

Short Term Scientific Missions (STSM) Applications

CA15137

European Network for Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and the Humanities (ENRESSH)

Call Number 4_2, part two
for Grant period 4 (01/05/2019 to 7/04/2020)
implementation from 25th August 2019 to 20th December 2019

What is the purpose of an STSM?

Short Term Scientific Missions (STSM) are aimed at strengthening existing networks and fostering collaborations by facilitating Researchers participating in a given COST Action to visit an institution or laboratory **in another Participating COST Country / an approved NNC institution or an approved IPC institution**. A STSM should specifically contribute to the overall scientific objectives of the COST Action*, whilst at the same time enable eligible researchers to learn new techniques or gain access to specific expertise, instruments and/or methods not available in their own institutions.

*CA15137 – ENRESSH

ENRESSH - European Network for Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and the Humanities

The challenge of the Action is to enable the Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH) to better demonstrate their true place in academia and society. To do so, the Action proposes to bring together different strands of work consecrated to SSH research evaluation, currently under development in different parts of Europe, in order to gain momentum, to exchange best practices and results, and to avoid unnecessary duplication.

A call for the following topics has been opened:

1. Topic 1.1: Who and What Fails Credibility of Research Assessment? Reflections on Public Discourse, Expert Knowledge, and Democracy (WG1)
2. Topic 1.2: Data Citation (WG1)
3. Topic 3.4: Identifying of and publishing in questionable social sciences and humanities (SSH) journals (WP3)
4. Topic 4.1 Drivers and barriers in achieving impact in impact on policy from and by European SSH projects (WG4)
5. Topic SIG ECI: Between a rock and a hard place: career demands versus good research for early career investigators (SIG ECI); two vacancies

Topic 1.1: Who and What Fails Credibility of Research Assessment? Reflections on Public Discourse, Expert Knowledge, and Democracy (WP1)

Host institution: Klaipėda University, Klaipėda (Lithuania)

Description of the topic: The aim of this STSM is to investigate who and what can lead to a failure of research assessment by analysing the public discourse, the role of expert knowledge, different representations and political aspects of a research assessment. For the last two decades research assessment has been a rapidly developing field of real-life experiments to measure research performance. The quest to find the best models of assessment bases on a discourse of fair decision making or social justice. Yet, a fair distribution of resources/rewards actually means political restructuring of symbolical hierarchies within academic community. Therefore, any assessment exercise is a political and discursive event and it mobilises different interest groups within and beyond academia with different and conflictual interpretations concerning assessment. Such conflicts might be driven by a diverse set of oppositional categories that vary by national and local contexts: management *versus* scholarship; local *versus* global; established *versus* dispossessed; Eastern *versus* Western; our academic tribe *versus* their clan; democratic *versus* authoritative etc. In such a situation, success or failure of a specific research assessment procedure mainly depends on the public discourse and its agents.

The STSM will analyse these discourses starting from the example of a new assessment exercise introduced in Lithuania in 2018. It was sued to the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Lithuania even before it started and serves as a source for a lot of theoretical and methodological issues and questions. How credibility of research assessment might be undermined in social and political terms? How the public discourse is constructed by agents of assessment and its subjects? What categories are used to compose idea of just/unfair assessment? How to analyse communicative and political aspects of research assessment? Practical arrangements of the STSM will cover three activities:

- 1) An applicant together with the host will construct a theoretical model and research design for analysing communicative and political features of research assessment;
- 2) The research design will be tested in preparing a short case study about the research assessment in Lithuania;
- 3) The applicant and the host will compose a list of contradictory cases of research evaluation in Europe for further analysis.

Objectives: This STSM aims to advance the understanding of motivations of the researchers both regarding knowledge production and dissemination in the SSH (Task 1 of WG1). This is a basic task which is important for the contextualization of each deliverable in WG1 (and thus also for writing scientific papers); it is also important for Task 3 of WG1. "Observe national regulations/ recommendations/ procedures for research evaluation in the SSH", as the acceptance of evaluation procedures is an important point in designing national evaluation procedures; and it will finally be a crucial input for the deliverable "Recommendations for better adapted criteria and indicators" (GP4) as acceptance of evaluation procedures might go hand in hand with the acceptance of criteria and indicators used in those procedures.

Special criteria for this STSM: the applicant has knowledge of the organisation of SSH research, at least in his or her country, and has knowledge in discourse analysis and in social theory.

Results: The proposed STSM will contribute to the understanding of the conditions of acceptance of research evaluation procedures and to the recommendations for better

adapted criteria and indicators for SSH research. It will also result in co-authored publications and conference presentations.

Practical details:

Working group: WG1 (conceptual frameworks for SSH research evaluation)

Duration and timing: between 2 weeks and 1 month from 1st of September to 31st of October 2019

Location: Center for Studies of Social Change, Klaipėda University, S. Nėries g. 5, Klaipėda, Klaipėda, Lithuania

Contact: Liutauras Kraniauskas (liutauras.kraniauskas@gmail.com)

Topic 1.2: Data Citation (WG1)

Host institution: FORS, located at the University of Lausanne (Switzerland).

Description of the topic: In the social sciences, data are important sources for research. With the rise of importance of empirical studies and the digitalisation, data is increasingly crucial for research not only in the social sciences but also in the humanities. Also, the data used is getting more and more complex, combining data from different sources, across many countries and using different media and collection modes. Also, data collection is often collaborative work across institutions and countries. Thus, the collection, cleaning, preparation and storage of data becomes a more and more important task also in the SSH. While the collection of data in many STEM fields is seen as part of the research task and secondary use of data includes citation of those involved in data collection, in the SSH, there is no clear standard how to cite data and thus data collection, preparation and storage is not valued as an important scientific work. However, the trend towards open science includes open data and researchers will be more willing to publish their data if data gathering is acknowledged as scientific work and the chances are that their data is re-used and their work properly cited. This STSM at the Data and Research Information Services Unit at FORS, Lausanne, sets out to investigate if and how data is cited in secondary data analysis. We investigate two different sorts of data: first, we investigate how data is cited that is created for secondary analysis, i.e. international comparative surveys. Second, we use the host institution's data repository to investigate how often data is downloaded and whether and how authors using such data that was made "open" by individual researchers cite these sources.

Objectives: The STSM aims to further the understanding knowledge production and dissemination in the SSH (Task 1 of WG1). It will add to the deliverable "recommendations for better adapted criteria and indicators" due in GP4. Furthermore, it will help fostering data repositories as enhancements of bibliographic repositories and add to Task 2 of WG3, "Analyse characteristics of diverse dissemination channels used in the SSH" as publishing data is one way of disseminating SSH research activities. It will lead to collaborative publications and to guidelines for citation of data sources.

Special criteria for this STSM: the applicant should have basic knowledge in bibliometric analysis and should be familiar with secondary analysis in the social sciences.

Results: The proposed STSM will produce co-authored publications and provide guidelines for citation of data sources.

Practical details:

Working group: WG1 (Conceptual frameworks for SSH research evaluation)

Duration and timing: between 2 weeks and 1 month from August to December 2019.

Location: FORS, Géopolis, CH-1015 Lausanne, Switzerland

Contact: Michael Ochsner (michael.ochsner@fors.unil.ch), responsible person: Brian Kleiner

Topic 3.4: Identifying of and publishing in questionable social sciences and humanities (SSH) journals

Host institution: University of Antwerp

Description of the topic: This work reviews and compares how questionable social sciences and humanities (SSH) journals are identified in correspondence with evaluation of the publication channels related to the performance-based research funding. The focus of the STSM will lie in a cross-country comparison. The current lists of SSH journals are analysed and compared from the aspects of predatory and legitimate OA. Communicating about questionable publishing to the research community is investigated and compared. It will be also reviewed, how the yearly number of publications in questionable SSH journals has evolved, and on the other hand, how publishing in legitimate OA journals has evolved. As a result, a description of best practices and challenges of identifying questionable journals and communicating about them will be prepared.

Objectives:

- Investigate and compare how questionable social sciences and humanities journals are identified
- Compare the current lists of social sciences and humanities journals from the aspects of predatory and legitimate OA
- Review and compare how information on questionability is communicated to the experts participating in the evaluation of publication channels in correspondence with performance-based research funding and further to the research community
- Find out how the yearly number of publications in questionable SSH journals has evolved, and on the other hand, how publishing in legitimate OA journals has evolved

Results:

- A description of best practices and challenges of identifying questionable journals and communicating about them

Special criteria for this STSM: The applicant should have knowledge on questionable publishing and access to the data needed

Practical details:

Working group: WG3 (databases and uses of data for understanding SSH research)

Duration: 2 weeks

Location: University of Antwerp, Antwerp, Belgium

Contact: Tim Engels (tim.engels@uantwerpen.be), Raf Guns (raf.guns@uantwerpen.be)

Topic 4.1 Drivers and barriers in achieving impact in impact on policy from and by European SSH projects

Host institution: Leiden University

Description of the topic: The grantee of this STSM will contribute to the understanding of long term policy impact from European collaborative SSH -social sciences and humanities, projects, such as COST Actions and Societal Challenges projects. It involves an analysis of ~15 of such projects funded by EU Framework Programme Horizon 2020 through documents produced by these projects and telephone interviews with their chairs and/or dissemination coordinators. The main question to be answered is: what are drivers and barriers for European SSH projects in having an impact on policy? The results will be used to organize ENRESSH's impact on policy in the final year of the action.

Objectives:

- Select European SSH projects and programmes to study.
- Collect contact details of interviews.
- Conduct interviews with chairs and dissemination coordinators of the selected projects.
- Collect documents, for example policy briefs, from selected projects.
- Analyse data using qualitative data analysis tools.
- Formulate recommendations for impact on policy from collaborative European projects.

Expected results:

- A one-pager with recommendations for European SSH projects.
- A working paper for the ENRESSH working paper series, to be developed into a manuscript that can be submitted to an international peer-reviewed journal.

Special criteria for this STSM: Preferably the applicant has experience with qualitative research, including the use of qualitative analysis tools such as Nvivo and Atlas.ti.

Practical details: Working group: WG4 (dissemination)

Duration: Between 2 weeks and 4 weeks, between September and December 2019.

Host institution: Leiden University^[SEP] Location: Leiden University, Leiden, the Netherlands

Contact: Stefan de Jong. (s.p.l.de.jong@luris.nl).

Topic SIG ECI: Between a rock and a hard place: career demands versus good research for early career investigators (two vacancies)

Host institution: Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań (Poland)

Description of the topic: ECI find themselves in a situation of a tension between individual and organizational expectations, motivations and limitations. During this STSM, we analyse such tensions and interactions, such as the influence of national evaluation procedures versus the fact that a career will be international (evaluation criteria of other countries apply); changes of rules during qualification period; the relation between evaluation or scientific networks versus career; self-interest/intrinsic motivation versus what is expected; own perceptions of ideal of research versus the ideal of research promoted by rules. The analysis of such tensions will help to understand the situation ECI find themselves in but they also inform how research evaluation procedures could be reformed to reduce such tensions and to better reflect the conditions under which research is conducted.

Objectives: This STSM will contribute to achieving the GAPG2 (to understand the impact of evaluation practices on ECI careers) and GAPG6 (to propose better adapted approaches to evaluating the SSH) foreseen in GP4.

Special criteria for this STSM: the applicant should have knowledge of the different evaluation systems and situations as well as have experience of qualitative research methodology.

Results: The proposed STSM will lead to the production of co-authored publications and presentations. It will also produce an input for the policy brief better adapted approaches to evaluating the SSH as well as for a document with recommendations for ECI regarding evaluation.

Practical details:

Working group: Special Interest Group for Early Career Investigators

Duration and timing: one to two weeks in September 2019

Location: Adam Mickiewicz University, Wieniawskiego 1, 61-712 Poznań, Poland *Contact:* Emanuel Kulczycki (emanuel@ekulczycki.pl)

Formalities

Financial support

The financial support is a contribution to the overall expenses incurred during the STSM and may not necessarily cover all of the associated outgoings. The following funding conditions apply and must be respected:

1. Travel expenses cannot exceed EUR 300;
2. For accommodation and meal expenses, a maximum amount of EUR 160 per day can be considered;
3. A maximum of EUR 2500 in total can be afforded to the grantee.
4. The final amount of the grant is dependent on the duration of the STSM and the level of prices at the host country.
4. STSM activities must occur in their entirety within the dates specified in this call.

Financial support is limited to cover travel and subsistence expenses and is paid as a grant. Payment of the Grant is subject to the scientific report (**after the completion of STMS**) being approved by the Action Chair, STSM Coordinator and a researcher affiliated to the Host institution.

Selection criteria

- **The application of the research to the field of the Action** – a detailed work plan will help determine if the scientific aims of the work will be applicable to the Action's aims.
- **The home institution of the researcher** – We will take into account the number of applications from each institution to ensure a fair spread of researches across the network.
- **The experience of the researcher** – in line with COST Office rules, we will preferentially award STSMs to early stage researchers (PhD + <8 years). This should not discourage more experienced researchers from applying but their chances of being selected are slightly reduced.

- **The publication potential of the research carried out** – a short publication plan as part of the workplan, including intended journal, aim/working title and timescale for submission, will help to identify the most promising research.
- **Geographical and gender balance** issues will be taken into consideration;
- **The research should fit into the host institutions' research profile.**

How to apply for an STSM

Interested Researchers are advised to follow the directions provided below and submit their application and supporting documents to Mimi Urbanc (mimi.urbanc@zrc-sazu.si) by the deadline, ie 14/08/2019.

THE APPLICATION PROCESS

1. All applicants must carefully read the funding rules detailed in section 8 of the *COST Vademecum*: <https://www.cost.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Vademecum-May-2019.pdf> (pages 34–35).
2. All applicants must register for an e-COST profile at <https://e-services.cost.eu/> - adding their bank account details to their profile.
3. All applicants must complete, submit and download their STSM application online at: <https://e-services.cost.eu/stsm>.
4. All applicants must send their submitted STSM application form and the relevant supporting documents to Mimi Urbanc mimi.urbanc@zrc-sazu.si for evaluation before the application submission deadline expires.

The list of supporting documents to be submitted for the evaluation includes:

- The submitted **STSM application form** (downloadable when the online application is submitted - see point 3 above)
- **A motivation letter** including an overview of the proposed activities that will be performed which must contain a **work plan** for the visit highlighting the proposed contribution to the scientific objectives of the ENRESSH COST Action and the general activities of the host institution;
- **A letter of support** from the home Institution;
- **A written agreement** of the host institution
- **A Full CV** (including a list of academic publications – if applicable). The CV must include the award date of the applicants PhD and their current position.

The applications will then be assessed by the Action Steering Committee and researchers affiliated to the Host institutions.

7. The applicant will be formally notified of the outcome of their STSM application by Mimi Urbanc by 14/08/2019.

8. Within 30 days from the end date of the STSM, the successful applicant must submit a scientific report to the Host institution and to Mimi Urbanc. The applicant is also responsible for acquiring an official acceptance letter / Email confirmation of acceptance from a senior Researcher affiliated to the Host institution formally accepting the scientific report. This formal acceptance of the scientific report has to be sent to the Grant Holder and Mimi Urbanc for archiving purposes.

Failure to submit the scientific report within 30 days from the end date of the STSM will effectively cancel the grant.

(Please note that COST can request additional information to substantiate the information contained within the documents submitted by STSM applicants).

Dates to remember

Deadline for applications to be submitted: 14/08/2019

Notification of application outcome: 21/08/2019

Period of STSM: between 25/08/2019 and 20/12/2019

Submitting the reports: within 30 days from the end date

Accepting/ rejecting the reports: within 2 weeks after submission of the report

Execution the payment of the grant: within 4 weeks after submission of the report.