

Work Group 1 Meeting in Ljubljana 10/11 July 2018

First session, 10 July 2018, 9:30-12:30

Participants: Michael Ochsner (Chair), Judit Bar-Ilan, Ondřej Daniel, Katya De Giovanni, Ioana Galleron, Aldis Gedutis, Haris Gekić, Elea Giménez-Toledo, Agnè Girkontaitė, Raf Guns, Jon Holm, Marek Holowiecki, Andrea Isenič Starčič, Dragan Ivanović, Litauras Kraniuskas, Emanuel Kulczycki, Elena Papanastasiou, Ginevra Peruginelli, Janne Pölönen, Hulda Proppé, Tony Ross-Hellauer, Elías Sanz-Casado, Ana Ramos, Linda Šile, Karel Šima, Jolanta Sinkuniene, Jack Spaapen, Mimi Urbanc, Marc Vanholsbeeck, Maja Vehovec, Alesia Zuccala

In the Work Group meeting in Ljubljana, the first session was dedicated to the report on research evaluation systems 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. After the information on the structure of the two sessions during this meeting, Michael presented shortly the conference paper on the survey on national evaluation systems. This was followed by presentation of the first drafts of country reports. Finally, the structure of the report and topics for comparative analyses were discussed.

Introduction

Michael informed the group that the meeting for SG5 will take place the next day (session 2) as there will be less double duties regarding peer review than country reports on evaluations systems and that he will chair session 2 on peer review as Nina Kancewicz-Hoffman was not able to travel this time.

National Evaluation Systems (Chair: Michael Ochsner)

Michael presented shortly the conference paper on the survey on national evaluation systems that will constitute the first part of the report on research evaluation system. This work on how evaluation systems are perceived by the ENRESSH members will be followed by comparative analyses of country reports on the regulations in the different countries.

In the following, nine drafts of country reports were presented: Bosnia Herzegovina, Czech Republic, Finland, Italy, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Portugal and Switzerland. The presentations were vividly discussed, showing that evaluation is complex and specific to the countries' contexts. Detailed knowledge on countries' research evaluation systems (i.e. the total and combination of research evaluation procedures) is thus valuable and needed. A second conclusion was that the grid for the country reports needed some adaptations. As there are typically different research evaluation procedures in a country,

it was decided that each section of the report has short subsections for each procedure and that a final table at the end summarizing the most important features of the set of procedures should be added. The grid will be adapted and sent out to all WG1 members around mid-August.

Further participants volunteered to write a country report until mid-September, so that also Spain, France, Croatia, Israel, Iceland, Lithuania and Slovenia will be covered (adding Bulgaria that was announced per mail before the meeting).

Starting in the end of September, the reports will be analysed. A brainstorming for different topics for comparative analyses led to the following suggestions: Trends (how do systems change/evolve and are there trends visible?); data use; differences in the organisation between performance-based and formative systems; role of societal impact; open science practices, depositing and paths away from publication focus etc.; harmonization (can some systems be harmonized via exchange? Which procedures benefit from harmonization which procedures won't); SSH adaptations. These are first suggestions that spawned interest by the participants. It was agreed that participants will think about to which focus they would like to contribute. Of course, new topics are welcome as long as participants from more than two countries will collaborate on it.

Second session, 11 July 2018, 10:45-12:15

Participants: Michael Ochsner (Chair), Judit Bar-Ilan, Ondřej Daniel, Katya De Giovanni, Ioana Galleron, Aldis Gedutis, Haris Gekić, Elea Giménez-Toledo, Agnė Girkontaitė, Raf Guns, Jon Holm, Marek Holowiecki, Andreja Isenič Starčič, Dragan Ivanović, Litauras Kraniauskas, Emanuel Kulczycki, Elena Papanastasiou, Ginevra Peruginelli, Janne Pölönen, Hulda Proppé, Tony Ross-Hellauer, Elías Sanz-Casado, Ana Ramos, Linda Šīle, Karel Šima, Jolanta Sinkuniene, Gunnar Sivertsen, Jack Spaapen, Mimi Urbanc, Marc Vanholsbeeck, Maja Vehovec, Alesia Zuccala

The second session was split into two groups: the meeting of Sub-Group 5: Attitudes and the meeting of Sub-Group 3: Peer Review.

Peer Review

(Michael Ochsner (Chair), Judit Bar-Ilan, Ondřej Daniel, Katya De Giovanni, Ioana Galleron, Aldis Gedutis, Haris Gekić, Elea Giménez-Toledo, Raf Guns, Jon Holm, Marek Holowiecki, Dragan Ivanović, Litauras Kraniauskas, Ginevra Peruginelli, Janne Pölönen, Tony Ross-Hellauer, Elías Sanz-Casado, Ana Ramos, Linda Šīle, Karel Šima, Jolanta Sinkuniene, Gunnar Sivertsen, Jack Spaapen, Mimi Urbanc, Alesia Zuccala)

The peer review session was organised around the presentations of the ongoing projects. Five projects were presented and discussed. First, Tony Ross-Hellauer presented the collaboration project on the state of the art of SSH peer review with Gemma Derrick and Katya De Giovanni: "Peer review in the Social Sciences and Humanities: In need of development?". The project is at the point where the theoretical framework is set and the major issues are identified. The next steps would be to collect the literature or note the

lack of it. The preliminary finding is the following: Basis of Peer review as a quality control and academic socialisation tool but also to assess embedded notions in the research community is grounded in the STEM fields. As a result, the practice of peer review as we now know it is based on negotiating what is important in research from a STEM perspective and this has repercussions for how reliability, validity and relevance (as hallmarks of academic research) are assessed in SSH research which can have widely different methodologies, perspectives and intellectual contributions.

Is it, therefore, relevant in its current form for negotiating and determining excellence for SSH research? This project will examine literature on the current state of the scholarly peer review process and examine the extent that it is suitable for the characteristics of SSH research.

Marek Holowiecki presented a collaboration with Sven Hug, Lai Ma and Michael Ochsner entitled “A review of empirically established criteria for assessing manuscripts”: The objective of the study is (a) to identify publications that develop criteria for assessing manuscript / journal articles or establish the reasons of peers for the acceptance and rejection of manuscripts, (b) to determine how many of these publications focus on the Social Sciences and Humanities, and (c) to provide a taxonomy of criteria. A systematic literature search has been conducted, metadata and the criteria have been extracted, until November, the metadata and codes will be analysed.

“Peer Review in book publication” was presented by Eléa Giménes Toledo. In depth interviews with Spanish academic publishers allowed the team to identify different manuscript selection processes within publishing houses for deciding the titles to be published. Not only procedures but different criteria for selecting books have been studied. Designing a backlist of academic books is the result of practices quite different to those in academic journals.

Janne Pölönen presented the study he conducts together with Tim Engels and Raf Guns “Ambiguity in the identification of peer-reviewed publications”. Pre-publication peer review is very common in the publishing process, also in the social sciences and humanities (SSH). The distinction between peer-reviewed and other publications plays a role in most metrics-based and expert-based evaluations. However, the scholarly literature has paid relatively little attention to the ambiguity in the identification of peer-reviewed publications. Our paper investigates the extent of ambiguities concerning peer-review status in context of performance-based research funding systems in Flanders and Finland. The results show considerable “grey-zones” of ambiguity over peer-review status of publications in the PRFS context: 9.5% of the SSH journals have been characterized inconsistently by experts, scholars report peer review of their output differently than the experts (16% of the output).

Alesia Zuccala reported from her joint STSM with the PEERE COST-Action. The aim of her project is to investigate the peer review process both in terms of authors' observations concerning manuscript reviews, as well as the thematic content of review texts themselves (i.e., manuscript referee reports). She developed an online survey to collect data on SSH reviews in the sense of a crowd-sourcing data collection. These data will be

analysed using Agent Based Modelling, and will involve the integration of hermeneutics and social simulation. There will be an ENRESSH STSM in Fall 2018, applications are welcome.

Scholars' Attitudes

(Marc Vanholsbeeck (Chair), Agnė Girkontaitė, Andreja Isenič Starčič, Emanuel Kulczycki, Elena Papanastasiou, Hulda Proppé, Maja Vehovec)

The group discussed the state of the submission of a paper for the Impact Conference in Vienna (28-29 November 2018). Notice of acceptance should be received on 17 July [we have received since then the acceptance message].

The interviews are at different state of advancement and some delegates still need to conduct, transcribe and/or translate their interview. Nevertheless the current state of the corpus (9) allows to test the coding of the material.

The group then discussed the relevant dimensions to which the codes (and the further analysis) will relate, and agrees that the research questions for the conference paper constitute a good basis:

- 1. How do senior academics in the social sciences perceive the changes – if any – that happened in the evaluation of researchers since the beginning of their career?*
- 2. To what extent is impact taken into account in the assessment procedures, according to their experience?*
- 3. How do they perceive their own role and influence in the (re)shaping of the rationales and indicators that are to be used in research evaluation, including in regards to impact?*
- 4. How do they perceive their role in the dissemination of these criteria towards the younger generation of researchers?*
- 5. To what extent are these perceptions and behaviours similar in the different participating countries?*

The group then discussed the results of their first floating reading of the available material:

- All interviewees (excepted one) consider that there has been some important change in the way SSH are assessed in their country.
- The change consists not only in the adoption of more quantitative criteria, but also in a general trend towards internationalization.
- The institutional and national contexts play an important role in the attitude towards these changes: what kind of evaluation practices existed previously?
- Some changes affect science in general, some have specific impact on SSH.
- Researchers are de facto quite reflexive interviewees. Some propose analysis of the situation, and not only their immediate experience.

- Most interviewees consider that there are pressure to produce “research with an impact”, but that impact is not well taken into consideration for funding. Most consider it legitimate though to ask researchers to have some societal impact.
- There is some perceived standardization in the career paths and profiles of Academics in sociology. Nevertheless alternative careers are still possible, according to some.
- The generalization of English as language of science brings tension between research and impact (in many cases impact is obtained via vernacular language).
- Internationalization affects the choice of research topics by researchers. Not all quality research can be published internationally.
- There are interviewees who consider they can play with the (new) system, others who do not (and consider it negatively).
- Different types of attitude seem to emerge from compliance to resilience or even resistance.
- There may be some distance between discourses and reality.
- There is a broad scope of interactions with PhD candidates from (perceived) transparency to almost avoiding discussing the topic of assessment.

We had no time to discuss the new deadlines. This will be done through e-mail after the meeting.

Appendix A: Country Reports

The following members agreed on filing a country report on evaluation systems (updated list from the Lisbon meeting):

BA: Haris Gekić

BG: Albena Vutsova

CZ: Karel Šima

CH: Michael, Karin and Marlène

ES; Eléa Giménez Toledo, Jorge Mañana Rodríguez

FI: Janne Pölönen

FR: Ioana Galleron

HR: Maja Vehovec

IE: Lai Ma

IL : Judit Bar-Ilan

IS : Hulda Proppé

IT: Ginevra Peruginelli

LT: Aldis Gedutis

LV: Linda Sīle and Arnis Kokorevičs

ME: Sanja Peković

NO: Jon Holm

PT: Ana Ramos

SI: Mimi Urbanc

ENRESSHers interested in filing such a country report are kindly asked to contact Michael so that the list can be updated.