COST ACTION CA15137

Conceptual Frameworks of SSH Research Evaluation

WG1 State of the Art

↗ Our **tasks** in the action are (always for SSH research)

  ↗ T1: collect, review, conduct studies on knowledge production and dissemination (incl. quality perceptions)

  ↗ T2: Analyse quality representations and assumptions in peer review

  ↗ T3: Observe national regulations, recommendations, procedures for research evaluation and their effects on knowledge production

  ↗ T4: Overview quality criteria based on scholars' notions of quality

WG1 State of the Art

↗ Our main **deliverables** are:

↗ D1: List of projects on quality perceptions in participating countries ✅

↗ D2: Overview of research evaluation practices 🚧

↗ D3: Overview of peer review practices 🚧

↗ D4: Scientific papers and presentations ✅ 🚧

↗ D5: Training School: Evaluation procedures and impact on careers ✅

↗ D6: Recommendations for better adapted criteria and indicators 📝 To Do:

↗ D7: Bibliography 🚧

↗ D8: Policy Briefs ✅ 🚧

WG1: Where we are

↗ Training School: Successful school with 29 trainees and 7 teachers from 14 countries

↗ Evaluation systems: 18 country reports, 3 countries close

↗ Peer Review: first draft ready

↗ Presentations: scientific and policy-oriented presentations, workshop

↗ Publications: Article, proceedings, special issue

↗ I don't know all presentations and publications, please communicate them to: Jon Holm

↗ New Communication Team: Jon Holm, Gemma Derrick, Jadranka Stojanovski, Albena Vutsova

WG1: Presentations

Presentations at scientific conferences:

⬀ Lendák-Kabók, K., & Mignot-Gérard, S. (2018). Geopolitika és a társadalmi nem: fiatal kutatók narratívái Európában [Geopolitics and gender: narratives of early career investigators in Europe]. 14. Nyelv, ideológia, média konferencia, 2018 [14. Language, Ideology, Media Conference]. 21.-22. September 2018, Szeged, Hungary.

⬀ Lendák-Kabók, K., & Mignot-Gérard, S. (2018). Engendering East and West: narratives of early career investigators across Europe. 10thEuropean Conference on Gender Equality in Higher Education. 20.–22. August 2018, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.

⬀ Ochsner, M., Kulczycki, E., & Gedutis, A. (2018). The Diversity of European Research Evaluation Systems. In Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Science and Technology Indicators, Leiden(pp. 1234-1241). Leiden: Leiden University.

⬀ Ochsner, M., Dokmanović, M., Kulczycki, E., Gedutis, A., & Hug, S. E. (2018). The Usefulness of Quality Criteria for Research Policy. 23rd Nordic Workshop on Bibliometrics and Research Policy, University of Borås, Sweden, 8.11.2018

⬀ Girkontaitė, A., & Ochsner, M. (2018). „Bet aš jau du metus nesipublikavau" arba Ko nemato vertintojai? [„But I haven't published for two years" or What is not visible for evaluators?]. X-oji nacionalinė Lietuvos sociologų draugijos konferencija [10thNational Conference of the Lithuanian Sociological Society], 12-13 October 2018, Klaipėda, Lithuania.

⬀ Ochsner, M. (2018). Bottom-up approaches to research assessment. Conference "Impact factor, h-Index and university rankings: sense and no(n)sense of quantifying science", 21. November 2018, Swiss Academy of Sciences, Bern, Switzerland.

WG1: Presentations

Presentations as dissemination activities:

➚ Ochsner, M. (2018). Chair of the World-Café-Workshop "Research Evaluation and Research Assessment" at the INTE-Meeting and Workshop by the LERU "Nurturing a Culture of Responsible Research in the Era of Open Science", 24.-25 May 2018, University of Geneva, Switzerland.

➚ Ochsner, M. (2018). Was ist Forschungsqualität und kann man sie messen? Nutzen und Gefahren von Bibliometrie, Szientometrie und Altmetrics in Bezug auf wissenschaftliche Karrieren [What is research quality and how can we measure it? Usefulness and risks of bibliometrics, scientometrics and altmetrics with regard to scientific careers]. Workshop at the Doctoral Programme at the Institute of Art History at the University of Zurich, 18. May 2018, Zurich, Switzerland.

➚ Ochsner, M. (2018). Conceptual frameworks for evaluation and the role of impact. Humanities in Practice Workshop "Studying the humanities through policy concepts: quality, excellence and impact", 6. December 2018, Bergen, Norway.

➚ Vanholsbeeck, M., Demetriou, Th., Girkontaite, A., Istenic Starcic, A., Keiski, V., Kulczycki, E., Papanastasiou, E., Pölöen, J., Proppe, H., & Vehovec, M. (2018). Senior academics as key negotiators in the implementation of impact policies in the social sciences and humanities. Pathways to Impact from SSH research:Austrian EU Council Presidency Conference on "Impact of Social Sciences and Humanities for a European Research Agenda – Valuation of SSH in mission-oriented research", Vienna, 28-29. November 2018.

WG1: Publications

Publications:

- Giménez-Toledo, E., Mañana-Rodríguez, J., Engels, T. C. E., Guns, R., Kulczycki, E., Ochsner, M., Pölönen, J., Sivertsen, G., & Zuccala, A. A. (2019). Taking scholarly books into account, part II: a comparison of 19 European countries in evaluation and funding. *Scientometrics*, 118(1), 233–251. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2956-7

- Ochsner, M. (2019). Open Access vision and implementation on international and Swiss levels. A critical appraisal of "Plan S" and "Swissuniversities Action Plan". Confidential report to the Swiss Science Council. 9. January 2019.

- Ochsner, M., Kulczycki, E., & Gedutis, A. (2018). The Diversity of European Research Evaluation Systems. In *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Science and Technology Indicators, Leiden* (pp. 1234-1241). Leiden: Leiden University.

- Vanholsbeeck, M., Demetriou, Th., Girkontaite, A., Istenic Starcic, A., Keiski, V., Kulczycki, E., Papanastasiou, E., Pölöen, J., Proppe, H., & Vehovec, M. (under review). Senior academics as key negotiators in the implementation of impact policies in the social sciences and humanities. *fteval: Journal for Research and Technology Policy Evaluation*.

- Zuccala, A. A., Giménez-Toledo, E., & Peruginelli, G. (2018). Scholarly books and their evaluation context in the social sciences and humanities. *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, 70(6), 586-591.

WG1: Timeline

➹ 15 April: Deadline for Abstracts to RESSH

 ➹ Please submit as many WG1 papers as possible, we need to showcase what we do and this sets us some deadlines

➹ May: Reports on Evaluation Systems and Peer Review due

➹ Valencia (September):

 ➹ Discussion of Policy Paper on Criteria

 ➹ Further the work on Evaluation Systems and Peer Review to publications

➹ Winter: Finalise Policy Paper and present our final results from all projects

WG1 meeting Thursday 7th, 13:30

↗ Welcome by Michael Ochsner (5 min)

↗ Report of STSM on Ethics by Aldis Gedutis (ca 5 min)

↗ Peer review (75 min)

↗ Presentation by Liutauras on new project about opposition (5 min)

↗ Work in Groups (30 min)

    ↗ SG4: Criteria

    ↗ SG5: Attitudes

    ↗ Any other project that needs a meeting

WG1 meeting Friday 8th, 14:00

↗ Evaluation Systems (75 min)

   ↗ Presentation of state of the art of country reports

   ↗ Discussion about contents of report and publications

   ↗ How to improve reports: comparability, form

   ↗ Papers

↗ Role of Learned Societies by Janne Pölönen (20 min)

↗ Open Access, Input by Michael and Marc Vanholsbeeck (20 min)

↗ Closing (5 min)

STSM on Ethics of Research Evaluation

↗ by Aldis Gedutis and Maria Teresa Biagetti: see separate presentation

Peer Review

↗ Draft of report ready

↗ Goals for today:

    ↗ Discuss some issues of the current version

    ↗ Decisions on some open questions

    ↗ Agree on a timeline

Peer Review: Some Open Questions

↗ For whom is the report, who is the target reader; Nina describes the target reader in the beginning of the draft of the report; we should reflect and agree on this description as this will have impact on the following chapters.

↗ We have been aware from the beginning that there are two 'traps' for this report. One is to 'dilute' the topic of peer review in the theme of evaluation in general; ENRESSH is about evaluation and peer review is one method to do that but we need to reflect how to find a right balance. The second difficulty is to find a balance between issues which are relevant for peer review in general and for the ones which are specifically important for SSH.

↗ Agree on the overall style of the report and whether and how to put forward which work is an ENRESSH result and when it is a review of work published outside ENRESSH. We should cover both if this is justified by our aim but we have to find a way to do it.

↗ How to organize a friendly peer review of the chapters to help each other to be more complete regarding the literature etc.; assign some reviewers to the chapters.

Peer Review: Practical Issues

↗ a structure and formatting of chapters,

↗ authorship

↗ preparing bibliography,

↗ how technically we continue our work and,

↗ a revised timeline.

Peer Review: Overview on Current Structure

1. General framework: state of the art of peer review in Europe

2. Issues and discussions specific to and most relevant for SSH peer review

3. Guidelines, procedures and formal criteria versus their practical application

4. Current challenges for peer reviewing: towards more open and gender-sensitive peer reviewing practices in the SSH

• Bibliography

Peer Review: Details of Structure

1. General framework: the state-of-the-art of peer review in Europe

1.a. The aim and scope of the report

1.b. Peer Review in SSH: In need of development?

2. Issues and discussions specific to and most relevant for SSH peer review

2.a. Evaluation criteria and methodology

2.b. Evaluation of impact

2.c. Issue of language of research and publications (national vs English) and internationalisation

Peer Review: Details of Structure

3. Guidelines, procedures and formal criteria versus their practical application

3.a. Review of recent documentation: guidelines, recommendations, evaluation and publication policies

3.b. Ambiguity in identification of scholarly peer-reviewed publications

3.c. Place, role and significance of peer review in SSH National Evaluation Systems

3.d. Practices of peer review in the SSH

- A systematic review of peer review criteria for journal manuscripts and grant applications

- Peer review and other manuscript selection processes for books in the SSH

Peer Review: Details of Structure

4. Current challenges for peer reviewing: towards more open and gender-sensitive peer reviewing practices in the SSH

4.a. Gender in research and innovation: a more gendered perspective on peer reviewing

4.b. Peer review in the context of the new modes of knowledge production, dissemination and evaluation

4.c. The Open Science turn: towards more open peer reviewing practices

4.d. The perception of senior sociologists towards peer reviewing in the context of the current changes in the SSH assessment systems

WG1 meeting Friday 8th, 14:00

↗ Evaluation Systems (75 min)

　　↗　Presentation of state of the art of country reports

　　↗　Discussion about contents of report and publications

　　↗　How to improve reports: comparability, form

　　↗　Papers

↗ Role of Learned Societies by Janne Pölönen (20 min)

↗ Open Access, Input by Michael and Marc Vanholsbeeck (20 min)

↗ Closing (5 min)

Evaluation Systems

- ⬈ 18 reports ready
  - ⬈ BA, BE_WA, CH, CY, CZ, FI, FR, IE, IL, IT, LT, LV, NO, PL, PT, RO, SI, UK
  - ⬈ ME, BG, HR to follow, maybe some more?

- ⬈ 190 pages!

- ⬈ Unique information not available anywhere else

First Findings

↗ National Evaluation as such is not a meaningful concept

  ↗ While used often, there is no evidence for a real "national evaluation procedure"

↗ National Evaluation systems are complex

↗ Aspects differ between different procedures in the same country

  ↗ Goal: describe the system of the different procedures

Some Issues with Reports

➚ The insights of the first draft in Ljubljana changed the grid a bit. Not all reports followed the new idea:

  ➚ We decided to include all procedures and describe them individually
  ➚ Not all countries having a national grant funder listed its evaluation practices

➚ Tables are filled in non-informatively: "Procedure 1" instead of its name, only filled the fields where information was available but left the information of the example, when no information was available

➚ Diversity in detail of information

➚ Non-National systems not described

Next Steps

↗ Decide on how we publicize our results

  ↗ What is the role of the report?

  ↗ What is the role of a potential book?

↗ Analysing:

  ↗ Nevertheless: start the conceptual work and the analysis with the reports that are already in the form: BE_WA, CH, FI, IT, LV, NO, PL, also CZ, LT are quite finalised

  ↗ To develop strategies and categories later applied to all reports

  ↗ Rather analyse when we have more comparable material

Topics

- Introduction: Michael and Ginevra

- Perception vs. Regulation: Michael

- Trends (change): Emanuel

- Data use: Emanuel

- Performance-based vs. Formative: Janne

- Role of Societal Impact: Gemma

- Open Science: Gemma

- SSH Adaptations: Ondrej

Discussion

- ↗ Book vs Report
  - ↗ Suggestion
    - ↗ Report: principal findings plus the table → May
    - ↗ Book: full country reports and analysis → Autumn
  - ↗ Presentations at RESSH

- ↗ Non-national systems
  - ↗ How to provide enough information

The role of Learned Societies

↗ Janne Pölönen: see separate presentation

Open Access

↗ Michael Ochsner

  ↗ Open Access/Open Data/Open Science are important themes

    ↗ Risks and opportunities (e.g. Impact: while OA books can reach out widely, small publishers usually strong in popularisation books might come under preassure)

  ↗ Link to evaluation

  ↗ Plan S has concequences on evaluation as it is a policy paper

  ↗ National adaptations also can include measures affecting evaluation

  ↗ Swiss case: More elaborated version

    ↗ ENRESSH-work was used as input in discussion about OA Action Plans in the Swiss Science Council

Open Access

- ↗ Marc Vanholsbeeck
  - ↗ Plan S and more generally Open Access (EU) policies
    - ↗ the choice of (one or complementary) pathway(s) to Open Access is not only a technology driven one, but has strong policy and epistemological implications on the kind of research production-dissemination-evaluation ecosystem. Choices of OA business models may as well foster the Majors' quasi-monopoly on the scholarly market, as open more innovative and "bibliodiverse" solutions
  - ↗ OA is also directly linked to societal impact in the SSH
    - ↗ example of the OA book of Lafleur and Mardouk (Université de Liège) about the perception of migrations, on the basis of ESSurvey data
    - ↗ Received a lot of attentions and downloads
  - ↗ Importance of fostering SSH participation into Open Research Data infrastructures
    - ↗ Joining Infrastructures like the EOSC (European Open Science Cloud) is important, since sometimes data are thought within the infrastructure community in a very "STEM / Big data" perspective, without enough consideration for SSH issues