

Minutes of the Work Group Meeting in Poznan 11th and 12th of July 2016

I. Plenary meeting 11th of July, 10h00-11h00

The Chair of the Action, Dr. Ioana Galleron, thanks everybody for participation, after such a short notice confirmation. This was due to a late approval of the budget for the Action; the university of Poznan (the Grant Holder) is still waiting the first instalment of the grant.

The Chair welcomes the new participants, and gives a short presentation of the organisation and objectives of the Action, mainly based on the slides already presented to the kick-off meeting (see pdf document “CA15137_Poznan_plenary”).

Each WG leader summarizes the advancements made by the group since the kick-off meeting:

- Dr. Michael Ochsner explains that WG1, in cooperation with WG4, progressed with the survey about “who’s who” in research evaluation in Europe, but many country representatives have not yet answered this question;
- Dr. Paul Benneworth shows that WG2 has circulated a questionnaire concerning key concepts and terminologies related to SSH social impact, and collected some twenty answers;
- Dr. Tim Engels indicates that WG3 worked on the update of the survey about SSH representation in RIS, and several presentations on this topic are scheduled;
- Pr. Geoffrey Williams explains that WG4 started to build a file listing the European and national stakeholders of SSH research, on the basis of which the conference in Prague will be organised in January 2017.

The general observation is that WG participation to these surveys has to increase; information, as well about who’s active in SSH evaluation, or about the organisation and procedures for research evaluation, is still missing for many countries. These are the basis for several deliverables of the Action, and a necessary step for going further. The WG meetings scheduled during the next two days will progress in other directions, mainly the definition of shared concepts and notions, as well as the identification of common problems. Information collection remains work in progress, and it is not too late, for any participant, to help with this.

The meeting continues with a short presentation of the COST system, by the representative of the Grant Holder, Dr. Marek Holowiecki (see pdf document “CA15137_Poznan_travel_reimbursement”). He explains how to claim fees and what justifications are needed for any kind of expense. He insists upon the need to claim the fees as soon as possible and in all cases up to 30 days after the meeting (at the latest); the faster the claims are made, the quicker the necessary verifications are done and the payment processed. The Chair of the Action adds that this will also allow the steering committee to observe closely the budgetary situation, and to avoid over or under-spending.

The last two points of the morning are the website and the press release. Pr. Williams (chair of WG4) informs the participants that a provider has been found for the first one, but the contract cannot be signed until the first instalment of the grant. However, WG4 and the steering group have designed the structure of the site, and information has been collected from Action participants in the form of a short template and a picture. These are supposed to appear on the website, at some point. A provisional version of the site will be released as soon as possible.

The press release prepared by WG4 is as follows:

“The “European Network for Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and the Humanities” is a new COST Action, starting in April 2016 and ending in April 2020, aimed at proposing clear best practices in the field of SSH research evaluation. The Action brings together various experts such as researchers in evaluation studies, policy makers and members of evaluation units, as well as researchers from SSH disciplines. The project will compare strands of work dedicated to SSH research evaluation, currently under development in different parts of Europe, in order to avoid unnecessary duplication and to upscale results; it will start with exchanges of experience in order to build a picture of practices across Europe and the state of the art in research on evaluation. During the subsequent years, the project team will organize conferences, workshops and meetings to bridge the gap between scholars in SSH research evaluation, research managers and policy makers.

COST is the longest-running European framework supporting trans-national cooperation among researchers and scholars across Europe. It was created in 1971 to bridge the gap between science, policy makers and society. The framework supports the mobility of researchers across Europe and fosters the establishment of scientific excellence. COST also plays an important role in building the European Research Area.”

It has been translated to French (available upon demand), and a call for translation in other languages is made. Each member of the Action is invited to use this press release for any kind of communication he/ she thinks fit of: publication of personal webpage, on social networks, in journals and newspapers, in specialised magazines, etc.

Since the kick-off meeting, the WG4 had also been involved in a number of actions, namely:

- Communication
 - Publications PEN – Pan European Networks
 - A short presentation of the Action on PEERE Facebook page
 - Conferences papers – STI ENID, Open Evaluation

After a short QA session, the members of the Action split in two groups, attending the parallel working sessions of WG1 and WG2.

WG1: first session
11th of July, 11h00-13h00

Participants: Michael Ochsner (chair), Kate Barker, Karin Byland, Katya DeGiovanni, Diana Eerma, Tim Engels, Aldis Gedutis, Haris Gekic, Raf Guns, Jiri Kolman, Arnis Kokorevics, Ineta Kristovska, Emanuel Kulczynski, Jorge Manana, Stéphanie Mignot, Claudia Oliveira, Ginevra Peruginelli, Hulda Proppe, Ewa Rozkosz, Anna Ruskan, Dagmar Simon, Jolanta Sinkuniene, Yulia Stukalina, Marc Vanholsbeeck, Maja Vehovec, Albena Vutsova, Daniela Wanek, Jelena Zarkovic Rakic.

The first session of the Work Group 1 was a joint session with Work Group 3. The aim of the first session was to get to know each other and to get informed about the research evaluation systems in the countries of the participants. Thus, it was organised as a “tour de table” where all participants had a maximum of 5 minutes to introduce themselves and describe the evaluation practices in their countries.

We concluded that there were many different practices in the countries ranging from no national coordination and different evaluation practices across disciplines at the same university (e.g. Switzerland) to a national point system being applied to all disciplines in almost the same way (e.g. Poland). However, we also identified some clusters of countries applying a similar system (e.g. Czech Republic, Latvia, Poland; Switzerland, Germany, Austria).

With regard to the deliverable (review of evaluation systems in the participating countries), Michael reminded the participants to hand in short information on research evaluation practices in their countries until mid-September.

WG2 First session
11th of July, 11h00-13h00

Participants: Paul Benneworth (chair of the WG), Julia Olmos Penuela, Jose Gabriel Andrade, Marc Caball, Luisa Carvalho, Elena Castro Martinez, Rita Faria, Ioana Galleron, Alexander Hasgall, Liutauras Kraniauskas, Nuno Miguel Lima, Sharon Link, Aline Muller, Rahman Nurkovic, Antun Plenkovic, Gunnar Sivertsen, Eirikuri Smari Sigurdarson, Ewa Rozskoz.

The first part of the session was dedicated to the presentation, made by the Chair of the WG, of the main findings generated by the questionnaire circulated amongst members of the group (see pdf document “CA15137_Poznan_WG2_session1”).

During the second part, participants reacted to the presentation and discussed the common starting point and perspectives, so as to start elaborate a “fiche” about SSH societal impact, to be circulated during summer for completion by early autumn.

WG1: second session
11th of July, 14h-16h

Participants: Michael Ochsner (chair), Kate Barker, Karin Byland, Katya DeGiovanni, Diana Eerma, Aldis Gedutis, Jiri Kolman, Ineta Kristovska, Stéphanie Mignot, Hulda Proppe, Ewa Rozkosz, Dagmar Simon, Jolanta Sinkuniene, Jack Spaapen, Yulia Stukalina, Marc Vanholsbeeck, Maja Vehovec, Albena Vutsova, Geoffrey Williams

In the first part of the session, Michael reminded the participants of the goals and deliverables of Work Group 1 and proposed a timeline regarding the deliverables for the first grant period. The time plan was accepted unanimously. Michael also presented the results of a survey among WG1 participants about what research projects on research evaluation in the SSH are currently going on in the participant countries (only a few projects were pointed out that focus exclusively on SSH and even fewer projects apply a bottom-up approach). As means of communication, Michael proposed to use the mailing list of WG1 for general information to all WG1 members and Slack as a means for communication about specific topics on which the WG1 members work together (subgroups). He also introduced simple guidelines to facilitate exchange of files across countries: only ASCII-characters should be used for filenames and no points. A version number at the end of a file is always to be used (e.g. template_test_v01). The version number has to be changed whenever something is changed in the document, and never should a file be uploaded with the same version number that is not equivalent to the one downloaded (i.e. no replacement of files).

The second part of the session consisted of the discussion of the deliverables and milestones of the first grant period. The first deliverable is the instalment and feeding of a bibliography on research evaluation in the SSH. The second deliverable consists of the collection of how research is evaluated in the participating countries, which will result in a publication. A milestone consists of an STSM on quality perceptions and criteria of SSH scholars and, finally, the formation of subgroups for research on the topics of WG1.

The third part of the session was dedicated to the last milestone: the formation of subgroups for research on the topics of WG1. Participants can choose to take part in any of the subgroups depending on their expertise and time availability. It is also possible to take part in several subgroups. Each subgroup has one or two responsible(s) who are responsible for organizing the group and drafting reports.

The participants vividly discussed Michael's first suggestions for subgroups. In a collective effort with input from all participants, we agreed upon the following subgroups (and responsible(s) of the subgroups):

- 1) Legal and policy frameworks (Karin Byland)
- 2) Overview of evaluation practices (Aldis Gedutis and Michael Ochsner)
(incl. criteria used in evaluations)
- 3) Methods of peer review (Geoffrey Williams and Dagmar Simon)
(incl. open peer review, book peer review, peer review vs. metrics)
- 4) Scholars' notions of quality and impact (Michael Ochsner and Stéphanie Mignot)
(incl. quality criteria, criteria for impact from scholars' perspective)
- 5) SSH scholars' attitudes towards and behaviour regarding evaluation (Marc Vanholsbeeck)
(incl. scholars' reservations and fears, dissemination practices, gaming)
- 6) Bibliography (Ewa Rozkosz)

It was decided to start with these 6 subgroups and decide later whether more subgroups are to be constituted. It is also possible that new subgroups are built by other participants not present at the Poznan meeting (e.g. it was mentioned – and agreed upon – that a subgroup on the ethics of evaluation would be desirable but there was no person who felt able to take the role of the responsible).

To end the session, the subgroups met and discussed their goals and organisation.

WG3: first session
11th of July, 14h00-16h00

Prior to the Poznań meeting, participants to WG3 from different countries were contacted, asking if they could prepare a short presentation on the (national) database or repository in their own country. The slides will be made available on the ENRESSH website. The following presentations were delivered:

- Flanders, Belgium (Raf Guns, raf.guns@uantwerpen.be)
- Scandinavia: Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland (Gunnar Sivertsen, gunnar.sivertsen@nifu.no)
- Portugal (Cláudia Oliveira, claudia.oliveira@ics.ulisboa.pt and Ana Ramos, Ana.Ramos@fct.pt)
- Spain (Jorge Mañana Rodriguez, jorge.mannana@cchs.csic.es)
- Switzerland (Sven Hug, sven.hug@gess.ethz.ch)

Meeting of WG4
11th of July, 16h30-18h00

Agenda

1. Reminder of points raised in opening session
 2. Website structure;
 - a. Site under construction
 - b. Domain name bought
 - c. Presence on Social networks
 3. Call for participation in the stakeholder's conference
 4. Ontology for ENRESSH bibliography and principles of inclusion in the bibliography
 5. AOB
1. Pr. Williams reminded the members of the central task of the WG, namely:
- The objective of this working group is to ensure a maximum visibility to the Action, among specialists in research evaluation and sociology/ geography of sciences, as well as among political, societal or economic stakeholders and among SSH researchers themselves.
 - Task 1. Compile lists of national and European associations, societies and bodies which might be interested by the achievements of the Action.
 - Task 2. Build annual communication plans (to be submitted to the approval of the Management committee).
 - Task 3. Design, build, feed and maintain the website of the Action, as well as other communication tools (newsletter, RSS feed, etc.)

- Task 4. When possible, stimulate and coordinate the translation of main deliverables of the Action in other European languages.
- Task 5. Organise the main conferences of the Action.

He insisted on the fact that WG4 should be a small highly dedicated team interacting with all the other WG, who in turn follow closely activities in WG4. This means that all WG4 members should be active in one other WG. As WG4 has a number of management tasks, it is proposed that this be carried out through a series of specialised commissions with WG4 and other members as for website management, stakeholder meetings, dissemination tools etc.

2. Professor Williams informed the group that a temporary version of the website was being prepared and would be put online as soon as the domain name had been bought. It has not been possible to buy the domain name until this very day as the budget agreement had not been signed. This loss of three months of communication was regrettable. The web developer would be coming to Poznan on 12th July and the site should be fully activated within three months. The temporary site would go online immediately. The structure of the site would be as follows:

Home page
 Featured information
 ABOUT
 ESR/ gender issues
 WG menus
 Exchange and training
 Literature

Prof. Williams introduced the work to be carried out in the next few months, notably:

- Building of a list of national and European associations, societies and bodies which can be interested by the achievements of the Action
- Design and implementation of the website
- Creating channels on Social networks
- Bibliography management of literature pertaining to research evaluation, with particular reference to the SSH and creating an ontology to ease access to this data.
- Building a communication plan
- Translation of the main deliverables of the Action where and when possible

Angelo Tramountanis offered to assist with the website and would be present at the meeting with Michal Lew of Expromo, the web designer. Website has now its domain name (www.enressh.eu) and will be ready in 2 months.

Tim Engels informed the participants that he had created a group on LinkedIn and would now proceed to open it up to all members of the action. Paul Benneworth offered to handle the Twitter account and Antun Plenkovic proposed to set up the Facebook group.

José Gabriel Andrade offered to work on a communication plan for the action.

Many participants have expressed their interest in translating the main deliverables of the action, in disseminating through different national channel the cost action

activities and in preparing press releases in their countries.

Bibliography management will consider also the bibliography produced by WG1 and WG3, so it is necessary to build a bibliography ontology. Raf Guns indicated that the library information science experts could tackle this.

Prof Williams underlined the need for more data on the who's who file with a deadline of 15 August 2016 so as to prepare a list of potential attendees to stakeholders meeting in Prague.

Prof Williams closed the meeting indicating that the group would next meet at the following ENRESSH meeting in March 2017.

**SIG ESR meeting
11th of July, 16h30-18h00**

SIG Agenda:

- streamlining the interests of ESR;
- conceiving a strategy for voicing the interests of ESR in the Action.

An initial presentation is done by Jolanta Sinkuniene, the chair of the group (see pdf document "CA15137_Poznan_SIG_ESR"). It is followed by a discussion on how the SIG for ESR could represent the interests of ESR through the possible medium of interviews. The following aspects have been covered:

- the medium itself: should it be semi-structured interviews, questionnaires, etc. depending on the targets raised (many answers of a more general type from many respondents or specific case studies / personalized stories from fewer respondents)
- who should be the respondents: doctoral students, postdoctoral fellows, ESR?
- basic idea of the content: experience concerning evaluation, fair / unfair treatment, impact on career planning, evaluation as a learning experience, impact on research practices, etc.
- preferable outcome: identification of the most problematic areas ESR face in terms of evaluation, ideas for the training school organized within the Action, a kind of a manual helpful for the future ESR in SSH, a "wake up" call for the evaluators and stakeholders so far as ESR position and problematic issues are concerned.
- possible problems / issues to decide upon: language of the interviews, number of respondents, disciplinary background of respondents, interview type, content design, potential interviewers having in mind the scarcity of ESR within the Action.

Joint agreement on the potential focus: SIG to focus on interviews and case studies of ESR in their respective countries concerning their experience with evaluation and its various aspects (understanding, fair/unfair treatment, learning experience, etc.). Possibly from a cross-disciplinary perspective.

Further direction of activities for shaping up and focusing the SIG for ESR:

- Overview of the literature, on-going projects, etc. concerned specifically with ESR and evaluation.
- Encouragement of a more active participation of ESR in the SIG.
- Interview design.
- Pilot interviews.

**WG2: second session
12th of July, 9h00-11h00**

The second session of WG2 was based on ideas collected during the first session, and put into shape by the chair and vice-chair of the group. A discussion is engaged on this basis and leads to a series of decisions summarised in the presentation “CA15137_WG2_session2”.

**WG3: second session
12th of July, 9h00-11h00**

The group continued with presentations about databases or repositories in various countries:

- Czech Republic (Jiří Kolman, kolman.j@czechglobe.cz)
- Latvia (Arnis Kokorevics, arnis.kokorevics@lzp.gov.lv)
- Lithuania (Jolanta Sinkuniene, jolanta2palmeris@gmail.com)
- Poland (Emanuel Kulczycki, emek@amu.edu.pl)

In addition input regarding the Estonian national system, which is well documented at www.etis.ee was provided.

Several issues were discussed in response to one or more presentations included:

- the question of how best to deal with ‘predatory’ Open Access journals. This is an issue in many European countries, for which various data sources are used (Beall’s list, Open Access Scholarly Publishers Association, Directory of Open Access Journals). The Scandinavian countries are working towards a formal collaboration with Directory of Open Access Journals.
- the importance of local language. Especially the Humanities have a strong relation to the language and culture that they study; this is part of the societal relevance of SSH research.
- the fact that WG3 should focus not just on databases but also on how they are used, e.g. whole versus fractional counting (cf. task 3: rules and procedures for databases).
- the need to address new (‘modern’) output types, such as multimedial products, in analyses of SSH scholarly production. The WG agreed to address this issue, relating to its task 5, in one of the next meetings.

The working group agreed upon starting the following initiatives:

- A thorough overview of existing databases will be created. This is listed as a milestone for WG3. Towards this end a fact sheet will be created and circulated among presenters at the meeting and other WG participants. The goal is to have an overview by the end of September.

Contact: Raf Guns, Tim Engels

- An extension of the article ‘Taking scholarly books into account’

(<http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11192-016-1886-5>) to other countries will be written. Input from additional countries and participants is welcome. This new paper will be structured by questions like ‘What types of book publications are taken into account? How are publishers considered? What criteria are used per book or per chapter? What is the role of book series?’ etc.

Contact: Jorge Mañana Rodriguez

- A study will be carried out on the context and proposed uses of national publication databases and local repositories. This way evidence can be found for intended as well as unintended effects of such databases.

Contact: Sven Hug

For all of these, input from and collaboration with other WG participants is highly welcome, regardless of whether they have attended the Poznan meeting.

More generally, the WG chair invites all WG participants to consider possibilities for bilateral or multilateral collaboration. Criteria for COST production are that COST support is mentioned, the result is publicly available, at least two countries in the network should be involved, and the research has started as a result of the COST action. One proposal is an extension of the 2005-2009 comparison of the evolution of publication patterns in Flanders and Norway to 2005-2014, with among other things an analysis of (de)concentration as a measure of internationalization.

Final plenary meeting July 12th, 11h30-12h30

During the final plenary meeting, each WG leader reports about the progress made in the group during the two days and the subsequent tasks (see pdf document “CA15137_Poznan_final_meeting”).

In addition, the leader of WG4 announces that the domain name has been bought and the provisional version of the website has been put on line at the address: www.enressh.eu

(Addition: the first call for STSM has been published since on this website on the 18th of August 2016).

The chair announces the next steps of the Action:

- dissemination event: a roundtable dedicated to the Action, organised at the STI-ENID conference in Valencia, in September 2017. The chair thanks all participants of the Action who will contribute to this roundtable in spite of the fact that their participation will not be financially supported by the Action. The roundtable is meant to present the problems of SSH evaluation, as conceptualised by ENRESSH, as well as the possible solutions our Action recommends. It will be a way to engage with an international audience, and to gather input from this.
- dissemination event: a presentation of the Action will be made at the Open Evaluation conference in Vienna, October 2017.
- the stakeholders’ conference in Prague, January 2017. The aim of this meeting is to achieve early engagement with institutional key players in research evaluation in Europe; it is conceived as well as a tool to collect needs, and to circulate ideas, methods and best practices, as researched by members of the Action. The meeting will gather a very small number of participants from the Action, who will act as keynote speakers and moderators of debates. If budgetary possible, the meeting will be preceded by a one day inter-WG

session, dedicated to tackling issues asking for a transversal (i. e., inter-WG) approach, such as altmetrics for the SSH. However, it is to be expected that, for constraints of room space, all participants to the inter-WG working day won't participate in the stakeholders' conference. This may be frustrating, and the chair thanks all participants in the organising committee who played the game knowing that they may actually not participate to the ball.

- MC and WG meeting: a proposal for hosting the next MC and WG meeting has been received from our Bulgarian participants, and the Chair thanks Mrs. Albena Vutsova for this. Dates are not definitive as yet, but the meeting has to take place in March 2017.

To sum up, the chair thanks everybody for their active participation, this allowed to progress towards the achievement of the goals of the Action. She insists on the need to be active in between the meetings of the Action through remote cooperation. She underlines that this cooperation does not necessarily need to involve the whole WG, during the two days several participants have discovered common interests and shared methodologies, and they may progress towards the completion of a joint publication under the auspices of the Action, which is precisely one of the types of deliverable we have promised. As leader of the dissemination group, Pr. Williams reminds participants to use the short or long COST boilerplate if they publish joint papers issued from cooperation stimulated by the COST Action.

The Chair invites participants to think about enlarging the network in their own countries. These can be as big as needed to tackle the scientific issues of the Action, but the Chair underlines that there is a maximum of people who can be invited to face-to-face meetings, meaning 2 per WG per country; even this is a virtual figure more than anything else, because the budget will simply not suffice to invite 240 people (8 multiplied by the 30 countries having signed the MoU). Moreover, the steering group reserves the right to filter applications, as it aims at achieving various balances in the whole network: a gender balance, a country balance (between research intensive and less research intensive countries), as well as a senior/ junior researcher balance. In particular, invitations to face to face meetings will strive to achieve this balance, even if the first criteria to be taken into consideration when issuing future invitations will be the scientific relevance of the contributions and the level of participation during the phases of remote cooperation.

New applications in the network will be reviewed on a rolling schedule, as the steering group has virtual meetings every 6 weeks.

The meeting ends at 13h00, followed by a lunch and an afternoon meeting of the steering group.