

Title of the report/ deliverable: Intermediary Report 3

Main authors: Dr. Michael Ochsner

Date of the release: 8. February 2019

WG to which the report/ deliverable is related: WG1

Grant period to which the report/ deliverable is related: GP2/3 (1.02.2018-31.01.2019)

Participants of WG1

Currently, there are 77 participants subscribed to Work Group 1. 11 participants joined since the last intermediary report. 50 participants chose WG1 as their main WG. Regarding country representation, 34 countries are present in WG1.

Activities and achievements since the last intermediary report

Since the last intermediary report, the focus has been put on three deliverables due in GP3: the training school in collaboration with the SIG ECI held on January 7th-11th 2019 in Vilnius, the overview of national research systems and the overview of peer review practices in the SSH, both due at the end of GP3, i.e. May 2019. At the same time, there was a collaboration with Work Group 3 on book publication and with Work Group 2 on societal impact. The intensive collaboration with the SIG ECI continued, by organizing an STSM for the design and development of a questionnaire, drawing on the experiences of the former questionnaires used in WG1.

Training School “Evaluation procedures and their impact on SSH careers” (with SIG ECI)

The Training School “Evaluation procedures and their impact on SSH careers” was organised jointly by the SIG ECI and WG1 from 7th to 11th January 2019 at the Vilnius University in Vilnius, Lithuania. 29 participants and 7 teachers from 14 countries (and even more nationalities), representing 24 disciplines, composed of 15 men and 21 women formed a highly diverse and very active group. Two of the participants and four of the trainers were members of ENRESSH. From the 30 participants accepted for participation, only one had to cancel due to illness.

The Training School was organised in lectures and hands-on sessions. The hands-on sessions were held in fixed groups of 5 trainees and each product of a hands-on session would be re-used in later hands-on sessions. On the first day, the trainees were asked to provide spontaneous associations with research evaluation and were filling in a questionnaire for Early Career Investigators. On the second day, they were introduced into the topic by lectures by Aldis Gedutis (research evaluation), Michael Ochsner (national research evaluation systems, quality criteria and measurement in research evaluation) and

European Network for Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and Humanities.
COST action 15137. www.enressh.eu

Agnė Girkontaitė (Scientific work and reporting). In the hands-on session, the trainees developed a fictive interdisciplinary research proposal for a call entitled “Culture & Innovation”. The second day was devoted to Bibliometrics and Altmetrics with lectures by Thed van Leeuwen and Alesia Zuccala. In the hands-on sessions the trainees could apply what they learned using the references in their proposals. The third day focused on peer review practices. Lectures by Wojciech Sowa covered what is peer review in the SSH and how to write and how to interpret reviews, while the lecture by Michael Ochsner explained the issues of peer review. In the hands-on session, each group wrote reviews for the proposal of two other groups. The final day was devoted how to take up and interpret the reviews and how to improve evaluation for early career investigators. For the first part, the groups were presented the reviews of their proposals by the other groups. For the second part, a lecture on evaluation and early career investigators (by Jolanta Šinkūnienė) led to a discussion on how to improve the situation for early career investigators. A summary by Agnė Girkontaitė finalized the Training School.

The Training School enabled the WG1 and SIG ECI to disseminate their work to early career investigators. The call was widely spread across all European countries through disciplinary networks and universities, thus adding to the visibility of ENRESSH. The evaluations of the Training School by the participants showed that the information is dearly needed, and the early career investigator lacked opportunities to gain knowledge about how to use evaluations and how to prepare themselves for evaluations. Also, it helped the early career investigators to understand how peer review functions and how research quality can be conceptualised. Furthermore, they received state-of-the-art knowledge about bibliometrics and altmetrics and about the opportunities and limitations of research metrics. Finally, the training school helped to establish the awareness of the topic at Vilnius University by including 6 local PhD students and Master’s degree holders among the participants who will bring the information on to their peers at VU. A summary article of the training school was published on the website of Vilnius University (<http://naujienos.vu.lt/jaunieji-mokslininkai-aiskinosi-moksliniu-tyrimu-vertinimo-kriterijus/>) giving the importance of the topic more visibility at Vilnius University. On the other hand, WG1 and SIG ECI were able to gain valuable data from the early career investigators: free associations of how young scholars see evaluation, data for a pilot for the questionnaire for early career investigators, and plenty of written information how young scholars see evaluation and career.

A video was produced with statements by trainers and trainees about the goals and outcomes of the training school.

Research Activities of Work Group 1

Overview on national evaluation systems

The full data of the second round of the Delphi survey was analysed and a classification of national research evaluation systems was established and presented to and discussed with the WG1 members at the WG meeting in Lisbon in March. In September, the refined results were presented at the 23rd International Conference on Science and Technology Indicators in Leiden and an article was published in the proceedings of the conference.

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.

The results from the typology were put into context with other research conducted in WG1 and presented at the Nordic Workshop for Bibliometrics and Research Policy on 8th November 2018. As a first draft of a “Framework for Research Evaluation in the SSH”, the presentation made a plea to link evaluation practices to research policy: Criteria for research quality based on perceptions of the scholars can help to make visible the aims of an evaluation while the typology of research evaluation systems can help to understand evaluation practices and research policy. Combining the two can help counter-balancing unintended effects of evaluation practices.

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

For the report on national evaluation systems, it was originally planned to have an in-depth report for two countries per ideal type identified in the classification mentioned above (10 reports). The same dimensions of the classification should be covered, but the report should go deeper into details, including regulations, legal frameworks and practical implementations. During the Lisbon meeting, however, there were many volunteers to write a report on how research is evaluated in their country. At the same time, the survey results showed that there is rather a diversity of research evaluation systems than just a few ways to evaluate. Therefore, the plan was changed and a new, more comprehensive concept for the report due at the end of GP3 was developed: a series of country reports will be presented and comparatively analysed. For this purpose, a grid for the country reports was developed that will make a comparative analysis of all the country reports possible. For the WG meeting in Ljubljana, nine pilot country reports were presented (Bosnia Herzegovina, Czech Republic, Finland, Italy, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Portugal and Switzerland). Based on these pilot reports, it was discussed how the grid should be improved to ensure comparability. Also, new members volunteered to hand in a report for their country. Furthermore, topic foci were discussed that will be analysed using the data generated by the report.

Until November, 17 reports were handed in and the group interested in analysing the data was organised into several thematic subgroups. In the following period, the reports were inspected for comparability issues and are currently refined to a complete, comparable form for the final report.

Peer Review Practices in the SSH

In the Lisbon meeting, Nina Kanczewicz-Hoffman presented a plan for the report on peer review practices and several projects were presented that could be used for the report. Missing parts were discussed and a timeline for the report was agreed upon. During the following two meetings in Ljubljana and Copenhagen, the projects were discussed and refined, and a structure of the report was agreed upon. By the end of January, drafts of the sections of the report were submitted. The report will cover the following topics: (1) State of the art in peer review in SSH in Europe (definitions, historical overview, different evaluation situations); (2) issues regarding SSH (methodology and criteria, evaluation of impact, language); (3) guidelines (summary of existing practices, ambiguity, role in national

evaluation, criteria in use, changes of peer review and gender; (4) comprehensive bibliography.

In early February, Tony Ross-Hellauer will visit Gemma Derrick at Lancaster University, UK, for an STSM on the topic of peer review in the SSH.

Scientific work and reporting in the social sciences

During the STSM in January 2018, Agnė Girkontaitė and Michael Ochsner collected data and conducted interviews on what scholars at FORS produce, what they report and how their works are represented in databases and reports. Since the last intermediary report, Agnė collected comparable data for the Department of Sociology at Vilnius University and analysed the quantitative as well as the qualitative data. She presented the results of the analysis at the “X-oji nacionalinė Lietuvos sociologų draugijos konferencija [10th Conference of the National Society of Sociologists]” in October 2018 and at the second ENRESSH Training School in Vilnius 2019.

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 [10th National Conference of the Lithuanian Sociological Society]*, 12-13 October 2018, Klaipėda, Lithuania.

The insights of the project were used by FORS to improve its annual reporting for 2018.

Scholars’ notions of quality and quality criteria

In the work package on scholars’ notions of quality and quality criteria, several presentations helped to disseminate the results of the research conducted within this group. Michael Ochsner was invited to hold a workshop for the doctoral students in the doctoral programme at the Institute of Art History in Zurich where he gave a lecture on what research quality in the humanities is, how it relates to metrics and how the students can use quality criteria (and metrics) in their own work but also with regard to reporting in their CVs and public profiles on professional social media. Furthermore, Michael was invited to host a “world café” session at the INTE meeting organised by the LERU where he gave a short introduction on quality, impact and evaluation to start the discussions on how to improve research assessments in the LERU institutions. Finally, upon invitation, Michael presented the work of WG1 to scholars of the natural sciences at the conference “Impact factor h-Index and university rankings” as a follow-up of the conference/movement “We scientists shape science” organised by the Swiss Academy of Sciences. The scholars agreed that the concepts developed within ENRESSH are valid just the same for the natural sciences (with some disciplinary adaptations).

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.

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.

Dissemination activities of Work Group 1 work in general

The following invited presentations and activities helped disseminate the work of ENRESSH with a particular emphasis on WG1 work: After the presentation at the conference “Impact factor h-Index and university rankings” organised by the Swiss Academy of Sciences, Michael was mandated by the Swiss Science Council to write a comment from the perspective of research evaluation on two open access documents: Plan S and the “Swissuniversities Action Plan”, the Swiss answer to Plan S. Furthermore, Michael Ochsner was invited to present at the “Humanities in Practice Workshop” in Bergen Norway, where several scholars, among them many ENRESSHers, were discussing new approaches to impact in the humanities. Michael focussed on conceptual issues of the current societal impact agenda.

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. (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.

Work in collaboration with other WGs and SIGs

Evaluation of scholarly books (with WG3, SIG Book Publications)

WG1 has been involved in a publication on evaluations of book publications initiated by WG3. WG1 contributed with the experience from the work on national evaluation procedures.

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>

Special Issue on book publication (with SIG book evaluation, WG3)

Members of WG1 contributed to editing a special issue entitled “scholarly books and their evaluation context in the social sciences and humanities” in the *Aslib Journal of Information Management*.

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.

In this context, a workshop on the topic was organised in Copenhagen by the SIG book evaluation, including contributions by all WGs. After the meeting, the group visited the Danish Ministry of Higher Education and Science in Copenhagen and discussed possible collaborations and how ENRESSH can provide knowledge to the Ministry.

Senior academics as key negotiators in the implementation of impact policies in the social sciences and humanities (contributing to WG2)

The interviews collected within the subgroup on attitudes towards research evaluation include as one aspect attitudes towards societal impact policies by senior academics. The subgroup took the Austrian EU Council Presidency Conference on “Impact of Social Sciences and Humanities for a European Research Agenda – Valuation of SSH in mission-oriented research” as an opportunity to start the analysis of the interviews with a focus on this aspect and to present a paper at this conference in Vienna on 29th November 2018.

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.

The presentation led to an article that will be published in 2019 in the journal *fteval: Journal for Research and Technology Policy Evaluation*.

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*.

Research Evaluation and Early Career Investigators (with SIG ECI)

During the STSM in January 2018 at the Université Paris-Est Créteil, Paris, France, Stéphanie Mignot-Gerard and Karolina Lendák-Kabók, analysed the data from the collected interviews within ECI SIG group and screened the data for possible research topics, conducted a literature review for the SIG ECI, and drafted a first version of a questionnaire that will complement the qualitative data. Focusing on the topic of gender issues and geopolitical issues with regard to evaluation and careers, Karolina Lendák-Kabók has presented the analysis of the interviews at two conferences in Dublin, Ireland and Szeged, Hungary:

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. *10th European Conference on Gender Equality in Higher Education*. 20.–22. August 2018, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.

The questionnaire was refined in a second STSM by Karolina Lendák-Kabók visiting Michael Ochsner at FORS, Lausanne, Switzerland, drawing from the experience of the Delphi survey conducted for the analysis of the national research evaluation systems. Also, a strategy for the fieldwork was developed and tested. The questionnaire was finalised, and a pilot was successfully fielded among the participants of the second ENRESSH Training School.