Agenda

- Accept the Minutes of the last meeting
- Accept the Directors’ Report for 2020
- Accept the Financial Accounts for 2020
- Looking ahead
- Presentation by John McDonald
- Appoint John McDonald as a new director
- Appoint Anne C. Osterman as director for three more years
- Appoint our auditors
- Over to you...
A note about voting

- When voting you can use the chat, or if you prefer, use the Slido Poll.
- In a new browser, or on your phone please go to Slido [https://www.sli.do/](https://www.sli.do/) and use the code we will display for each agenda item.
Minutes 2020

At the meeting in May 2020 it was resolved to:

• Accept the minutes of the last meeting held in Telford, UK in April 2019
• Accept the Directors’ Report for 2019
• Accept the Financial Accounts for COUNTER Online Metrics for 2019
• Appoint Elisabeth Ling as a director for a further three years
• Appoint Irene Barbers, Jo Lambert and Heather Loehr as directors
• Appoint the firm of A.J.Carter as auditors
Vote to accept minutes
Directors’ Report 2020

This year we have focused on supporting our community in implementing and using the COUNTER Code of Practice.

In doing this, our members have enabled us to reach goals that would otherwise have been impossible.

In 2020 they have maintained the Code of Practice, created training materials and presentations in English and other languages, and built tools which are open to everyone.
Creating our training materials

- The Couperin consortium translated our Friendly Guide for Providers into French and has translated several of our Foundation Classes. Couperin also translated the whole Code of Practice into French.

Creating our training materials and events

• We published the first modules in our Manual for Librarians.

• We published two new Foundation Classes. Class 12 explains the impacts of Covid-19 on usage statistics.

• Experts from the COUNTER Executive Committee gave two virtual workshops in the German language. In the first of these, Irene Barbers and Bernd Oberknapp provided an explanation of the Code of Practice Release 5. In the second, Conni Jung explained how to use Microsoft Excel when analysing COUNTER reports. Conni also collaborated with UKSG to deliver a webinar about COUNTER 5 Reports in Microsoft Excel.
Introduction to COUNTER SUSHI for vendors, librarians, and consortia

- Official SUSHI documentation from the COP5
- Validation Tool (free registration required)
- Technical specifications (Swaggerhub)

Note that because the new policy under R5 is one of continuous maintenance for incremental changes, this document may mention planned changes.

What is COUNTER 5 SUSHI

COUNTER 5 SUSHI is a standard for software developers to use to allow software to automatically retrieve all possible reports for all supported possible time ranges for a given library or consortium. Such a standard is called an “API” and allows the developers to write their programs in whatever language they like. COUNTER 5 SUSHI uses the “client-server” model where the vendor provides a SUSHI-compliant server, and the user runs “client” software to harvest the reports from the server. The client may be anything from a locally installed desktop program to a cloud-based commercial harvesting service that the end customer interacts with via a web environment.

COUNTER_SUSHI is a RESTful interface returning JSON-formatted reports. This allows retrieval of full reports, or of snippets of usage. It also allows usage data to be embedded in other applications.

A SUSHI URL has four basic sections: the base URL of the vendor’s SUSHI server, the particular report being requested, the authentication credentials identifying the particular customer’s account, and report-specific settings such as date range and other report options.

- What does RESTful mean?
- What is JSON?

Taken together, these mean that a properly authenticated user could even retrieve their data without a special client at all, just using a normal web browser, although that is primarily useful for troubleshooting, as the JSON response will not be user-friendly to read.

Melissa Belvadi created our online guide to SUSHI:
https://www.projectcounter.org/counter-sushi/
Building tools that are freely open

- We continue to collaborate with CC-PLUS, an open-source software, community, and administrative tool for usage-statistics management.
- The Release 5 Validation Tool is maintained by Bernd Oberknapp.
- The COUNTER-5-Report-Tool built by Melissa Belvadi and students from UPEI.
• Every year we survey our members, but in 2020, independent consultants undertook an in-depth review via interviews, surveys and focus groups.

• The COUNTER Board, and Executive Committee are addressing the recommendations in the report.

https://www.projectcounter.org/counter-release-5-an-independent-review/
Acceptance of the Directors’ Report
Accept Directors' Report

Start presenting to display the poll results on this slide.
### Financial Report

#### Capital and reserves
- **Member funds**: £156,919

#### Year Ended 31st December 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>140,098</td>
<td>125,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross profit</td>
<td>140,098</td>
<td>125,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>(137,146)</td>
<td>(90,835)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating profit</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>34,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit before taxation</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>34,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax on profit</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit for the financial year and total comprehensive income</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>34,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained earnings at the start of the year</td>
<td>153,967</td>
<td>119,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retained earnings at the end of the year</td>
<td>156,919</td>
<td>153,967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the activities of the company are from continuing operations.
Acceptance of the Accounts for COUNTER Online Metrics for 2020
Accept Financial Report

Start presenting to display the poll results on this slide.
Looking ahead

Our work priorities in 2021 and beyond
Release 5 of the COUNTER Code of Practice is designed for continuous maintenance. This allows for incremental changes that should not require Content Providers to invest in significant developments.

As part of that continuous maintenance process, in late summer 2021 we will publish version 5.0.2 of the Code of Practice.

This version includes corrections and clarifications that will make it easier for publishers and vendors to comply. We will make a full change log available so that the community can easily track the modifications we have made.
Release 5.1

Looking beyond version 5.0.2, the next major release of the COUNTER Code of Practice is in active development and will include more substantive changes around things like Open Access usage metrics.

• First draft for consultation: April 2022.
• Publication in final form: October 2022.
• Effective date: January 2024.
Release 5.1

Areas of focus
Reporting open content

• We have established an Open Access Advisory Group, which will meet for the second time in June.

• We are consulting with publishers about Usage of Open Content Not Attributed to Institutions – our consultation is open until 12 June!

• We are organizing library focus group to determine how useful non-attributed usage might be to the library community.
Improving the audit process

Our Audit Task and Finish Group, which has met four times, considering how to:

- lower barriers to compliance
- build greater trust in COUNTER compliance
- improve transparency in the audit process and results

Our new Registry of Compliant Content Providers will make verifying compliance and obtaining SUSHI details much easier.
Promoting Library Analytics

John McDonald
COUNTER
Annual General Meeting 2021

EBSCO
The problem for libraries was

- No data
- No standards
- No automation
The problem for libraries now

- Still lack robust analytics tools
- Struggle with data acquisition & management
- Low capacity: personnel, expertise, support
- Perform ad-hoc/reactive/episodic analysis
- Potential for invisibility/opaqueness due to inability to harness & report data
- Focus on budget value rather than supporting educational outcomes & institutional mission
• Focus on supporting educational outcomes & institutional mission rather than (just) budget value

• Potential for invisibility/opaqueness due to inability to harness & report data
Library vendors maintain vast amounts of data about users and their access to resources, but many (or most) libraries do not have easy access to that data. For example, if librarians want to understand the ways in which student interactions with library resources connect to student learning and success, they may require a deeper understanding of student use of resources housed in vendor-supplied databases. However, many librarians do not have access to detailed data related to student use of resources and perceive that information to be difficult to obtain. LIILA participants generated a number of actions library vendor partners could take in order to support and participate in the inclusion of library data in learning analytics:

- Cede or share ownership of data with libraries and/or institutions.
- Provide access to data to libraries and/or institutions.
- Develop tools for data capture.
- Experiment with data formats to meet library and institution needs.
- Develop tools for data query.
- Provide dashboards and visualizations to facilitate understanding and use of data.
- Develop tools for data export, transformation, and loading (ETL).
- Instrument data integration with other applications; develop and adopt standards, including interoperability standards.
- Investigate, in cooperation with libraries, data points of significance.
- Define a consistent set of data relevant to student learning and success efforts.
- Develop a common set of best practices for collaborating with library on data and learning analytics.
- Commit to compliance with institutional, local, state, national, and international guidelines and statutes.
Points of Significance

Correlate data with other metrics of user engagement

Integrate new data to produce more robust analyses

Leverage MORE of the standard for deeper insights

Explore opportunities for new metrics of user engagement
Deeper Value Metrics

- Move beyond descriptive statistics
- Put data into context
- Compare data across formats
- Understand the value of usage
• Correlate user engagement metrics
• COUNTER compared to: Link Resolver, Discovery, Authentication
• Build models of usage estimation for new formats or unavailable usage
• Move beyond Annual totals & descriptive statistics
• Challenge assumptions on usage of the standard
Is backfile usage derived from the Unpaywall browser extension representative of all users/all institutions?

Figure 1: Usage by Institution & Year of Publication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Usage (pre-2011)</th>
<th>% of total use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1b</td>
<td>254,886</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1a</td>
<td>198,557</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>145,949</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2b</td>
<td>40,574</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2a</td>
<td>49,264</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative interest in older vs. newer papers

Table 1: Rank order correlations by Journal & Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3440</td>
<td>3440</td>
<td>3440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>3305</td>
<td>3305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>0.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>2924</td>
<td>2924</td>
<td>2924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>0.487</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4299</td>
<td>4299</td>
<td>4299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation coefficient</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>4584</td>
<td>4584</td>
<td>4584</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interest in a journal varies from Y2Y within an institution depending on institutional size and research focus.
Can they “correlate year of publication usage with green OA”?

Table 3: Pre-2011 usage by Broad Subject & Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Humanities</th>
<th>Total Paywalled Articles Not Provided</th>
<th>% of Total use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1b</td>
<td>188,968</td>
<td>65,734</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1a</td>
<td>200,910</td>
<td>43,936</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>194,953</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>132,973</td>
<td>12,946</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>113,065</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2b</td>
<td>23,660</td>
<td>23,712</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>35,655</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2a</td>
<td>31,646</td>
<td>26,644</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>44,104</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Open Access availability by Year of Publication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>2011+ OA %</th>
<th>Pre-2011 OA %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Paywalled Pre-2011 usage by Broad Subject & Institution

Pre-2011 usage varies by size of school & research focus, and OA availability varies by Year of Publication and discipline

*Average OA % for Backfile (<2010) was adapted from research provided by E. Archambault (2020), https://www.science-metrix.com/
New metrics for User Engagement

• Encourage usage of Open Access metrics already within COUNTER
• Leverage metric correlation to uncover/estimate additional metrics around Open Access
• Build & promote metrics for transformative agreements
- Understand the publishing profile of your institution and the open access publishing trends of your authors
- Cost model open access and transformative agreement scenarios based on your institution’s publishing trends and current expenditures (library subscription fees and APCs paid by authors)
- Assess the relevance of a publisher’s portfolio to your students and faculty in terms of citations, publications and usage, to prepare for negotiations
- Evaluate bibliometric data sources and identify methods and tools to normalize and enrich them
- Determine success criteria and monitor the progress of transformative agreements and other open access strategies
- Establish recommendations for metadata requirements associated with open access and transformative agreements with scholarly publishers
- Advocate for improvements in metadata practices within the scholarly publishing community

https://esac-initiative.org/about/data-analytics/esac-data-working-group/
Questions?

EBSCO
Thanks to Oliver

- Oliver Pesch who has been involved with COUNTER since its inception.
- Chair of our Board of Directors for six years.
- Led the development of Release 5
- The R5 Harvester was created by an EBSCO development team led by Oliver.
Appointment of new Director, John McDonald

• Director of Product Management for Analytics & Assessment for EBSCO Information Services, leading the development of products that help libraries and librarians to better understand their users, their usage, and the value of their collections & services.

• Prior to EBSCO, John was the Associate Dean for Collections at the University of Southern California Libraries.

• John’s professional background in higher education and library management spans more than 20 years and his research has focused on collection development and information usage behaviors, with a focus on statistical analysis of data.

• John holds a Bachelor of Science in History and a Master of Science in Library and Information Science from the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
Appoint John McDonald

Start presenting to display the poll results on this slide.
Renewal of Director, Anne C. Osterman

• Anne C. Osterman is Director of the Virtual Library of Virginia (VIVA), the consortium of the 72 nonprofit college and university libraries within the Commonwealth of Virginia.

• She also teaches Applied Managerial Statistics through an online course for the Kogod School of Business at American University. Anne has worked in many capacities in academic libraries, including as head of technical and access services, acquisitions librarian, and research and data services librarian.

• Anne serves on the NISO SUSHI Standing Committee. She has a Master’s degree in Statistics from American University and a Master’s degree in Library Science from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

• She has been a director of COUNTER for three years.
Renew Anne C. Osterman
Appointment of our auditors

Appointment of the firm
A.J.Carter as auditors
Appointment of A.J. Carter
Over to you