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Towards a Coalition on reforming research assessment

• As of today, **334 organisations from 38 countries** have expressed their support to the principles outlined in a **scoping report** published in November 2021, and are involved in the co-creation of an agreement bringing together a coalition:

  ➢ 122 Universities, 22 Universities associations and 10 European Universities Alliances;
  ➢ 43 Research centers/institutes, 4 Research infrastructures;
  ➢ 23 Public funders, 4 Private funders, 2 Funders associations;
  ➢ 6 National/regional evaluation agencies, 5 Ministries, and 2 Regional authorities;
  ➢ 20 Academies, learned societies, researchers associations;
  ➢ 8 National reproducibility networks;
  ➢ 63 other organisations (research management, standardisation, consultancy, etc.).

• The call remains open: europa.eu/!DQMKYG
Near-final Agreement

• Signatories agree to:
  ➢ Base actions on common Principles (from scoping report)
  ➢ Implement Commitments for change, incl. timeframe for implementation
  ➢ Organise and operate the coalition along common principles

How will it support the implementation of the UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science?

• Recognition of a diversity of outputs (beyond publications), practices (incl. open science practices), and activities of researchers (incl. societal engagement, teamwork);
• Assessment based primarily on qualitative judgement, supported by responsible use of quantitative indicators;
• Respect the autonomy of organisations and allow for differences in implementation;
• Piloting of changes to research assessment practices, and sharing of experience and evidence.
Next steps

3rd Stakeholder Assembly
8 July 2022

- Present final agreement
- Continue discussion on governance, organisation and operations of the coalition

Collecting signatures and Constitutive Assembly
Autumn 2022
First meeting of the Working Group
Open Science Funding and Incentives -
UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science

Open science incentives in research assessment - Latin America and the Caribbean

Laura Rovelli, Latin American Forum for Research Assessment (FOLEC-CLACSO)
- Region with highest % of open access adoption in scholarly journals, with no APCs and no outsourcing to commercial publishers. Publicly funded, community owned and governed open access: bibliodiversity & multilingualism

IMPLEMENTATIONS

- University-led regional cooperation for open access (diamond model)
  * regional portals of scientific journals (Latindex-C, Redalyc-AmeliCA, SciELO)
  * institutional repositories are the privileged instrument by legislation and policies for sustaining and expanding open access

- Inter-governmental cooperation for repositories networking (La Referencia, 11 countries, regional harvester)

- Initial steps in
  * research data collections
  * preprints (SciELO Preprints)
  * co-production of knowledge with other societal actors+citizens

- Open Science promoted in the region, mobilized by approval of UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science

Latin American+Caribbean initiative to discuss and agree on a regional approach in research assessment in times of open science (CLACSO-FOLEC)

PROPOSAL FOR A DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

A new type of research assessment towards a socially relevant science in Latin America and the Caribbean

www.clacso.org/en/folec
• In a region with strong tradition of community-led, non-profit, scholarly publishing (diamond model, no APC/BPC) this production is very poorly represented in WoS and Scopus research assessment indicators used in the region (In 2019: 416 LAC journals in WoS and Scopus, from a total of approx. 2,800 quality journals in the region, indexed by Latindex-C, Redalyc, SciELO and DOAJ)

  • Challenges:
    ➢ **regain control of the scientific and academic community over the evaluation processes and their indicators**
    ➢ **Eg. in LAC: complement WoS and Scopus indicators with those mentioned above (already implemented in CONICET, Argentina, for SSH)**

• In social sciences and humanities, strong tradition of publishing within the region in local language (eg. Argentina: 80% publish in local journals in local language)

  • Challenges:
    ➢ **Add peer-review to contents in repositories**
    ➢ **Value bibliodiversity + multilingualism in research assessment**

• Underfunding of community-owned infrastructures because scarce funds are directed to subscriptions/APCs in commercial circuit

  • Challenge:
    ➢ **Stronger policies and financial support for community-owned infrastructures and services**
Open Access and Open Science presence in the assessment of proposals for research funding.

2021 Survey by FOLEC-CLACSO-IDRC (based on 34 responses from Latin America & Caribbean)

From the open science perspective, most responses state that a very important or moderately important information input for the assessment is the written commitment that the data generated by the project and the research results obtained will be open access, thus promoting the dissemination of the solutions found. However, indicators on refereed publications with local/regional circulation that could potentially contribute to local/regional dissemination of research results are considered very important information inputs for assessment by less than a third of the organizations surveyed.
• Reduce the influence of the impact factor of journals, starting by eliminating all references to this indicator and the H-index in the texts of calls for projects and in the RA of careers.

Example: resolution for SSH research funded by the National Research Council from Argentina (CONICET), the only one in Latin America which also includes regional indexing indicators provided by Latindex-C, SciELO and Redalyc among the first levels indicators together with WoS and Scopus to classify journals researchers publish. The resolution is currently under revision for its expansion.

• Value open science and the diversity of scientific production in the evaluation of research and teaching staff, projects, universities and research organizations.

Example: FOLEC-CLACSO promotes bibliodiversity, multilingualism and favors development of socially relevant research that helps sustain cultural diversity. It also encourages to complement the notion of impact in research assessment with the notion of collaboration and participation in research processes, using indicators of relevance, social interaction and intervention and other measures drawn from the social sciences and humanities tradition.

Peer-review and open science

UNESCO-CLACSO Project 2021-2022

- Open science: questioning the blind and confidential nature of journal evaluation.
- Openness that aims at transparency. Incipient process. Pre-print, is the most widespread form of open evaluation of journals.
- Resistance and uneven global distribution in the use of pre-print servers.
- In Brazil, the SciELO pre-print server, was launched in 2017. Heterogeneous progress per editorial team and disciplines.
- Central role of institutional repositories in Latin America. Proposals for “next-generation repositories” incorporating peer-review (La Referencia-OpenAIRE-COAR)

Thank you very much

Laura Rovelli, FOLEC-CLACSO Coordination
folec@clacso.edu.ar
www.clacso.org/en/folec
www.clacso.org
The Intersections between DORA and Open Science (and Equity)

Let’s change what we value in research.

Stephen Curry
Imperial College and DORA
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DORA: a declaration and an organisation

- sfdora.org
- >19,000 individuals and >2,500 organisations have signed
- **International funding**: 2 members of staff (plus an intern)
- Steering group with **worldwide representation**
- Strategy:
  - More signatories
  - Greater global & disciplinary impact
  - Develop & promote best practice in research assessment

**Do not** use journal-based metrics, such as Journal Impact Factors, as a **surrogate measure** of the quality of individual research articles, to assess an individual scientist’s contributions, or in hiring, promotion, or funding decisions.

---

**Our vision**: To advance practical and robust approaches to research assessment globally.

**Staff**

- Amanda Aikem: Science Policy Intern
- Anna Hatch: Program Director
- Hailey Hazlett: Program Manager
DORA: research assessment is an important part of a bigger picture

The intersections between DORA, open scholarship, and equity

August 18, 2020

Introduction

The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), published in May 2013, does not mention the term ‘open scholarship.’ And yet DORA and open scholarship are becoming increasingly entwined[1]. DORA’s ambition is to improve research evaluation practices but the practicalities of implementation make it impossible to separate the evaluation of research from questions about who and what research is for, who gets to be involved, and how it should best be carried out, all of which have to take account of the power dynamics that shape the scholarly landscape. Equally, progress towards open scholarship, which aims to make the products and processes of academic work as

**DORA**: developing and promoting good practice

- Briefings
- Articles
- Webinars
- Conferences
- Workshops
- Curated resource library
- Case studies
- Community grants
- Collaborative work (e.g. policy discussions)
- Tools development (e.g. TARA)

**Resource Library**

A collection of materials to facilitate the development of responsible research and innovative assessment policies and practices.

**Case study: Academia In Motion**

Recognition & Rewards at Leiden University

In support of the IRMO and Leiden's programmes, Leiden University published a position paper on the 'Academia in Motion' initiatives. A review of the paper is available here.

**Case study: University of Amsterdam**

Academic criteria for promotion and tenure in biomedical sciences faculties: cross sectional analysis of international institutions.

**Research Culture: Changing how we evaluate research is difficult, but not impossible**

Anna Hatch, Stephen Curry

DORA, United States, Imperial College, United Kingdom

**Reimagining academic assessment**

Stories of innovation and change

Case studies of universities and national contexts highlight key elements of institutional change to improve academic career assessment.

https://sfdora.org/
DORA: we collaborate on tools and policies

Contributions to:
• the generation of knowledge
• the development of individuals?
• the wider research community?
• to broader society?

Resume for Researchers

Charité University Hospital, Berlin
• Scientific contribution to your field
• Your 5 most important papers
• Contribution to open science
• Your most important collaborations
DORA latest: new tools and projects

Tools to Advance Research Assessment (TARA) is a project to facilitate the development of new policies and practices for academic career assessment.

- Interactive online dashboard to track adoption and implementation of responsible research assessment practices in institutions worldwide
- Survey of US institutions to understand attitude and approaches to research assessment reform
- An expanded toolkit of resources informed by best practice in the community

Project TARA is supported by Arcadia – a charitable fund of Lisbet Rausing and Peter Baldwin
Questions

• How to foster a culture of open science and aligning incentives for open science and removing the barriers for open science?
  • Open access mandates?
  • Clarify the meaning of academic freedom...
  • Talk about the value of open science
  • How to include openness as a performance criterion in hiring/promotion/funding
  • Get the public onside
  • Build costs into research costs (e.g. publishing, data/code/reagent sharing)
  • Create space for Diamond OA

• How to identify and establish regional and international funding mechanisms for promoting and strengthening open science
  • Good question! – sustainable infrastructure is needed
  • How to promote DiamondOA in regions where commercial publishers dominate?
  • Is GRC up to the task or is it too loose a coalition of national funders?

• Innovative approaches to long-term sustainability of funding mechanisms?
  • Needs to be considered in answer to the Q above
Thank you

s.curry@imperial.ac.uk
@Stephen_Curry

Let’s change what we value in research.

Sign DORA

Imperial College London