tool?

Would you like to try this out with us? Write to outreach@bepress.com.