

**Minutes of the Second Management Committee Meeting of the COST ACTION
CA15137: “European Network for Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and the
Humanities (ENRESSH)”**

Sofia, Bulgaria
07/03/2017

1. Welcome to participants

The participants were welcomed by Ioana Galleron, Chair of ENRESSH, and by Jack Spaapen, vice-chair. The minutes of the meeting were taken by Mr. Marek Holowiecki, administrative officer, representative of the grant holder, and by Dr. Jack Spaapen.

2. Verification of the presence of two-thirds of the Participating COST Countries.

Number of Participating COST Countries present at the meeting: 25 (Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Montenegro, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Romania)

25 COST Countries attended the meeting and the quorum (2/3 of COST countries participating in the Action) was reached.

3. Adoption of agenda.

The agenda (annex 1) for the 2nd Management Committee (MC) was adopted unanimously.

A participant from Switzerland asked when the “Prague Manifesto” would be discussed. The Chair answered that the discussion had initially been scheduled for the first WG meeting day. For time reasons, it was postponed to the morning of the 8th of March.

4. Update from the Action Chair.

The Action chair presented general facts about the Action, following the annexed presentation (annex 2).

a) Status of the Action

Start of the Action: 08/04/2016

End of Action: 07/04/2020

Total number of COST Countries having accepted the MoU: 35

Total number of COST Countries intending to accept the MoU: 0

Participating NNC institutions

Information Society Development Institute from Moldova, represented by Pr. Gheorghe Cuciureanu.

A letter of intent was uploaded by the representative of the institution on the 16th of August

2016. A MC Written procedure, approval procedure, was notified to MC members on the 23rd of August 2016. In the absence of any objections, the approval of Moldova's participation was validated on the 1st of September 2016.

However, the chair observes that the cooperation has not fructified yet, due maybe to political changes in Moldova.

International cooperation

1. ITESO University (Universidad Jesuita de Guadalajara, Mexico), represented by Mrs. Catalina Morfin Lopez
Letter of intent : 22nd of August 2016
MC written procedure started : 21st of October 2016
Participation approved on : 29th of October 2016

2. Centre for Research on Evaluation, Science and Technology, Stellenbosch University (South Africa) represented by Mr. Nelius Boshoff
Letter of intent : 23rd of August 2016
MC written procedure started : 14th of October 2016
Participation approved on : 29th of October 2016
Cooperation with CREST is active ; the representative of the institution attended the WG meeting in Sofia, and actively engaged in activities of all WGs.

b) STSM

See presentation by Dr. Mimi Urbanc (annex 3).

c) Promotion of gender balance and early career investigators.

The Action presents a good balance in terms of gender and ECI, and has put into place several measures to preserve this balance. See slides 7 to 9 of the general presentation (annex 2).

d) Inclusiveness and excellence.

The Action seeks to involve members from all participating countries. However, some members have never manifested any interest in the activities of the network. Surveys launched by the four working groups receive, in general, answers from the same very active members. This is obviously less a matter of geographical origin (active members come as well from Eastern and Western countries, from Nordic and Southern countries), than a matter of personal willingness to contribute. Therefore, the steering committee proposes that participation to meetings to be prioritised towards members having actively participated in remote cooperation between the meetings. See slides 10 and 11 of the general presentation (annex 2).

5. Update from the Grant Holder: Action budget status.

The Action will probably underspend its budget, but this is to be linked to the fact that financing rules have been changed by the COST office during the first GP. As a consequence, the Grant Holder has not received the second instalment of the budget. Therefore, Adam Mickiewicz university had to advance the money for the meeting in Sofia, and also had to partly subsidise the previous meeting, in Prague. Considering its financial capacity, the steering committee was very cautious in accepting participants for Prague. However, all demands of participation have been accepted for Sofia. See slide 12.

6. Follow up of MoU objectives: progress report from the working groups.

WG 1 tasks and deliverables were presented by Dr. Michael Ochsner, leader of the WG. Six subgroups have been created, as well as one on the transversal issue of gender. He presented what has been done so far, the status of the deliverables and proposes a list of tasks to be done in GP2 (see slides 14 to 20 of the annex 2).

WG 2 tasks and deliverables were presented by the Chair of the Action, in the absence of the leader of WG2, who was unable to attend the meeting. The WG has attained its objectives, articulated mainly around the creation, the diffusion and the analysis of a fiche for understanding “pathways to impact”. This will feed in the report on “Synthetic typology of ‘modes of SSH engagement”, to be presented at the beginning of the second GP. (slides 20 to 25)

WG 3 achievements are presented by Dr. Tim Engels, WG leader. The group has expanded, especially with new members from Finland and Serbia. Activities and deliverables are on track, especially thanks to three very successful STSM, but also to the work of Linda Sile on the survey about databases covering SSH output. Exploitation of the survey is planned during the second GP, as well as other tasks. (slides 26 to 32).

WG4 was presented by Pr. Geoffrey Williams, its leader. This group, the smallest of the Action, has been very active: the website has been built, social media created, a press release conceived, then translated in 17 languages, several dissemination papers and blogs have been written. The group organised the first stakeholders’ conference in Prague, a very successful conference, where the “Prague manifesto” concerning principles of SSH research evaluation was elaborated. More work is needed on this “manifesto”, but this is a powerful document, a showcase of the know-how of the members of the Action. Also, the “who’s who in SSH research evaluation” is an on-going task, the information provided is very variable and needs to be updated and completed. (slides 33 to 40)

A special interest group for ECI was created at the beginning of the Action. Its activities were presented by Dr. Jolanta Sinkuniene, its leader. The SIG involves participants from 18 countries, and defined its working plan (inexistent in the MoU). A survey is in preparation, concerning challenges for ECI in the context of SSH research evaluation specificities. (slides 41 to 46)

At the end of the presentation, the MC organised a vote upon the monitoring progress report, to be submitted by the Chair of the Action on behalf of the MC committee. The progress report will be based on the presentations of WG leaders. In a lighter form, it has been already sent to all ENRESSH members, for completion.

Resolution 1. The MC votes unanimously the submission of the progress report, and authorises the Chair to bring all needed modifications.

7. Scientific planning.

a), c) and d)

The Chair reminded participants of the aims of the Action, then presented the goals for the second GP. These have been elaborated with the WG leaders, and respond to the actual state of the activities, as well as to the need to realise on time the deliverables promised in the MoU. The long-term planning of the activities was presented in the same time (before the presentation of the budget).

A participant asked if the proposed plan was not too ambitious: do we have enough capacity, especially if all members of ENRESSH do not pull with the expected weight? The Chair underlines again that the deliverables are all in the MoU, and that participants have accepted to work on these since their country signed the MoU.

Resolution 2: The MC adopts the proposed working plan and authorises the MC Chair and steering committee to bring, if necessary, modifications to the WBP (corrections, additions, specifications demanded by COST office).

Unanimous approval

b) Action budget planning

Resolution 3: The MC approves a FSAC rate of 15% of the total scientific expenditure.
Unanimous decision to back up the resolution.

Resolution 4: The MC adopts the proposed budget. Modifications to the reimbursement rates can be further voted before the meetings in order to allow participation of a maximum of members
Unanimous decision to back up the resolution

Regarding the Action Budget Planning, Jon Holm asks if there is room for saving on certain items? Answer: in principle yes, all synergies are to be sought, and shared expenses to be privileged.

8. AOB.

Resolution 5: The steering group will continue the same policy for balancing age, gender and country participation.
Unanimous decision to back up the resolution

9. Location and date of next meeting

Antwerp, 5 and 6 of July 2017. This is not a MC, but a WG meeting. Financial provision has been made for some 40 participations. A doodle will be launched from March 13 to March 17 to gauge participation. If too many participants, the steering committee will select participants to be reimbursed; balance between countries, age and gender will be sought. However, the main criteria is the scientific contribution of each participant to the goals of the meeting. It is strongly recommended to get in contact with the WG leader and to propose a clear input for Antwerp. Specific tasks and goals for each WG in Antwerp have been presented in WG meeting in the morning, or will be presented on the 8th of March. See also slides from all WG meetings, in the members' area of the website (password needed, the procedure for obtaining a password has been sent weeks before by Pr. Williams to all participants).

10. Closing

No other matters having to be discussed, the Chair closed the MC meeting at 18h15.