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Poster Description:
As publishing models continue to change and evolve, libraries have remained constant in their pursuit of information access. After nearly three decades, academic institutions are still adapting to open access publishing. At a medium-size, private institution, a library working group was formed in order to alleviate rising faculty concerns on predatory OA journals.

In Spring 2015, three librarians formed the Credible Journal Criteria Working Group (CJCWG) in response to faculty inquiries on open access (OA) publishing, particularly, how to evaluate OA journals for quality and credibility. This new project was an exciting opportunity to extend the OA conversations at the local institution. The development of the Journal Evaluation Rubric was an institution-wide collaboration, including feedback and input from the Office of Assessment, faculty from the science and engineering departments and librarians.

This poster presentation will share the process of developing a rubric for evaluating OA journals, findings from the faculty focus group and ideas to implement the rubric in your own institution.
NEW TOOL IN TOWN: IDENTIFYING THE GOOD, THE BAD, AND THE PREDATORY OA JOURNAL

OPEN ACCESS (OA) PUBLISHING
Predatory publishing is an unintentional by-product of the OA movement and a rising concern for scholars. The term refers to those journals that are deceptive and exploit the gold OA model. Librarians play a key role in educating scholars about publishing in a digital environment in the era of predatory publishing.

CHARACTERISTICS OF PREDATORY PUBLISHING
- Fast Peer Review & Publication
- Targeted Spam Emails
- Fake Editorial Board
- Lack of Transparency in Author Fees
- No Clear Review Policy Stated
- Copycat Journal Names
- Contradictions & Inconsistencies
- Amateurish Website

LITERATURE REVIEW
Sources on OA publishing; collection of criteria

CHECKLIST
List of “good”/“bad” indicators

RUBRIC & SCORING SHEET
List of criteria to evaluate OA journals with rationale

ASSESSMENT
Collaboration with Office of Assessment, LMU librarians, and select faculty to validate instrument

Criteria | Rationale
--- | ---
Web search for the journal | Reputation must be credible
Journal name | Journal name is distinguishable
Editorial board | Names & affiliations are accurate
Review process | Policy is clearly stated
Conflicts of interest | Policy is clearly stated
Revenue sources | Transparency in business model
Journal archive | Full-text articles are accessible
Publishing schedule | Schedule is consistent
Author fees | What & how much is the fee

https://lmu.box.com/v/journalevaltool

At Loyola Marymount University, a task force was created to assist faculty in identifying credible and reliable open access journals. Acknowledgements to Marie Kennedy and Shilpa Rele (task force members).

PERCENT OF AGREEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIBRARIANS</th>
<th>FACULTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interrater reliability is substantial agreement

2.59

The overall average score is Good

2.53

The overall average score is Good

TL: DR: Due to research bias & subjectivity of evaluating journals it is important to educate & empower scholars in identifying credible journals.

Nataly Blas, nblas@lmu.edu, Loyola Marymount University

Pilot tests were conducted with 11 LMU librarians & 6 faculty from LMU’s Seaver College of Science and Engineering:
- Faculty & librarians expressed taking longer time evaluating the OA journal than expected
- All participants assigned the journal within the scoring range Good but there were differences in the scores for the various criteria
- Faculty found Revenue Sources & Publisher Information problematic (17% agreement)
- Librarians found Revenue Sources & Journal Name problematic (31% agreement)