If you would like to attend the ENRESSH Meeting in Paris, please register via the following form by 10 February 2020:

https://forms.gle/6HeVbVVfnbRcsmU2A

Participation in the meeting is free of charge.

Venue:
Université Sorbonne Nouvelle
Institut du Monde anglophone
5, rue de l’École de Médecine
75006 PARIS

AGENDA
18th of February, 2020
Dissemination Event

10h00–10h30  Opening of the event by Mrs. Monica DIETL, former director of COST and Mr. Jamil Jean-Marc DAKHLIA, president of the Université Sorbonne-Nouvelle

10h30–10h45  Research evaluation for the benefit of society (Emanuel Kulczycki)

10h45–12h45  ENRESSH toolbox for SSH policy community
Chair: Jack Spaapen

Evaluation as a tool to achieve policies

- Michael Ochsner: Aligning research evaluation with clear policy goals: risks and opportunities
● Paul Benneworth: How to provide structures and incentives to foster impactful research

*Improving research information systems*

● Linda Sīle: National bibliographic databases for research evaluation: the knowns and the unknowns
● Elea Gimenez-Toledo and Gunnar Sivertsen: ABP, the register of Academic Book Publishers

*Internationality and locality: Opposition or a winning team?*

● Janne Pölönen: The Helsinki Initiative on Multilingualism in Scholarly Communication
● Jon Holm: Peer Review, language, national and international communities

12h45–14h00 *Lunch*

14:00–16:00 **ENRESSH tips for SSH research community**  
Chair: Emanuel Kulczycki

*Evaluation and publication strategy*

● Tim Engels & Emanuel Kulczycki: Diversity of publication patterns and its implications for evaluation
● Marc Vanholsbeeck: How to promote open science
● Julia Olmos Peñuela: Managing the tensions of rigour and relevance in output evaluation

*Evaluation and career*

● Ginevra Peruginelli: Diversity of evaluation systems
● Marc Vanholsbeeck: Early career investigators and evaluation in SSH: Opportunities and threats

*Role as evaluators*

● Michael Ochsner: Identifying research quality
● Raf Guns & Marek Hołowiecki: Ambiguity, labelling and questionable practices in peer review