

Master Evaluation Criteria Workbook

Resource Name	
URL	
Resource Provider	
Resource Provider Contact	
Brief Description	
Cost (from tab 8) - indicate if price has been negotiated	

Referred by (UC individual or group)	
Date of referral	
Current UC investment status	
Current UC interest	

Individual Criteria Ratings - Fill in your ratings from criteria tabs 1-7.	Pass	Fail	N/A	
1. Baseline UC Libraries Principles				
	Low	Medium	High	N/A
2. Potential for Transformative Influence				
3. Community Engagement or Endorsement				
4. UC Long-Term Affordability				
5. Operational Sustainability				
6. Disclosure & Transparency				
7. Protection from Financial Risk				

Assign an overall rating based on your assessment of how well this resource meets the individual criteria above.	Low	Medium	High	

Evaluator Recommendation to Fund	Yes	No		

Comments	
-----------------	--

	Name	Location in this document
Top 3 Highlights		
Top 3 Concerns		

Date of Evaluation	
Lead Evaluator	
Lead Evaluator email	
Others consulted	

Baseline UC Libraries Principles	<i>Responsibility for certifying the baseline quality and desirability of the product or service under review rests with the committee or entity that requested the STAR review. After the baseline criteria are met STAR assesses the transformative nature of the product or service.</i>			
<i>Context: The group requesting the STAR review was reminded of the principles outlined in the Collection Development Framework and the UC Libraries E-Book Value Statement (February 2013) and asked to use their professional judgement to certify the baseline quality of the resource proposed for review. Below are their comments about quality.</i>				
(1.3) Name of Group Attesting to Quality	Their Assessment Notes			
Relevant Resources to Consult				
CDL Collection Development Framework	https://cdlib.org/services/collections/licensed/policy/collection-development-framework/			
UC Libraries E-Book Value Statement (February 2013)	https://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/cdc/docs/UC_Libraries_E-Book_Value_Statement.pdf			
CDL Licensing Toolkit	Licensing Toolkit – California Digital Library (cdlib.org)			

Potential for Transformative Influence	Definition: A resource can be considered to be transformative when it is developed principally to a) remove or reduce impediments to the flow and availability of knowledge, especially of quality-filtered (peer-reviewed) material; or b) create a more sustainable set of economic transactions among the stakeholders, especially of payments from content consumers and originators to publishers for access to content. Ideally both of these attributes should be present, but if only one is present then it would have to be judged to be significant. This is a key criterion.					
Instructions: Rate the resource on the applicable Standard Investment Indicators below. Add as many indicators as needed under Additional Indicators. Ratings are based on the available information at the time of review and the evaluator's best judgement for each indicator. Provide an overall rating for this criterion once the indicators have been evaluated; note that not all indicators are given equal weight in this overall rating.						
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <p>Low</p> <p>Medium</p> <p>High</p> <p>Provisional</p> <p>Unknown/NA</p> </div> <div style="text-align: right; width: 60%;"> <p>Comments</p> </div> </div>						
(2.4) Overall criterion rating						
Standard investment indicators						
<i>I. Overall Transformative Influence</i>						
(2.7) Current iteration of the initiative represents a shift from a more traditional model						
(2.8) Current iteration of the initiative represents increased scholar or society control over a previous model						
<i>II. Copyright and Downstream Reuse</i>						
(2.10) Uses Creative Commons license (CC-BY preferred for text and CC0 preferred for data)						
(2.11) Allows rightsholders to retain copyright						
<i>III. Knowledge Production & Technologies</i>						
(2.13) Redistributes production costs and payments (e.g. from reader pays to producer pays)						
(2.14) Leverages technology for efficiencies in production and timely distribution						
(2.15) Open architecture that supports and integrates well with evolving modes of scholarly communication (e.g. text mining, open APIs)						
(2.16) Provides unique content that was not previously available (e.g.: posters, negative results, data publications, multimedia formats, etc.)						
(2.17) Supports vulnerable content that is important to UC or academia as a whole, which would otherwise be at risk						
(2.18) Does the product integrate with ORCID or other author/contributor identifier systems?						
(2.19) Minimizes existing UC support requirements (e.g. technical, instructional, administrative)						
<i>IV. User Access Barriers</i>						
(2.21) Removes access barriers; opens access to more potential users and uses						
(2.22) Provides alternative methods for sharing research results (e.g. social networking tools that facilitate commenting and discussion)						
(2.23) Data sets supporting article findings or digital objects are archived, assigned a DOI, made available via an appropriate license that encourages reuse (Creative Commons Zero preferred, Creative Commons BY acceptable but not optimal), and linked from the article or object.						

<p style="text-align: center;">Potential for Transformative Influence</p>	<p><i>Definition: A resource can be considered to be transformative when it is developed principally to a) remove or reduce impediments to the flow and availability of knowledge, especially of quality-filtered (peer-reviewed) material; or b) create a more sustainable set of economic transactions among the stakeholders, especially of payments from content consumers and originators to publishers for access to content. Ideally both of these attributes should be present, but if only one is present then it would have to be judged to be significant. This is a key criterion.</i></p>					
<p>Instructions: Rate the resource on the applicable Standard Investment Indicators below. Add as many indicators as needed under Additional Indicators. Ratings are based on the available information at the time of review and the evaluator's best judgement for each indicator. Provide an overall rating for this criterion once the indicators have been evaluated; note that not all indicators are given equal weight in this overall rating.</p>						
	Low	Medium	High	Provisional	Unknown/NA	Comments
(2.24) Facilitates identification of author contributorship in a machine readable way, e.g. through employing the CRediT taxonomy and/or implementing code for contributorship badges						
(2.25) Actively facilitates discovery and use of resources.						
V. Market Influence						
(2.27) Provides direct competition to expensive comparable resources						
(2.27) Includes strategies for libraries to influence scholarly communication ventures (e.g. sponsored forums between researchers, library professionals, and publishers to discuss new ways of disseminating research results seamlessly)						
(2.29) Evidence that new startups or existing traditional publishers have adopted a similar transformative model						
(2.30) Provides additional value to the scholarly community beyond that of the core resource or initiative (e.g. setting aside a portion of revenue to engage in other transformative activities; publishing source code to allow replication of operations; supporting other society operations)						
VI. Impact Metrics						
(2.32) Provides alternative means of signaling value in scholarly output that reduce reliance on more traditional measures (e.g.; open peer review, alt-metrics, etc.)						
(2.33) Value measures such as impact factor, eigenfactor, and usage/download statistics indicate the resource has demonstrated substantial exposure and adoption.						
VII. External Endorsement/Support						
(2.35) Has key forms of endorsement by respected advocacy organizations beyond direct engagement by scholars e.g. SPARC, ARL, ICOLC						
Additional investment indicators						

Community Engagement or Endorsement	<i>Note: preference will be given to ventures and resources in which scholars and scholarly organizations are closely involved.</i>					
<p>Instructions: Rate the resource on the applicable Standard Investment Indicators below. Add as many indicators as needed under Additional Indicators. Ratings are based on the available information at the time of review and the evaluator's best judgement for each indicator. Provide an overall rating for this criterion once the indicators have been evaluated; note that not all indicators are given equal weight in this overall rating.</p>						
	Low	Medium	High	Provisional	Unknown/NA	Comments
(3.4) Overall criterion rating						
Standard investment indicators						
(3.6) Investment by peer institutions.						
(3.7) Provides an opportunity for UC to actively partner with other national or global institutions in transforming research output to OA.						
(3.8) Administrative or leadership roles (e.g. board members, editors, etc.) are filled by scholars or other academic community members who are influential in their field.						
(3.9) Represents a grassroots resource or service designed and/or managed by practitioners (e.g. scholar-led)						
(3.10) UC specific: presence of UC academic community in administrative or leadership roles.						
(3.11) Healthy level of scholarly output relative to the field.						
(3.12) UC specific: Sustained or increasing uptake and/or usage by UC scholars.						
Additional investment indicators						

UC Long-term Affordability	<i>Definition: Utilizes mechanisms for managing costs and generating revenue that ensure long-term affordability for UC libraries and other institutional stakeholders while generating operating revenue to the publisher that is sufficient for ongoing viability.</i>					
Instructions: Rate the resource on the applicable Standard Investment Indicators below. Add as many indicators as needed under Additional Indicators. Ratings are based on the available information at the time of review and the evaluator's best judgement for each indicator. Provide an overall rating for this criterion once the indicators have been evaluated; note that not all indicators are given equal weight in this overall rating.						
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; transform: rotate(-45deg); display: inline-block;">Low</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; transform: rotate(-45deg); display: inline-block;">Medium</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; transform: rotate(-45deg); display: inline-block;">High</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; transform: rotate(-45deg); display: inline-block;">Provisional</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; transform: rotate(-45deg); display: inline-block;">Unknown/NA</div> </div> <div style="text-align: right; width: 50%;"> Comments </div> </div>						
(4.4) Overall category rating						
<i>Standard investment indicators</i>						
(4.6) OA publication fees at or below the industry average for the discipline or type of publication						
(4.7) UC specific: additional discounts for fees charged to UC users of the resource						
(4.8) Fees have not increased excessively over time						
(4.9) Cost is reasonable for the value that the resource brings to the scholarly enterprise						
(4.10) Business model lowers costs for participants in the value chain while maintaining the potential for ongoing sustainability						
(4.11) Cost of investment to the Library is less than or does not exceed the cost of a traditional profit-driven or toll-access approach that offers equivalent value or level of service						
(4.12) Can be implemented and sustained in UC's environment without excessive/burdensome barriers (e.g. technical, instructional, or administrative)						
<i>Additional investment indicators</i>						

Operational Sustainability	<i>Definition: The organizational setting, technical infrastructure, and other factors suggest the product/model can endure, and can move from startup to ongoing operational status in a reliable and trustworthy manner. The publishing model is explicit with regards to the duration and nature of its financial support and preferably, seeks self-sustainability. In the case of new initiatives, there exists the potential for future operational sustainability.</i>					
Instructions: Rate the resource on the applicable Standard Investment Indicators below. Add as many indicators as needed under Additional Indicators. Ratings are based on the available information at the time of review and the evaluator's best judgement for each indicator. Provide an overall rating for this criterion once the indicators have been evaluated; note that not all indicators are given equal weight in this overall rating.						
						Comments
Low	Medium	High	Provisional	Unknown/NA		
(5.4) Overall criterion rating						
Standard investment indicators						
(5.6) Business model is designed to cover production and strategic development costs but is not geared toward maximizing profit. Non-profit status may be an indicator, but how both for-profit and non-profit organizations use their revenues should be evaluated and not assumed						
(5.7) Sited with an experienced vendor						
(5.8) Follows industry technical standards						
(5.9) Evidence is available that the resource is financially sound or that it has a plan to work towards being financially sound						
(5.10) Risks related to connections with other business entities (e.g. operational dependence on an outside or secondary body) are limited or controlled						
(5.11) Plans for ongoing business continuity in the case of financial hardship						
(5.12) Resource can be successfully implemented in the UC environment (funding, workflows) without excessive barriers to participation or implementation (e.g. having to distribute vouchers, funding reconciliation with other purchases, pre-paid points system, etc.)						
(5.13) Resource employs methodological and other quality controls that can ensure trustworthiness and reliability of the content or service (e.g. membership in COPE, authenticity verification tools, etc.)						
(5.14) Participation in trusted archives (such as Portico)						
Additional investment indicators						

Disclosure & Transparency

Instructions: Rate the resource on the applicable Standard Investment Indicators below. Add as many indicators as needed under Additional Indicators. Ratings are based on the available information at the time of review and the evaluator's best judgement for each indicator. Provide an overall rating for this criterion once the indicators have been evaluated; note that not all indicators are given equal weight in this overall rating.

	Low	Medium	High	Provisional	Unknown/NA	Comments
(6.4) Overall criterion rating						
Standard investment indicators						
(6.6) Regular disclosure of revenue and operating costs						
(6.7) Documented editorial policies						
(6.8) Vendor does not require non-disclosure statements within licenses or formal agreements; provisions of the agreement may be shared with all interested stakeholders						
(6.9) Provision of reports or information to indicate the impact of the resource on scholarship as a whole (e.g. alternative metrics, use reports)						
(6.10) Provision of reports or information to customers and the public about how much content is supported by different funding methods (e.g. APCs, grants, etc.)						
(6.11) UC specific: availability of institution specific reports of usage (e.g. COUNTER), authorship, etc						
(6.12) Vendor is transparent about what user data they are collecting and how they are collecting it and using it						
Additional investment indicators						

Protection from Financial Risk	<i>Definition: Business model does not expose UC to undue risks in managing its financial obligations.</i>				
<p>Instructions: Rate the resource on the applicable Standard Investment Indicators below. Add as many indicators as needed under Additional Indicators. Ratings are based on the available information at the time of review and the evaluator's best judgement for each indicator. Provide an overall rating for this criterion once the indicators have been evaluated; note that not all indicators are given equal weight in this overall rating.</p>					
					<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; font-size: small;"> Low Medium High Provisional Unknown/NA </div>
(7.4) Overall criterion rating					Comments
Standard investment indicators					
(7.6) Published schedule or plan that shows how fees/investments will be adjusted downward if financial stability improves based on specific measurable criteria. Example: fees will be lowered based on a published schedule of increased number of participants.					
(7.7) Stable fees and/or funding levels.					
(7.8) Adequate warning for and explanation of requests for increased investment levels					
(7.9) Cost control expectations have been honored					
(7.10) If endowment funding or other up-front investments that are amortized over time are involved, guarantees are present that these funds will be returned upon failure of the model.					
(7.11) Formal participation agreement or MOU that clarifies obligations of the parties					
(7.12) Vendor declares no existing encumbrances or issues that could jeopardize ongoing financial support, including business relationships or ownership/subsidiary concerns or constraints.					
(7.13) If initially grant funded, project has become self supporting without adverse financial impact on libraries and other stakeholders.					
(7.14) Perpetual access to purchased content is guaranteed regardless of the life of the platform					
Additional investment indicators					

Cost Information	<i>Use this spreadsheet tab as needed to provide cost information that cannot fit on the Summary sheet. Indicate if cost has been negotiated.</i>

Glossary	<i>Definitions of terms referenced throughout the spreadsheet</i>
Resource	The term "resource" refers to the object of a potential investment that is under review by the STAR Team. This may include content, such as journals or books, or it may include services that support authors or researchers.
Resource Provider	STAR uses this term to refer to the entity that is offering the resource. This could be a vendor or other commercial or noncommercial organization.
Provisional ranking	A selection of the "provisional" ranking means that the resource is too new to have sufficient information available to make a complete assessment on this particular criteria. An example would be criteria 4.8, "Fees have not increased excessively over time": a new resource which has just set a pricing level would not have a track record by which to fully gauge the appropriate low/medium/high response, and a response of "unknown/NA" implies a lack of ability or need to investigate the criteria that is not present. A choice of "provisional" signifies that this is a criteria that may require further investigation in the future. The "provisional" choice shall be accompanied by a ranking of low, medium, or high, but this selection should be interpreted cautiously.
UC Community	All students, staff, and faculty of the University of California campuses (and, where included, the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab and Lawrence Livermore National Lab), including but not limited to: undergraduates, graduate students, postdoctoral researchers, other non-tenured researchers and academics, faculty, teachers, and administrators