On the Current and Future Uses of Quantitative Scientometric Indicators (QSI) in Swiss Higher Education Institutions

Dr. Martin Jaekel[1], Dr. David Johann[2], **Dr. Moritz Mähr**[2], Dr. Rüdiger Mutz[3], Dr. Elena Šimukovič[1]

[1] ZHAW Zurich University of Applied Sciences • [2] ETH Library, ETH Zurich [3] CHESS, University of Zurich •

📋 Overview

The **NAIF** (National Approach for Interoperable repositories and Findable research results) project aims to increase the visibility and findability of Swiss research output.[@naif]

- 📜 **DORA** — Declaration on Research Assessment[@dora]
- 🤝 **CoARA** — Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment[@coara]
- 📊 **Leiden Manifesto** — Best practices for research metrics[@leiden]

Track 1 focuses on the **responsible use of quantitative indicators** for research assessment, aligned with:

This poster presents results from a **workshop with 27 stakeholders** from Swiss Higher Education Institutions, including **Ginny Barbour** (DORA Co-Chair), and a **survey of swissuniversities member libraries**.

🔬 Methods

Workshop Design

- **Participants:** 27 stakeholders from Swiss HEIs, policy makers, and international experts
- **Focus:** Four key questions on QSI implementation and responsible use
- **Case Study:** ETH Zurich's approach to research monitoring

Survey

- **Target:** swissuniversities member libraries
- **Scope:** Current practices, tool importance, and future needs

🎯 Key Findings at a Glance

Aspect	Current State
📈 Framework Adoption	Growing alignment with DORA, CoARA, Leiden
⚠️ Implementation	Struggles translating declarations into practice
🏛️ Assessment Level	Organizational monitoring preferred over individual
📊 Data Quality	Critical prerequisite for meaningful metrics

Acknowledgments

We thank all workshop participants, Ginny Barbour (DORA Co-Chair), and the swissuniversities member libraries for their valuable contributions.

Contact

NAIF Track 1: Responsible use of quantitative indicators

🌐 <eth-library.github.io/naif>

Partner Institutions

❓ Q1: How firmly is QSI embedded?

✅ **Adoption:** Significant momentum to align with DORA, CoARA, Leiden Manifesto

⚠️ **Challenge:** Struggle to translate declarations into appropriate QSI practices

💡 **Core Values:** Indicators must be transparent, contextual, and fair — complement, not replace, expert judgment

❓ Q2: Where are QSI currently used?

🏛️ **Organizational over Individual:** QSI favored for university/departmental monitoring, *not* individual researcher output (ETH Zurich case study)

📊 **Use Cases:**

- 🔬 Research Profiles — Topics & evolution over time
- 🌍 Impact Analysis — Citations by discipline/country
- 🔗 Network Analysis — Collaboration patterns
- 📖 Strategic Initiatives — OA shares, funding sources

❓ Q3: How important are QSI tools?

📊 **Data Quality First:** Metrics often flawed or misapplied — requires multiple sources and rigorous cleaning

🎯 **Context-Based:** Tools only useful when context-based — first understand how users engage, then define QSI

🤝 **Collaboration:** Data specialists + subject experts working together

❓ Q4: Future of responsible QSI?

Four Pillars

	Pillar
🤝	**Expert Collaboration** — Data + subject + methodology specialists
💬	**Dialogue-Based** — Clarify purpose and limitations upfront
🎯	**Context-First** — Build use cases, then define QSI
🌐	**Holistic Scope** — Beyond citations: ORD, Open Science, media

📌 Conclusion & Key Takeaways

The NAIF project will develop **guidelines** for Swiss HEIs applying transparent, context-specific research assessment aligned with international best practices.

#	Takeaway
1	**Start with context**, not indicators
2	**Organizational monitoring** over individual assessment
3	**Data quality** is non-negotiable
4	**Multi-stakeholder dialogue** drives implementation