Dear Judges of the Stanford Prize of Innovation for Research Libraries (SPIRL),

It is with great pleasure that the National Library of the Netherlands hereby nominates the Library of the Radboud University of Nijmegen for the SPIRL because of the highly innovative service for academia they built in 2013: the Quality Open Access Market www.qoam.eu

Quality Open Access Market (QOAM) is a public web site on which members of the academic community can deliver quality judgments about scientific journals. QOAM also mentions the publication fees of a journal if available. By the combination of quality and price a market arises, the Quality Open Access Market.

First and for all, QOAM aims at authors who want to publish their article in open access (both in open access and in hybrid journals) in a high quality journal and for a reasonable price. Then there is the library community. In the subscription period libraries were invaluable to academia when building up high quality collections. The Big Deals with their take-it-or-leave-it approach seemed to make this capacity redundant. QOAM enables libraries to apply this competence anew in the open access world by publishing Journal Score Cards and give journals (editors and publishers) feedback on how to improve. Last but not least, QOAM makes the world of academic publishing transparent to policy makers, journalists, and the public at large.

As QOAM will be operating in a nascent market, both its journal quality indicator and the information about pricing are in their infancy and may need further development. But one has to start somewhere. At this point, mainly Dutch academics and librarians are involved, but the first German institute has already joined QOAM (Leibzig) through EduGAIN, and many more have expressed their interest. Furthermore, the publishers of hybrid journals like Springer, Sage, Royal Society of Chemistry, De Gruyter and Brill have asked to add these to the list of QOAM journals,
which shows an emerging interest from the publishers side as well.

QOAM will of course only be successful if it becomes a fully international service for all intended clientele as mentioned above. The National Library of the Netherlands thinks that winning the highly prestigious Stanford Prize of Innovation for Research Libraries would help accelerate the familiarity of QOAM worldwide, and therefore would help restore the market place in academic publishing in the complicated transition towards Open Access.

Yours sincerely,

Drs. J.S.M. Savenije
Director General
National Library of the Netherlands
Quality Open Access Market – www.qoam.eu

Were it necessary ten, or even five years ago, to advocate the case of Open Access, today this would be preaching to the choir in the academic community. The most telling illustration is the Position Statement\textsuperscript{1} of Science Europe, published in April 2013. The umbrella organization of national financiers of research in Europe once again expounds the necessity of open access, in both a scientific and societal sense, on behalf of all its members.

The question why open access has not yet become a reality in spite of this is an easily answerable one. The traditional business model of the major academic publishers is based upon the exploitation of copy rights. This model is far more profitable than the open access model, which presupposes a service-driven market. The established publishing industry has, until now, managed to successfully oppose any changes to this system of monetization. But developments like those in Britain, where publishing in open access was ruled mandatory last year by law, and the letter that state secretary Sander Dekker addressed to the House of Representatives of the Netherlands in November 2013, which detailed similar plans, have caused a paradigm shift even among publishers: as of late, and out of necessity, they have started judging open access more positively, provided that their income is not affected negatively by it.

A worrying development in the open access market is the emergence of predatory journals. The publishers of such journals do collect compensation for a publication, but neglect to provide the corresponding quality control through peer review. The existence of these publishers has created the perception that open access publications are of lower quality. This perception is incorrect; there is an abundance of open access journals for which peer review is a chief focus. But there is certainly a need for an instrument to test the quality of a journal. The Library of the Radboud University of Nijmegen, with the help of many others in the Netherlands, built such an instrument:

Quality of service matched against price

Quality Open Access Market (QOAM) is a public web site on which members of the academic community can deliver quality judgments about scientific journals. They do this by using a survey form, the Journal Score Card – JSC, a crowd sourced instrument to determine the quality of journals in the emerging market of Open Access publishing. QOAM also mentions the publication fees of a journal if available. By the combination of quality and price a market arises, the Quality Open Access Market. QOAM focuses on the scientific community, in particular on authors who are looking for a good journal to publish their open access article for a competitive price.

When scientific and scholarly publishing is no longer seen as copyright exploitation but as a service, as is the case in the OA paradigm, there is a need for a market where quality of the service can be matched against price. So, once the Journal Score Card was developed, it was a natural step to create a place where information about actual journal

\textsuperscript{1}

prices, that is publication fees, was available as well. The idea of the Quality Open Access Market – QOAM - was born. As QOAM will be operating in a nascent market, both its journal quality indicator and the information about pricing are in their infancy and may need further development. But one has to start somewhere.

**Journal Score Cards**

In QOAM quality of a journal is determined by the academic community itself via so called Journal Score Cards. A Journal Score Card is a questionnaire resulting in subscores for five critical aspects of a journal. Four of them – Editorial information, Peer review, Governance and Process - are based on the journal’s website. The fifth – Valuation – is a reality check, preferably based on experience with the submission of an article to the journal. The lowest subscore of the four web site related aspects is called the **Base Score** of the journal. The subscore of the fifth aspect is called the **Valuation score** of the journal.

QOAM offers members of the academic community the opportunity to publish a Journal Score Card for one or more of the OA and hybrid journals in QOAM’s scoring section. This section includes all journals in Ullrichs, therefor also all DOAJ journals. At the time of this submission, it also included all more than 200 hybrid journals of Brill Publishers, 150 ones of Sage and more that 1500 of Springer. Although there may be afterthoughts about hybrid journals (see FAQ “Why are so called hybrid journals also included in QOAM?”), from an author-centric point of view they may simply be prestigious journals in which one can publish articles in open access as well.

**What exactly is a Journal Score Card?**

A Journal Score Card (JSC) is a questionnaire on five relevant journal aspects. Four of them – Editorial information, Peer review, Governance and Process - are based on the journal’s website. The fifth – Valuation – is a reality check, preferably based on experience with the submission of an article to the journal. Every aspect has some bullets and each bullet can be rated from 1 to 5. The average of these ratings is called the subscore for this aspect. The lowest subscore of the four web site related aspects is called the **Base Score** of the journal. The subscore of the fifth aspect is called the **Valuation Score** of the journal.

**How are JSCs used in QOAM?**

In QOAM journals are ranked by default in order of their Base Score. So, a journal at the top of the list, i.e. with a high Base Score, has a web site that addresses all the journal aspects adequately. On the other hand, a journal with a low Base Score has at least one weak aspect, but may still be strong in other respects. In order to climb on the list a journal must address its weakest aspect.

Next to the Base score the Valuation score of a journal is shown. This score reflects an appraisal of the journal, preferably based on a real submission. If this experience is lacking, circumstantial information may do and a free text box gives room for additional comments. NB Price information is only asked for when it is based on submission experience. In QOAM it is possible to limit a search to submission based Journal Score Cards only. We are working on a more layered system in order to give everybody that may score JSC’s the possibility to add price information, for example when it has been found on the website of the journal.

QOAM has the option to filter journals per title key word, ISSN, publisher, discipline and language. Filtering per discipline enables to take the varied recognition of different aspects over disciplines into account. E.g. if speed of publication is less important in a specific
discipline all journals in this discipline will produce a low subscore for the aspect ‘process’, which might be their Base Score. In a general search this would result in a place at the bottom of the ranking. Within their own discipline the other aspects are more profiling.

On top of that, every academic author can decide for herself which aspects she deems most relevant. Per journal all aspect subscores are produced.

**Who may publish JSCs in QOAM?**

Members of the academic community with a Higher Education (HE) institutional account can select open access and hybrid journals from QOAM’s scoring section. Then QOAM offers the opportunity to publish a Journal Score Card for one or more of the selected journals. Per person only one JSC may be published for a specific journal. In case several people publish a JSC for the same journal the averaged subscores will be attributed to the journal. Thus QOAM is crowd sourced in a controlled way.

Every JSC is presented in QOAM for a period of a year. Authors can edit their published JSC at any moment, e.g. in order to reflect new developments of the journal. Updated Journal Score Cards will be dealt with as newly published ones. Thus QOAM is kept up to date.

A year after its publication a JSC expires and will be archived. It no longer plays a role in QOAM but its author will keep access to it via the Profile section of QOAM. A month before a JSC will be archived its author will be notified of the upcoming expiration and will be invited to update their JSC (provided they are still a member of the academic community.) Thus QOAM keeps in touch with people who committed themselves by publishing a JSC.

The Journal Score Card as a format will be evaluated periodically and possibly adapted to new insights. However, changes will not be abrupt and draft versions will be circulated for comment prior to installation. As JSCs are archived after a year the migration period in which ‘old’ and ‘new’ subscores sit together lasts a year at most. Effectively the migration period could be shorter because everybody may edit their JSC any time. Thus, the JSC evolves organically.

**A brief history**

For long, SURF (one of the founders of QOAM) has been convinced that in the OA paradigm, next to price quality is a critical issue. For established journals the Journal Impact Factor, though controversial, is used as a proxy for quality but for young journals there is no such quality indicator whatsoever. This is a specific handicap for young OA journals whereas young subscription journals are often just included in Big Deal packages. The outcomes of the EC-project SOAP confirmed a growing urgency to address the quality issue for OA journals (later alarmingly demonstrated by the emergence of predatory journals and John Bohannon’s article ‘Who is Afraid of Peer Review?’)

As early as 2009 SURF took the initiative to investigate the feasibility of an accreditation system for young OA journals. The idea was embraced by the European Commission but rejected by SURF’s OpenAIRE project partners (who stuck to the Green Road to OA). Publishers and funders reacted expectantly. SURF left this approach after all and, in hindsight, it might have been too ambitious.

In autumn 2011 a new endeavour was started, this time aiming at tools that would enable a crowd sourced solution. For that purpose two indicators were prototyped: an Editorial Board Indicator, a metric for the scientific impact of the editorial board, and a Transparency
Indicator, checking the transparency of the article admission process. Both indicators were presented, and the second one even tested, at an international expert colloquium in Rotterdam, October 2012.

**For whom is QOAM useful?**

First and for all, QOAM aims at authors who want to publish their article in open access in a high quality journal and for a reasonable price. Then there is the library community. In the subscription period libraries were invaluable to academia when building up high quality collections. The Big Deals with their take-it-or-leave-it approach seemed to make this capacity redundant. QOAM enables libraries to apply this competence anew in the open access world by publishing Journal Score Cards and give journals (editors and publishers) feedback on how to improve. Last but not least, QOAM makes the world of academic publishing transparent to policy makers, journalists, and the public at large. Therefore, QOAM is a public website. But academics have to log in with their institutional account for publishing a Journal Score Card (to avoid misuse) or if they want to check if their institution has bargained a good publication price (because of non-disclosure clauses of publishers).

**Sustainability of QOAM**

The success of QOAM depends completely on the willingness of academics and librarians to engage in it by scoring JSC’s and thereby contribute to the mapping of the quality of hybrid and open access journals. Now that the website is built and up and running, the largest investment (in time) will have to come from within academia itself. We have been contacted by The Knowledge Exchange to discuss how these partners of SURF can help other countries apart from the Netherlands join QOAM, namely in Finland, Denmark, Germany and the United Kingdom through respectively the CSC – IT Center, DEFF, DFG and Jisc. We expect to role out QOAM in the next couple of months to more countries by adding universities through EduGain, which interconnects identity federations around the world, simplifying access to content, services and resources for the global research and education community. This will enable staff of many more institutes to simply log in to the scoring section of QOAM via their institutional account.

Last but not least, we have already seen interest from publishers in the last couple of months, who are eager to have their hybrid journals included in QAOM: we included those of Brill publishers (200+), SAGE publishers (150+) and Springer (1500+), and we expect more to come. We have also noticed that these publishers are asking their editorial boards to score JSCs.

The initial costs have been covered by various partners in the Netherlands (SURF, NWO, CWTS, KNAW, Radboud University) and three university libraries (Radboud, Eindhoven and Wageningen) have offered to technically support the website from now on.
Published mission statement of nominated institution: Radboud University Nijmegen is a student-oriented scientific research university. Research at Radboud University explicitly and conscientiously contributes to expanding the limits of knowledge in the interests of Society as a whole. The University Library’s priority areas are the development of the digital library and the creation of Open Access services for the university.

Principal players (staff, consultants), with brief biographical statements:

Natalia Grygierczyk is director of Radboud University Library. She leads the transition to digital library services and is responsible for Radboud University’s Open Access programme. As a member of the national Dutch Open Access Working Group she is involved in many OA initiatives in co-operation with the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences and the National Library of the Netherlands. She is also member of the Dutch Library Policy Group on Innovation of Knowledge Infrastructure and a member of LIBER’s Working Group on Scientific Information Infrastructure.

Maurice Vanderfeesten is a former project coordinator / manager from SURF. A pioneer who’s main focus lies in the innovation of the scientific knowledge infrastructure. He is creative, curious and is able to see new opportunities to connect ideas, solutions and people. Currently he works at TU Delft on Research Data. In QOAM he provides advice on the web-service’s interface, interaction design, connection between other systems, and the software development process.

Saskia de Vries is an academic publisher. She is the director of Sampan – academia & publishing, that she founded in 2012 ago after running Amsterdam University Press as its first director for 20 years, and helping Leiden University Press start up in 2006. She coordinated the EU project Open Access Publishing in European Networks (www.oapen.org) between 2008 and 2011 and thus became an expert on Open Access publishing. She works with universities, libraries, science funding agencies and academies/cs on innovation in publishing, especially in the transition to Open Access.

Leo Waaijers has a long-term commitment to Open Access developments, first as the University Librarian of Delft University of Technology (1988) and later in a corresponding post at Wageningen University & Research Centre (2001). He concluded his career as the manager of the SURF Platform ICT and Research where he managed the national DARE programme (2004-2008). In 2008 he won the SPARC Europe Award for Outstanding Achievements in Scholarly Communications. After his retirement he advised about the Open Access infrastructure of the Irish universities (together with Maurice Vanderfeesten) and in 2009 he evaluated the Swedish national Open Access programme "Open Access.se" (together with Hanne Marie Kvaerndrup). Regularly, he is conducting studies for Knowledge Exchange, together with Maurits van der Graaf. Currently he is the supervisor of Quality Open Access Market.
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Score Card

49th Parallel: an Interdisciplinary Journal of North America

ISSN: 1753-5794
Publisher: University of Birmingham
Language: English
Disciplines: History

Go to website

Aims, scope, and expected readership of the journal are clearly specified on the journal’s website
- 1: Absent  2: Poor  3: Moderate  4: Good  5: Excellent

The names and affiliations of members of the editorial board are listed on the website
- 1: Absent  2: Poor  3: Moderate  4: Good  5: Excellent

Editorial correspondence and reviewer’s comments are published alongside papers
- 1: Absent  2: Poor  3: Moderate  4: Good  5: Excellent

The role of members of the editorial board is explicated on the website including who will make final decisions about article acceptance (e.g., editor, associate/action editor)
- 1: Absent  2: Poor  3: Moderate  4: Good  5: Excellent

Base Score for this journal: 0

Finished your rating? Publish your Score Card
JSC Peer review

Score Card

49th Parallel: an Interdisciplinary Journal of North America

ISSN: 1753-6794
Publisher: University of Birmingham
Language: English
Disciplines: History

Go to website

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Card</th>
<th>Editorial info</th>
<th>Peer review</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Valuation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base Score for this journal: 0

Finished your rating? Publish your Score Card

The website indicates whether all submissions are sent out for review
- 1: Absent
- 2: Poor
- 3: Moderate
- 4: Good
- 5: Excellent

Criteria used by reviewers to rate submissions are specified on the website
- 1: Absent
- 2: Poor
- 3: Moderate
- 4: Good
- 5: Excellent

The website indicates if authors have a say in suggesting names of (non-)desired reviewers
- 1: Absent
- 2: Poor
- 3: Moderate
- 4: Good
- 5: Excellent

The journal website allows ratings of papers and post-publication commentaries by the community
- 1: Absent
- 2: Poor
- 3: Moderate
- 4: Good
- 5: Excellent
Score Card

49th Parallel: an Interdisciplinary Journal of North America

ISSN: 1753-6794
Publisher: University of Birmingham
Language: English
Disciplines: History

The journal (publisher) has clear guidelines concerning sharing and availability of replication data for verification purposes
- 1: Absent
- 2: Poor
- 3: Moderate
- 4: Good
- 5: Excellent

The journal (publisher) makes copies of published articles available in trusted third-party repositories (e.g., PubMed Central) immediately upon publication
- 1: Absent
- 2: Poor
- 3: Moderate
- 4: Good
- 5: Excellent

The journal (publisher) takes care of inclusion of its articles in relevant indexing services
- 1: Absent
- 2: Poor
- 3: Moderate
- 4: Good
- 5: Excellent

Journal's website highlights issues of publication ethics (e.g., plagiarism, retraction policy), conflicts of interest, and (if applicable) codes of conduct for research in life sciences and social sciences
- 1: Absent
- 2: Poor
- 3: Moderate
- 4: Good
- 5: Excellent
Score Card

49th Parallel: an Interdisciplinary Journal of North America

ISSN: 1753-6794
Publisher: University of Birmingham
Language: English
Disciplines: History

Go to website

Base Score for this journal: 0

Finished your rating? Publish your Score Card

The website provides a track & trace service enabling authors to follow the status of their submission (e.g., under review)
- 1: Absent
- 2: Poor
- 3: Moderate
- 4: Good
- 5: Excellent

Published papers include information on dates of original submission and acceptance
- 1: Absent
- 2: Poor
- 3: Moderate
- 4: Good
- 5: Excellent

The journal (publisher) provides the articles with a Digital Object Identifier
- 1: Absent
- 2: Poor
- 3: Moderate
- 4: Good
- 5: Excellent

The journal discloses the past (yearly) number of submissions, publications, and rejection rates
- 1: Absent
- 2: Poor
- 3: Moderate
- 4: Good
- 5: Excellent
Geacht bestuur Stichting Pica,

Op 21 november jl. heeft de plenaire vergadering van UKB het initiatief QOAM besproken, het platform waarin open access tijdschriften een kwaliteitsoordeel toegekend kunnen krijgen door leden van de internationale academische gemeenschap. Het initiatief is goed ontvangen in de vergadering, en er zijn vervolgacties afgesproken. UKB ondersteunt dit initiatief dan ook van harte.

Met vriendelijke groet,

Anja Smit,
Voorzitter UKB

Translation.
UKB discussed QOAM in their plenary meeting of November 21st; QOAM being a platform that enables members of the international academic community to express their quality evaluation of open access journals. The initiative was welcomed and follow up actions were agreed upon. UKB supports this initiative wholeheartedly.

Signed,
Anja Smit,
Chair UKB.

NB UKB is the Dutch consortium of the thirteen university libraries and the National Library of the Netherlands.
Dear Bas,

The SURF foundation has recently discussed the QOAM initiative both with the formal representatives of its members, i.e. the Dutch Higher Education institutions, and the eResearch Board. All people concerned are enthusiastic about QOAM. Together with our members and board SURF believes that QOAM can contribute to the transfer from publication in subscription journals to publication in open access journals as well as to higher quality open access journals. SURF therefore happily supports QOAM.

Kind regards,

Marc Dupuis
eResearch programme manager
**Jelte Wicherts** is the lead developer of the questionnaire in QAOM that measures the transparency of the peer-review process that may be seen as an indicator of the quality of peer-review.

He has just submitted an article on this subject at PloS one:

**Peer review quality and the transparency of the peer-review process in (open access) scientific journals.**

**Jelte M. Wicherts.**

**Background:** With the increase of author-paid (gold) Open Access (OA) journals, there is a growing need for authors, funders, publishers, and academic institutions to assure quality of the peer-review process in academic journals. Here we propose that transparency of the peer-review process may be seen as an indicator of the quality of peer-review, and develop and validate a questionnaire that can be used by different stakeholders to assess transparency of the peer-review process.

**Methods and Findings:** Based on several professional editorial guidelines and best practices in peer-review, we developed a 15-item questionnaire to rate transparency of the peer-review process. In Study 1, a random sample of 231 authors of papers in 92 traditional (non-OA) journals in five main scientific fields rated transparency. Authors’ ratings of the quality of peer-reviews were positively associated with assessed transparency but were unrelated to journal’s impact factors. Study 2 involved twenty experts on OA publishing who assessed the transparency of established (non-OA) journals, OA journals categorized as being published by potential predatory publishers, and OA journals from the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ). Results show high reliability across items (Alpha = .91) and sufficient reliability across raters (ICC = .74). Ratings differentiated the three types of journals well. In Study 3, academic librarians rated a random sample of 140 DOAJ journals and another 51 journals that had received a hoax paper to test the quality of peer-review (Bohannon, 2013). Ratings of transparency predicted whether the flawed paper was accepted or rejected for publication.

**Conclusions:** Assessments of transparency of the peer-review process predict authors’ assessments of the quality of peer-review and predict whether journals accepted a flawed manuscript. Journals with substandard peer-review often have peer-review systems lacking in transparency.

**Biography.**

**Jelte Wicherts** (1976; PhD 2007, cum laude) is an associate professor at the Department of Methodology and Statistics of Tilburg University. He has authored over 50 peer-reviewed publications on a wide range of topics including group differences in IQ, the nature of g, psychometrics, the Flynn Effect, behavior genetics, advanced factor analysis, measurement invariance, stereotype threat, publication bias, meta-analysis, errors with statistics, fraud, and data sharing in various peer-reviewed journals, such as Intelligence, Learning and Individual Differences, Proceedings of the Royal Society:B, Psychological Review, PLoS ONE, Behavior Research Methods, Personality and Individual Differences,
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, American Psychologist, Perspectives on Psychological Science, Structural Equation Modelling, Psychological Methods, and Nature. He has received various grants and awards, including the ISIR Templeton Best Student paper, the Early Career Award from Division 5 of the American Psychological Association, and large VENI and VIDI research grants from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). He chairs the social science section of the Netherlands Statistical Society and sits in the Editorial Boards of Intelligence (since 2007), Psychological Methods (since 2013), and the Journal of Health Psychology (since 2012). He is also an academic editor at PLoS ONE and the founding editor of the Journal of Open Psychology Data.
Functional specifications and requirements of QOAM

Functional requirements running the webservice
- Windows based web-server with ASP capabilities.
- Programming language ASP .NET
- Open Source available on: https://github.com/QOAM/qoam
  - Third party database/system credentials are not part of the public source code
- Connections with third party systems
  - Journal databases: Current connection with Ullrich’s. Future connections possible with others e.g. DOAJ, Zetoc, NCC, WorldCat, etc.
  - Authentication & Authorization: OAuth; Current connection to SURFconext. Future connections to EDUgain.

Functional requirements using the webservice
- Any web browser
- Any OS
- Any Device
- Responsive design

Functional specifications
- Search for Open Access journals
  - Current Faceted Search / Filter capabilities: Journal Title, Publisher, ISSN, Scientific field, Base score minimum, Valuation score minimum, Scores entered by authors who submitted an article.
  - Future Faceted search / Filter capabilities: Price (APC) entered by visitors, Price (APC) entered by publishers, Price (APC) entered by institutional library employees (package deals).
- Scoring Open Access journals
  - Only after logging in.
- View details of Open Access journals
  - More price details and procedures for specific institutions (package deals) available, only after logging in.
- View details of people who posted a Score card.
  - More contact details available, only after logging in.
- View personal profile page
  - Only after logging in.
  - Edit saved and previous Score Cards.