# Work Group 1 Meeting in Podgorica
# 7/8 March 2019

## First session, 7 March 2019, 13:30-15:30

**Participants**: Michael Ochsner (Chair), Aldis Gedutis, Elea Giménez-Toledo, Agnė Girkontaitė, Jon Holm, Marek Holowiecki, Todor Hristov Dechev, Nina Kancewicz-Hoffman, Arnis Kokorevics, Litauras Kraniauskas, Emanuel Kulczycki, Jorge Mañana-Rodríguez, Elena Papanastasiou, Sanja Peković, Ginevra Peruginelli, Janne Pölönen, Hulda Proppé, Elías Sanz-Casado, Linda Sīle, Dagmar Simon, Jolanta Sinkuniene, Gunnar Sivertsen, Jack Spaapen, Jadranka Stojanovski, Mimi Urbanc, Marc Vanholsbeeck, Albena Vutsova, Alesia Zuccala

The first session for Work Group 1 in Podgorica was dedicated to the report on peer review practices due at the end of the running Grant Period. It was structured as follows: First, Michael shortly updated the WG1 members about the state of the art of the work in WG1 and presented the plan for Grant Period 4. After the information on the structure of the two sessions during this meeting, Aldis Gedutis presented shortly the result of the STSM on Ethics in Research Evaluation at the Sapienza University, Rome. This was followed by a short presentation of the current state of the report on peer review practices due in May and a decision on the points that were still to be discussed. Liutauras Kraniauskas presented a new project on the opposition against evaluation procedures. The last 30 minutes were dedicated to group work for the different projects.

*Introduction*
Michael presented the outputs that the work group needs to deliver, and which outputs were already created. He also announced the newly created "WG1 communication group" consisting of Jon Holm, Gemma Derrick, Jadranka Stojanovski and Albena Vutsova. This group will support Michael in creating the newsletter and updating the website and – most importantly – will work on formulating the results of WG1 work into important messages for each stakeholder. Michael reminded the members that all activities related to WG1 work, be it presentations, publications or stakeholder interactions, should be reported to this group (mail to Jon Holm and CC Michael).

*Presentation on project "ethics of research evaluation in the SSH"*
Aldis Gedutis presented the results of his STSM at Sapienza University in Rome where he visited Maria Teresa Biagetti. They analyse ethical foundations of research evaluation. So far, their analysis showed that there is not much on this topic. However, there are works on ethics of research and ethics of evaluation. These works can be used to develop an ethics of research evaluation. This is an ongoing project and other ENRESSH members interested in joining this project are asked to get in contact with Aldis Gedutis and Maria Teresa Biagetti.

*Peer Review Practices (Chair: Nina Kancewicz-Hoffman and Michael Ochsner)*
The report "overview of peer review practices" is on its way and a first draft has been circulated among the involved members. Some chapters are almost completed, others are in draft version and some are still missing. During this meeting, some issues were addressed that emerged when drafting the report: Whom does the report address exactly? Peer review vs. evaluation in general; balance between peer review in general vs. SSH specific issues; overall writing style, e.g. ENRESSH results vs. overview of work on peer review; authorship is not always clear; bibliography. Furthermore, it was suggested to organise "friendly peer review" within ENRESSH and an updated time line was introduced.

The following conclusions were drawn:
**To whom** the report is addressed: The report is *aimed at* researchers in evaluation, research managers, policy makers, publishers and journal editors but also SSH community at large. To facilitate its dissemination and strengthen impact a separate *executive summary*/policy brief will be produced to reach policy makers; the brief will be prepared only after the report is finalized. Dagmar Simon volunteered to (co) work on the policy brief.
**Peer review vs. evaluation** in general: ENRESSH is about evaluation and peer review is one method to do that so the *two issues cannot be separated* but *focus should be on peer review*.
**Balance** peer review in general vs. SSH: We write on issues generally relevant for peer review *without stressing general distinctions* between STEM and SSH but *focus* on those aspects which are *specifically relevant for SSH.*
**Overall style**: We accept that there *cannot be the same approach for all four chapters*; among others there are differences in research methods, cultures and publishing patterns between fields within SSH.
**Authorship**: Revised chapters sent to Nina should have clear indication of authorship.
**Bibliography**: Marek will compile the bibliography; all authors are asked to send their bibliography to Marek.

After the discussion of these issues occurring in the current draft, the group discussed potential topics that could be added regrading current ENRESSH projects. Hearing Aldis' presentation, it was concluded that the topic fits well into the report. Aldis agreed to write a paragraph on ethical issues in peer review based on his and Maria Teresa Biagetti's work. Ginevra and Elías volunteered to write a summary their work on peer review in law in Italy and Spain for chapter 3. Janne and Tim agreed to write a summary of their article on peer review labels for book publishers that will be included in Elea's section on peer review for books.

It was decided that the sections go through a friendly peer review within ENRESSH. Jon, Mimi, Ginevra, Elea, Michael and Karolina volunteered to involve in the review process. **More volunteers are needed**. Please **contact Nina** as soon as possible if you are ready to review a section.

Nina will edit the whole report eliminating repetitions and making the structure of chapters as uniform as possible. Marek and Michael will help with editing and formatting. Dagmar volunteered to review the whole report with regard to consistency, mistakes etc.

Revised timeline

| | |
|---|---|
| Chapters still due and revised chapters due | 31 March |
| Review of chapters by reviewers-volunteers | 2-15 April |
| Chapters with reviews back to authors to revise/respond to reviews: | 15-25 April (includes Easter) |
| Nina should have final versions of all chapters by | 25 April |
| Nina with assistance of Marek editing the final draft | 26 April-15 May |
| A first version will be published on ENRESSH website in early May (or as soon as possible) | |
| The draft report available for comments from all authors | 15-22 May |
| Review of the whole report Dagmar, finalizing the report Nina | 22 May - 05 June |

*New project by Liutauras Kraniauskas: Who and What Fails Credibility of Assessment? Reflections on Public Discourse, Expert Knowledge, and Democracy*
In 2018, Lithuania introduced a new evaluation procedure, institutional benchmarking taking the form of a hybrid model between the UK REF and quantitative measuring of publication output. It was an absolutely new assessment exercise covering all HE and research institutions in the country. The results were presented recently (January 2019) and criticized by experts who performed the benchmarking as well as by scholars who were the subjects of the procedure.
As a consequence, the benchmarking procedure was sued (even before it was carried out), and the case is currently at the Constitutional Court. Liutauras Kraniauskas suggests as a new project for WG1 to analyse the public discourse, representations and political aspects of the assessment and its failure.

*Group work*
The last 30 minutes were intensively used to discuss ongoing projects. Among the projects discussed were *SG5, scholars' attitudes*, which constituted the biggest group. Also *SG4, criteria,* met and discussed further plans and coordinated works as the group leader now resides in New York and cannot join meetings. Smaller groups included projects regarding the peer review report, the *ethics* project and the *who and what fails credibility of assessment* project. Furthermore, some groups also discussed country reports for the *research evaluation procedures* and *communication* of results of WG1.

## Second session, 8 March 2019, 14:00-16:00

**Participants**: Michael Ochsner (Chair), Aldis Gedutis, Nina Kancewicz-Hoffman, Jon Holm, Marek Holowiecki, Todor Hristov, Marlène Iseli, Nataša Jermen, Arnis Kokorevics, Litauras Kraniauskas, Emanuel Kulczycki, Elena Papanastasiou, Sanja Peković, Janne Pölönen, Hulda Proppé, Linda Sīle, Jolanta Sinkuniene, Mimi Urbanc, Marc Vanholsbeeck, Alesia Zuccala

The second session's main focus was on the report on national research evaluation systems. Furthermore, Janne Pölönen presented a Finnish project on the role of learned societies in evaluation procedures. Finally, Michael Ochsner and Marc Vanholsbeeck pointed to the fact that the Open Science movement is important also to research evaluation practices in the SSH.

*Research Evaluation Systems (chair: Michael Ochsner)*
The discussion about the report on Research Evaluation Systems started with a feedback on the reports already submitted. First, Michael thanked for all the reports handed in until now. All reports together without any analysis already amounts to 190 pages. While this is impressive as such and constitutes nice data for analysis, it is also clear that the report that will be published in early May will not contain all details yet as it would become too long. Michael also mentioned that the level of detail is very variable for the different countries and some questions have been interpreted differently by the rapporteurs. This is also due to the fact that even though there was already a lot of discussion what we understand as "national research evaluation systems", it is still not clear enough for the rapporteurs. It was therefore decided that Michael and Ginevra develop a new scheme that includes clear instruction on each dimension. Furthermore, there was a long discussion, which evaluation procedures were relevant for the report, which seems not to have been clear enough because in some countries, grant evaluation is equivalent to institutional evaluation (e.g. SI) or career promotion is the most prominent version (e.g., HR), in other countries, there are two institutions carrying out institutional evaluation (and coming to different results, e.g. BG or RO). Other countries have several procedures in place (PL).
Michael answered that, first, it is normal in comparative cross-cultural research that finding a definition that matches all countries is a difficult and time-consuming task. So, there is no need for despair but rather he thinks that there is a lot of progress in understanding how complex the issue is. Second, the main idea of the concept "National Research Evaluation Systems" is that, indeed, evaluation procedures are combined differently and sometimes are linked to each other. Therefore, each country should describe the setting of the research evaluation procedures in place. The focus will be on how research production is addressed by policy or how researchers are affected by evaluations. There are international reports on evaluation procedures that look only at one aspect (mostly performance-based research funding) but ignore others. We do not want to reproduce those reports, especially as it is key to understand that different evaluation procedures are in place and might even influence each other. To have an idea how research production is affected by the evaluation procedures, we need to know the combination of the different procedures and their importance. This is where the innovation of the project lies – but it also takes time to gather the information and compare the different settings.
It therefore was decided that Michael creates a short survey to make an "inventory" of research evaluation procedures making up a "National Research Evaluation System". We

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

agreed on 5 types of evaluation procedures, for each of which we want to know whether and how many of them are in place in each country. These five are:

0. Accreditation (block funding, right to be called a university, includes teaching, often affecting a university as a whole, not differently across disciplines)
1. Institutional evaluation
   a. evaluation (either formative or funding, based on research evaluation)
   b. performance-based funding (performance-based funding based on metrics, affecting disciplines, institutes or individuals differently)
2. National career promotion (assigning titles or positions for the whole country; single appointments of jobs are excluded)
3. National competitive research funding (grants, usually for projects but can also include career (temporary professorships or mobility grants) or long-term flagship projects (e.g. 10-years project with institutional funding)). Only competitive grants based on national funding (no private funding institutions)
4. Evaluation of academies of sciences or important extra-university research institutions

After that, Michael and Ginevra will provide a template to produce a summary table (last page of the current reports) before going into full detail. However, the information given in the table must be collected seriously by citing official sources. These tables will be part of the report published in May.

The tables will also be used for a first analysis for the GP3-report. After the GP3-report the rapporteurs will update the country reports regarding the missing evaluation procedures. It will be decided on the basis of the inventory which procedures will be included in which detail in the final country reports. These will be used for the final report which is due in 2020.

It is planned to publish a book out of the country reports as this will be one of the major outcomes of WG1. Up to date, there is no information in such detail on evaluation procedures available, certainly not for the SSH.

We plan also to submit a roundtable on national research evaluation system at the RESSH conference. An abstract needs to be prepared for the 15th April.

| | |
|---|---|
| Survey: Inventory | 31 March |
| Update of summary tables | 2-15 April |
| <span style="color:red">Abstract for Roundtable at RESSH conference</span> | <span style="color:red">15 April</span> |
| Some descriptive analyses on the topics, one or two paragraphs each | 15-25 April (includes Easter) |
| <span style="color:red">Michael receives final versions of paragraphs</span> | <span style="color:red">25 April</span> |
| Michael creates report for website | 26 April - 1 May |
| Update of country reports in more detail | 25 April - 31 May |
| Analysis regarding the topics for the final report and the book | 1 June - 17 September |
| Roundtable | 19/20 September |

*New project by Janne Pölönen: The Role of Learned Societies in Research Evaluation*
In Finland, a survey was administered to the Finnish learned societies as these organisations take an important role in the Finnish research system, for example as publishers (they account for around two thirds of peer reviewed publication channels in Finland). The survey takes around 15 minutes to complete and covers the following topics: Background information, reasons for membership, finances, organization and personnel, membership, publishing activity, seminar and conference activity, research activity, societal interaction, open science, collaboration, future.
Janne suggests fielding the survey in more countries. The project would then write an ENRESSH report on SSH learned societies and publish an article on a comparative analysis. Persons interested in this project are asked to contact Janne directly.

*Open Access in the SSH (Marc Vanholsbeeck and Michael Ochsner)*
Michael shortly introduced the topic by stating that the theme of Open Access, Open Data and Open Science should be addressed in the last Grant Period. It is partly addressed in the reports on peer review and national evaluation systems, but it should be investigated in more details as there are risks as well as opportunities in the transition to Open Access. It is important that the SSH are included in the discussion about the transition in order to be sure that the SSH way of knowledge production benefits most of the advantages and is not hit by its disadvantages. There is also a clear link to evaluation as the current plans to Open Access involve how journals are evaluated and ignore the effects on the small publishers, especially those who do a tremendously important work in the popularisation of humanities research. ENRESSH should get involved in the national discussions about the implementations of Plan S.
Marc pointed out three current topics in the Open Access discourse that are relevant for ENRESSH:
1. Plan S and more generally the flipping to Open Access (EU) policies. He emphasized that the discussion about 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 we want (for the SSH). Choices of OA

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

business models may just as well foster the Majors quasi-monopoly on the scholarly market, as it may nurture more innovative and "bibliodiverse" solutions.

2. OA is also directly linked to societal impact in the SSH. Marc used the example of the OA book of Lafleur and Marfouk (Université de Liège) about the perception of migrations on the basis of European Social Survey data. This book received a lot of media attention in French speaking BE, and the number of downloads is impressive.

3. Besides OA, Open Research Data Infrastructures are relevant for the SSH. Marc stressed the importance of fostering SSH participation into Open Research Data infrastructures like the EOSC (European Open Science Cloud), since within the infrastructure community, data are often thought in a very "STEM / Big data" perspective, without enough consideration for SSH and the long tail of science in general.

Persons interested in working on a document on Open Access/Open Data/Open Science are asked to contact Marc for collaboration.

Michael closed the meeting by thanking all members for their valuable work and commitment.