Final report of the Action

April 2020

CA15137: European Network for Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and the Humanities (ENRESSH)

enressh.eu

ENRESSH aim

ENRESSH has two aims. The first is to enhance the visibility of SSH research and its potential to address societal challenges, many of which are also or even mainly in the area of SSH. Think of the current corona pandemic with major implications for our social, economic and cultural systems, apart from our health of course. But also what seems more technical challenges require the input of the SSH because they can only be successfully implemented when the effects on our societies are studied.

The second aim of ENRESSH is to develop evaluation methods that better fit how SSH researchers communicate with each other and with society. This aim, that obviously supports the first aim of enhancing the potential of SSH, is a necessity for two reasons: (1) many of the evaluation methods in use still are based on the way STEM fields communicate their research results; and (2) most methods are still weak on assessing the contribution of research to societal questions. We addressed this by gathering knowledge about evaluation procedures in Europe and by developing instruments and tools that better fit the SSH.

To change and improve the situation, ENRESSH targets three broad communities involved in SSH research: the academic community, both researchers and policy makers, stakeholders in society, and the world of publishers.

We have done so in many different ways which we will summarize here:

1. **Academic community**

   In the first place we target our closest colleagues, those working in the social sciences and humanities. But we also did reach out to colleagues working in other fields with a connection to SSH, for example in health or sustainability or urban development. With the exception of Sweden, all European countries are involved in ENRESSH one way or another, which means that we have access to almost all SSH communities in Europe. For researchers, ENRESSH has stimulated many projects that addressed one of the main aims of the action (see publication list / website), organized conferences and used various instruments of which the STSM's are perhaps the most important because they target the next generation of talented researchers in short cooperative projects.

Regarding the academic policy community, we aimed at connecting to EU, national and institutional policy makers, specifically focussing on strengthening SSH and/or improving evaluation procedures. We did so in may ways, often in interactive modes, in meetings and workshops and the like. One of our workpackages specifically worked on databases and metrics that were more fit to serve the SSH. A nice example of interaction with the policy community is the collaboration with the Research Council of Norway where we worked together on developing guidelines to help those charged with evaluating societal impact of research.

2. **Stakeholders in society**

This is perhaps the most difficult group to connect to for several reasons, the most important being its wide range. The societal context of every research endeavour is different, and the stakeholders vary in terms of sector, geographical location, size, power and experience. What we did is invite stakeholders to join our general meetings, workshops, and training schools. While we realize that we only reached a small portion of all stakeholders imaginable in Europe, we hope that we were able to plant some seeds for further collaboration. And this worked in some cases where input from stakeholders helped us steer research projects in certain directions, cf. when we looked at what blockages hindered the creation of societal impact.

3. **Publishing world**

The world of book publishing is very important for SSH, but it's role in evaluation is small, certainly relative to the role of journal publications. ENRESSH has focused on improving the knowledge about methods surrounding the book — i.e., edited books, chapters, monographs, textbooks. We also worked on issues related to data access, metadata accuracy, the business of publishing, changes in publishing formats (e.g., open access; electronic publishing) and peer review standards, the results of which helps the evaluation community.

Summary of Work Group 1 activities

Research activities and achievements

The goal of Work Group 1 focused on conceptual frameworks of research evaluation as there is a lack of theoretical knowledge about evaluation of research. To further our knowledge on conceptual issues of research evaluation, we approached the topic from two directions: first, we studied current research evaluation practices across Europe to facilitate mutual learning and to understand how evaluation practices influence research practice and how policy impacts evaluation procedures. Second, we furthered knowledge on research and dissemination practices as well as knowledge creation in the SSH as a basis for the development of evaluation practices adequate to SSH disciplines. To achieve these goals, research activities have been streamlined into different sub-groups facilitating collaborations with the other Work Groups and Special Interest Groups to benefit from synergies. The following sub-groups structured WG1 work: (1) national evaluation systems; (2) peer review practices; (3) quality perceptions and criteria; (4) scholars' attitudes towards evaluation; (5) Research Practices and Evaluation; (6) ethics of research evaluation; (7) the role of learned societies.

As the WG set out to tackle a complex issue with a broad range of topics in more than 30 countries, the focus was laid upon finding common terms and definitions and on collecting a wealth of comparable data across countries as the nature of a COST Action lies in networking. A further focus was on generating policy relevant documents and presentations that needed consultations across, or collaborations between, members of different countries. Given the wealth of data produced, the production of scientific papers based on the data produced will continue for the coming years as such activities can continue without the funding of COST. The wealth of data produced will help perpetuating a Europe-wide network of scholars studying conceptual issues of research evaluation of SSH research beyond the lifetime of the COST Action.

The different research strands from the seven sub-groups were regularly brought together in the joint WG1 meetings where their work and results were discussed in the plenum. Several sessions were held to discuss the relevance of the project results for evaluation practices and how an adequate research evaluation should look like.

The final result of WG1 is a joint policy brief combining all the findings streamlined to

policy recommendations presenting the conceptual framework for research evaluation in the SSH developed by ENRESSH. It emerged from several WG sessions and was written by a dedicated subgroup of WG1 members. It is published on the ENRESSH website and on Figshare. The policy brief contains seven recommendations on research evaluation in the SSH.

It was presented to stakeholders of SSH research evaluation at the final ENRESSH conference in Paris:

- Ochsner, M., 2020. *WG1. Aligning research evaluation with policy goals: Risks and opportunities.* Presentation of the final results at the ENRESSH final meeting in Paris, 18. February 2020. ENRESSH. https://enressh.eu/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/Stakeholders_PolicyGoals_v04.pdf

Another important output combining the different strands of research of WG1 was the Training School on "Evaluation procedures and their impact on SSH careers" from 7th to 11th January 2019 at the Vilnius University in Vilnius, Lithuania that was jointly organized with the SIG ECI. 29 participants and 7 teachers from 14 countries (and even more nationalities), representing 24 disciplines, composed of 15 men and 21 women formed a highly diverse and very active group. Two of the participants and four of the trainers were members of ENRESSH. From the 30 participants accepted for participation, only one had to cancel due to illness.

The Training School was organised in lectures and hands-on sessions. The hands-on sessions were held in fixed groups of 5 trainees and each product of a hands-on session would be re-used in later hands-on sessions. On the first day, the trainees were asked to provide spontaneous associations with research evaluation and were filling in a questionnaire for Early Career Investigators. On the second day, they were introduced into the topic by lectures by Aldis Gedutis (research evaluation), Michael Ochsner (national research evaluation systems, quality criteria and measurement in research evaluation) and Agnė Girkontaitė (Scientific work and reporting). In the hands-on session, the trainees developed a fictive interdisciplinary research proposal for a call entitled "Culture & Innovation". The second day was devoted to Bibliometrics and Altmetrics with lectures by Thed van Leeuwen and Alesia Zuccala. In the hands-on sessions the trainees could apply what they learned using the references in their proposals. The third day focused on peer review practices. Lectures by Wojciech Sowa covered what is peer review in the SSH and how to write and how to interpret reviews, while the lecture by Michael Ochsner explained the issues of peer review. In the hands-on session, each group wrote

reviews for the proposal of two other groups. The final day was devoted how to take up and interpret the reviews and how to improve evaluation for early career investigators. For the first part, the groups were presented the reviews of their proposals by the other groups. For the second part, a lecture on evaluation and early career investigators (by Jolanta Šinkūnienė) led to a discussion on how to improve the situation for early career investigators. A summary by Agnė Girkontaitė finalized the Training School.

The Training School enabled the WG1 and SIG ECI to disseminate their work to early career investigators. The call was widely spread across all European countries through disciplinary networks and universities, thus adding to the visibility of ENRESSH. The evaluations of the Training School by the participants showed that the information is dearly needed, and the early career investigator lacked opportunities to gain knowledge about how to use evaluations and how to prepare themselves for evaluations. Also, it helped the early career investigators to understand how peer review functions and how research quality can be conceptualised. Furthermore, they received state-of-the-art knowledge about bibliometrics and altmetrics and about the opportunities and limitations of research metrics. Finally, the training school helped to establish the awareness of the topic at Vilnius University by including 6 local PhD students and Master's degree holders among the participants who will bring the information on to their peers at VU. A summary article of the training school was published on the website of Vilnius University (http://naujienos.vu.lt/jaunieji-mokslininkai-aiskinosi-moksliniu-tyrimu-vertinimo-kriterijus/) giving the importance of the topic more visibility at Vilnius University. On the other hand, WG1 and SIG ECI were able to gain valuable data from the early career investigators: free associations of how young scholars see evaluation, data for a pilot for the questionnaire for early career investigators, and plenty of written information how young scholars see evaluation and career.

A video was produced with statements by trainers and trainees about the goals and outcomes of the training school. The testimonial video can be found here:

https://youtu.be/62NfmYyGO-s

Work Group 1 members have been invited to several national and international conferences and workshops disseminating results regarding conceptual frameworks of research evaluation or have organized dissemination meetings at relevant international conferences. What follows are a selection of such general presentations (presentations linked to specific sub-groups of WG1 are listed in the section of the sub-group).

- Ochsner, M. (2020). Should the extra-scientific impact/value of research in the SSH be evaluated? Input Presentation in the Workshop "Societal Impact in the SSH" at Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF), Division Humanities and Social Sciences, Berne, Switzerland, 05.05.2020.

- Ochsner, M. (2019). *Societal Impact als Gegenstand der Forschungsevaluation*. Presentation at the public workshop of the general assembly of the Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences (SAGW), University of Berne, Berne, Switzerland, 24.05.2019.

- Ochsner, M. (2018). Conceptual frameworks for evaluation and the role of impact. The populist and nationalist nature of the societal impact agenda. Presentation at the Humanities in Practice Workshop "Studying the humanities through policy concepts: quality, excellence and impact" at the University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway, 06.12.2018.

- Ochsner, M. (2018). Bottom-up approaches to research assessment. Presentation at the Conference "Impact factor, h-Index and university rankings: sense and no(n)sense of quantifying science", Swiss Academy of Sciences, Bern, Switzerland, 21.11.2018.

- Ochsner, M., Dokmanović, M., Kulczycki, E., Gedutis, A., & Hug, S. E. (2018). *The Usefulness of Quality Criteria for Research Policy*. Presentation at the 23rd Nordic Workshop on Bibliometrics and Research Policy at the University of Borås, Sweden, 07.-09.11.2018.

- Ochsner, M. (2018). Chair of the World-Café-Workshop "*Research Evaluation and Research Assessment*" at the INTE-Meeting and Workshop by the LERU "Nurturing a Culture of Responsible Research in the Era of Open Science", University of Geneva, Switzerland, 24.-25.05.2018.

- Ochsner, M. (2018). Wie lässt sich Forschungsleistung sichtbar machen? Ein bottom-up Ansatz zur Entwicklung adäquater Kriterien für die Beurteilung von Forschungsleistungen. Input Presentation and Panel participation at the Workshop „'Und wie möchten Sie beurteilt werden?' Diskussion zur Bewertung von Leistungen in den Geistes-, Sozial-, und Kulturwissenschaften" at the University of Graz, Austria, 15.01.2018.

- Ochsner, M. (2017). The misconception of societal impact. Consequences for its

measurement and its impact on science policy and research. Nordic Workshop for Bibliometrics and Research Policy, 2017. Helsinki, Finland, 10.11.2017.

- Ochsner, M. (2017). How to improve research quality in the social sciences? Young Researchers' Training on Research Quality and Evaluation at the SS. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, Macedonia, 03.10.2017.

- Ochsner, M. (2017). European Network for Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and Humanities (ENRESSH). Presentation of the Action at the Network Meeting of the Program P-3 "Research Performances in the Social Sciences and Humanities" at swissuniversities, Bern, Switzerland. 12.05.2017

- Ochsner, M. (2017). Responsible Individual Metrics? What we can measure and what we want to measure. Presentation at the Workshop "Governance of Science" organized by the VolkswagenStiftung und Leopoldina at Schloss Herrenhäusern, Hannover, Germany. 25.07.2017

- Spaapen, J., & Ochsner, M. (2016). Evaluating to valorise: the societal value of SSH research and the ENRESSH COST Action. Presentation at the conference "Open Evaluation 2016 in Vienna, Austria, 25.11.2016.

- Sivertsen, G., & Galleron, I. (2016). Developing appropriate methods and indicators for evaluation of research in the social sciences and humanities. Presentation of a new COST Action. Special Track with presentations of all Work Groups at the STI Conference in Valencia, Spain, 15 .09.2016

In the following, the most important contributions of the different sub-groups are presented.

1. National Evaluation Systems

To analyse the way SSH research is evaluated across Europe, a multi-stage mixed-methods project was conceived already before the Action started. The leader of the Work Group analysed existing typologies, which showed that there is a lack of knowledge, not only about how SSH research is evaluated, but more generally, how research is evaluated in different countries. Discussing the results with the other co-proposers it was concluded that this is due to the missing definition of the concept "national research evaluation". It was therefore decided that an in-depth analysis and a discussion of the concept with a broad range of experts from different countries will be a priority of this Action. Already

from the outset of the discussions on this topic within Work Group 1, it was clear that the most difficult part of this endeavour was to find a set of terms that could be applied to all countries and were interpreted in a similar way.

In such a complex situation involving different scientific traditions, a diverse range of institutional settings, very different socio-political contexts, various languages and legal conditions, the multi-stage mixed-methods approach was welcomed by the Management Committee and the work on this project lasted for the whole life-cycle of the Action. The project involved two phases: The first phase consisted of a survey approach combined with discussions in the work group using a Delphi-like approach in five steps. This phase served to understand how the experts in our Action perceive the evaluation processes in their countries and to build a typology of national evaluation systems that serves the discussion about definition of terms and concepts. The second phase builds on a qualitative approach based on the knowledge gained in the first phase. In this second phase, the goal was to describe how research is evaluated in the different countries starting from legislations, looking at implementations and give an expert judgement on the potential effects of the different evaluation procedures. The second phase also consisted of five steps, however, steps three and four were introduced during the project as the situation needed refinement. The total project's organisation was the following:

Phase 1: Multi-stage Delphi-like survey:

1. Selection of dimensions characterising different evaluation procedures on the basis of existing typologies and expanded by selected specialists from the extended Steering Group of the ENRESSH Action.
2. A survey consisting of these dimensions was administered to the members of the ENRESSH Action. The members rated the evaluation procedures in their country according to these dimensions. The goal of this survey was to find out whether the dimensions are relevant (discriminate between countries) and whether there are dimensions missing (open questions and comments) or whether there is consistency between ratings of different members from the same country.
3. The results were discussed in the work group, and based on the results and discussions, a refined survey was designed.
4. The refined survey was again fielded among the members of the Action, which had grown considerably in the meantime
5. A typology of European National Evaluation Systems was established using the results of the survey.

Phase 2: Qualitative Analysis of the countries' regulations

1. Creation of a structure based on findings of the previous phase and common definition of terms in discussions in Work Group 1.
2. First versions of country reports by members of the Action
3. Refinement of structure and definition of terms by discussion the first versions of the country report.
4. Inventory of evaluation procedures, revealing structures of national evaluation systems
5. Final versions of country reports

The project showed that there is a lack of knowledge about how research is evaluated across Europe, not only but especially with regards to the SSH. While for some countries, a big corpus of literature regarding one procedure exists, it is never discussed how different evaluation procedures in one country interact, complement, counter-balance or even act against each other. For example, in Norway, there is not only the much discussed "Norwegian Model". Rather, research evaluation takes many forms in Norway, for example there is a peer-review based evaluation procedure by the Norwegian Research Council, an excellence initiative and, of course, competitive research project funding by the government as well. All these procedures have an impact on research and an analysis of how research is evaluated in a country must take into account the full set of such evaluation procedures to adequately describe a situation in a country.

The project also showed that experts do not always agree on certain aspects of research evaluation in a specific country when the procedure is not mentioned explicitly. This can have several reasons: First, as mentioned above, they might have different evaluation procedures in mind when speaking about "research evaluation in country X". Second, regulations can differ from implementations as well as informal use of evaluation results seems to be quite common. The first phase led to a series of publications and presentations. Step 2 of phase 2 has been documented in a preliminary unpublished report distributed among ENRESSH members containing country reports for 18 countries. Its goal was to see how the structure for the country reports work and whether the reports are comparable. The conclusion was that while there is rich material, it is difficult to compare the country reports as not all existing procedures were included in all countries. We therefore decided to not publish it. However, the report led to a number of presentations (see below).

Step 5 had to be postponed due to the Corona Crisis. A book proposal is underway with

Palgrave Macmillan to publish the collection of country reports and add analytical chapters. The project thus will continue throughout 2020/2021.

A subproject under the lead of WG3 focused on the role of books in national evaluation procedures differentiating four types of book evaluation systems.

The following publications are linked with this project:

- Galleron, I., Ochsner, M., Spaapen, J., & Williams, G. (2017). Valorizing SSH research: Towards a new approach to evaluate SSH research' value for society. fteval Journal for Research and Technology Policy Evaluation, 44, 35–41. https://doi.org/10.22163/fteval.2017.274

- Giménez-Toledo, E., Mañana-Rodríguez, J., Engels, T. C. E., Guns, R., Kulczycki, E., Ochsner, M., Sivertsen, G., & Zuccala, A. A. (2019). Taking scholarly books into account, part II: A comparison of 19 European countries in evaluation and funding. Scientometrics, 118(1), 233–251. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2956-7

- Ochsner, M., Kulczycki, E., & Gedutis, A. (2018). The Diversity of European Research Evaluation Systems. Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Science and Technology Indicators (pp. 1234–1241). Leiden: Leiden University. https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/65217

- Ochsner, M., Kulczycki, E., Gedutis, A., Peruginelli, G. (accepted for publication). National research evaluation systems. In R. Ball (ed.), *Handbook of bibliometrics*. De Gruyter.

The following presentations are linked with this project:

- Holm, J. & Ramos, A. (2019). National evaluation exercises as implementation of research policy. A comparative study of Norway and Portugal. Persentation at the 3rd International Conference on Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and Humanities (RESSH), Polytechnical University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain, 20.09.2019.

- Ochsner, M., Peruginelli, G., Giménez-Toledo, E., Holm, J., Ramos, A., & Simon, D. (2019). Towards a clear Research Evaluation Strategy? Overview of SSH Research Evaluation Practices across Europe. Round Table at the 3rd International

Conference on Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and Humanities (RESSH), Polytechnical University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain, 20.09.2019.

- Ochsner, M. (2019). National Research Evaluation Systems, Research Quality and the SSH. Keynote for the KNOWSCIENCE Workshop 2019, Lund University, Lund, Sweden, 21.03.2019.

- Ochsner, M., Kulczycki, E., & Gedutis, A. (2018). The Diversity of European Research Evaluation Systems. Presentation at the STI Conference, Leiden, the Netherlands, 12.–14.09.2018.

- Ochsner, M., Kulczycki, E., & Gedutis, A. (2017). Diversity of research systems in Europe. Nordic Workshop for Bibliometrics and Research Policy, 2017. Helsinki, Finland, 09.11.2017.

- Ochsner, M., Kulczycki, E., & Gedutis, A. (2017). SSH research evaluation in Europe: Towards a classification. Presentation at the conference "Research Evaluation for the Social Sciences and the Humanities (RESSH)" in Antwerp, Belgium, 07.07.2017.

2. Peer Review Practices in the SSH

The subgroup on peer review practices investigated different aspects of peer review relevant for SSH research. Two STSMs were conducted in this sub-group. The first STSM examined the role of peer review in the improvement and validation of knowledge in the social sciences and humanities (SSH). It explored the conceptual basis of peer review in the STEM and its transferal to the SSH. It led to an introductory chapter in the WG1 report on peer review practices and a journal article that will be submitted in the coming weeks. The paper argues that peer review of manuscripts, as a formalised (ritualised) process, evolved in a STEM paradigm to meet STEM priorities (during the cold-war expansion of research) and explores the extent to which those priorities are shared within SSH disciplines.

The second STSM in close collaboration with WG3 investigates peer review in law studies by comparing peer review practices in Italy, Croatia and Spain. Legal scholarship is both the science of law and one of the authoritative and influencing sources of that law. This is why there is a strict correlation between legal science and legal practice. The use of external and independent referees is not in the tradition of this field but still is being adopted recently. In this context, three national surveys have been carried out (Italy, Spain and Croatia) providing a picture of peer review procedures for the evaluation of scholarship included in legal periodicals. The surveys show that there is a change towards

ENRESSH

a more rigorous and transparent peer review process in the law domain in all three countries. The STSM led to a chapter in the report and to an article to be submitted in the coming weeks.

The peer review sub-group had an intensive and fruitful collaboration with WG2 on societal impact (peer review of societal impact, definitions of societal impact), WG3 on data infrastructure (peer review in legal journals, ambiguity of identification whether a publication is peer reviewed) and with the SIG Early Career Investigators (gender issues and geopolitical differences in peer review). This allowed for a broad perspective on peer review in the SSH. The projects in this subgroup led to several presentations as well as articles (published or submitted) and to a comprehensive report entitled "overview of peer review practices in the SSH". The report is structured into five parts: general framework, state of the art of peer review in the SSH in Europe; issues and discussions specific to and most relevant for SSH peer review; guidelines, procedures and formal criteria versus their practical application; current challenges for peer reviewing: towards more open and gender-sensitive peer reviewing practices in the SSH; and conclusions. It covers the topics of the current situation and role of peer review in the SSH; evaluation criteria and methodology of peer review; societal impact (w/ WG2); internationalization; a review of guidelines; ambiguity in identification of peer reviewed publications (w/ WG3); role of peer review in national evaluation systems; systematic review of criteria; peer review for books; peer review in the legal domain (w/ WG3); gender and geopolitical perspectives (w/ SIG EIC); peer review in new modes of knowledge production and dissemination; peer review and Open Science; comprehensive bibliography.

The report is available on the ENRESSH website and figshare.

- Ochsner, M., Kancewicz-Hoffman, N., Hołowiecki, M., Holm, J. (2020). *Overview of Peer Review Practices in the SSH*. ENRESSH. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.12032589.v1

The following publications are linked with this project:

- Derrick, G. & Ross-Helauer, T. (forthcoming). Decolonising the social sciences and humanities through peer review.
- Pölönen, J., Engels, T.C.E., & Guns, R. (2020). Ambiguity in identification of peer-reviewed publications in the Finish and Flemish performance-based research funding systems. *Science and Public Policy, 47*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1093/scipol/scz041

The project led to the following presentations:

- Ross-Hellauer, A., & Derrick, G. (2019). Decolonising the social sciences and humanities through peer review. Presentation at the 3rd International Conference on Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and Humanities (RESSH), Polytechnical University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain, 19.09.2019.
- Hug, S. E., Ma, L., Holowiecki, M. & Ochsner, M. (2019). Criteria for Peer Review of Manuscripts and Grant Proposals: a systematic literature review. Presentation at the 3rd International Conference on Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and Humanities (RESSH), Polytechnical University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain, 19.09.2019.
- Pölönen, J., Engels, T.C.E., Guns, R., & Verleysen, F.T. (2017). Is my publication peer reviewed? A comparison of top-down and bottom-up identification of peer review in the framework of the Finnish and Flemish performance-based research funding systems. In Conference abstracts: Science, Technology and Innovation indicators STI 2017. Open indicators: innovation, participation and actor-based STI indicators Paris 2017, 6–8 September 2017.

3. Quality Perceptions and Criteria

The central concept in research evaluation is research quality. If one evaluates research, one makes statements about what is considered "better" or "worse". What is research quality can differ across disciplines and evaluation situations. Especially the link between SSH research quality conceptions and evaluation is understudied. This sub-group thus started with a review on European projects on SSH research evaluation adopting a bottom-up approach to collect the state of the art of research in the topic. A review paper was published in Palgrave Communications.

In the next step, the sub-group asked the Action members to collect research projects on what is SSH research quality in their countries. This led to an overview of projects on SSH scholars' perception of research quality in the participating countries that was published on the ENRESSH website.

In January 2017, Mišo Dokmanović from Macedonia visited Michael Ochsner at FORS, University of Lausanne, for an STSM on SSH scholars' perceptions of research quality. During the stay, a survey was prepared to investigate criteria for research quality in the social sciences as well as obstacles of doing research in Macedonia. The questionnaire was

fielded among all Macedonian scholars in the social sciences from May to June 2017. In July, the first results were presented at the conference "Research Evaluation in the SSH" at the University of Antwerp. Mišo Dokmanović was funded a follow-up project on Brain Drain in Macedonia by ISIE and Civica Mobilitas, in which he applied the survey methodologies discussed at FORS during his STSM stay. This project included a workshop for young scholars on research quality and a roundtable on brain drain in Macedonia in October 2017. In the workshop for young scholars, Michael Ochsner presented amongst others the work from Work Group 1 to around 70 Bachelor, Master and PhD students. At the roundtable, Michael Ochsner presented the work carried out together with Mišo Dokmanović during the STSM, and Mišo Dokmanović presented the follow-up survey on brain drain. The panel also included the Dean of the law faculty of the Ss. Cyril and Methodius University Skopje and a representative of the Macedonian Ministry for Education and Science who presented the approaches of the new government to improve the research situation in Macedonia. Before the roundtable, Michael Ochsner and Mišo Dokmanović met with the Dean of the law faculty of the Ss. Cyril and Methodius University Skopje and the Representative of the Ministry to discuss how to better evaluate SSH research and how to improve the conditions for research in Macedonia. The meeting was followed by a media conference which led to a comprehensive media coverage of the event including the daily news on TV.

For the media coverage, see:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Uof4MKb4OKM
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CV81NlzzzIU
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z0qiIw-Wo9I

The activities of this sub-group led to the following publications:

- Ochsner, M., Hug, S. E., & Galleron, I. (2017). The future of research assessment in the humanities: bottom-up assessment procedures. Palgrave Communications, 3, 17020. doi:10.1057/palcomms.2017.20
- Ochsner, M., Galleron, I., & Ionescu, A. (2017). List of projects on SSH scholars' perceptions of research quality in participating countries. ENRESSH Report. Version 1.4. http://enressh.eu/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Report_Quality_Projects.pdf
- Ochsner, M. (accepted for publication). Messung von Forschungsleistungen? Was gemessen wird und was gemessen werden will. In I. Welpe, J. Stumpf-Wollersheim, L. Ritzenhöfer & M. Prenzel (Hrsg.), Leistungsbewertungen in Universitäten. De

Gruyter.

The following presentations are linked to this subgroup's activities:

- Ochsner, M. (2018). Was ist Forschungsqualität und kann man sie messen? Nutzen und Gefahren von Bibliometrie, Szientometrie und Altmetrics in Bezug auf wissenschaftliche Karrieren [What is research quality and how can we measure it? Usefulness and risks of bibliometrics, scientometrics and altmetrics with regard to scientific careers]. Workshop at the Doctoral Programme at the Institute of Art History at the University of Zurich, 18. May 2018, Zurich, Switzerland.
- Ochsner, M. (2018). Wie lässt sich Forschungsleistung sichtbar machen? Ein bottom-up Ansatz zur Entwicklung adäquater Kriterien für die Beurteilung von Forschungsleistungen. Input Presentation and Panel participation at the Workshop „'Und wie möchten Sie beurteilt werden?' Diskussion zur Bewertung von Leistungen in den Geistes-, Sozial-, und Kulturwissenschaften" at the University of Graz, Austria, 15.01.2018.
- Ochsner, M., & Dokmanović, M. (2017). Quality criteria for SSH research. SSH scholars' perceptions of research quality at LERU universities and universities in Macedonia. Input presentation at the workshop "Setting up Criteria for Quality in Social Sciences to Prevent Brain Drain in the Republic of Macedonia. SS. Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje, Macedonia, 03.10.2017.
- Ochsner, M., & Dokmanović, M. (2017). Quality criteria and research obstacles in the SSH in Macedonia. Presentation at the conference "Research Evaluation for the Social Sciences and the Humanities (RESSH)" in Antwerp, Belgium, 07.07.2017.

4. Scholars' Attitudes towards Evaluation

Evaluation impacts research practice but the way how research is evaluated is also influenced by how researchers see evaluation as they are not only subjects of evaluation but also involved in them as reviewers or even as experts in the design of evaluation procedures. Therefore, it is important to understand how scholars see evaluation. This subgroup conducted interviews with senior researchers in nine countries. One aspect of the interviews were attitudes towards societal impact policies by senior academics. The subgroup took the Austrian EU Council Presidency Conference on "Impact of Social Sciences and Humanities for a European Research Agenda – Valuation of SSH in mission-oriented research" as an opportunity to start the analysis of the interviews with a focus on this aspect and to present a paper at this conference in Vienna on 29th November 2018.

The presentation led to an article published in the journal fteval: Journal for Research and Technology Policy Evaluation.

Complementing the perspective of senior researchers on evaluation, WG1 members also investigate early career investigators' attitudes towards evaluation in close collaboration with the SIG ECI. Several aspects are covered, a special focus has been laid on gender and geopolitical issues of evaluation. This has led to several presentations and another article submitted to the journal Gender, Work and Organization. An STSM by Karolina Lendák-Kabók visiting Michael Ochsner at FORS, Lausanne, Switzerland, refined a questionnaire drafted in an earlier STSM for the SIG ECI and prepared the fieldwork of a survey of senior and junior researchers to find differences in attitudes but also challenges junior researchers face regarding evaluation. The questionnaire was finalised, and a pilot was successfully fielded among the participants of the second ENRESSH Training School. The addresses for several countries were collected. Fieldwork, however, was delayed due to technical reasons and due to the Corona crisis. Fieldwork is planned for 2020. The work led to several presentations.

Publications linked with this sub-group:

- Mignot, S., Lendak-Kabok, K., & Vanholsbeeck, M. (submitted). Are young researchers fitted to "everyday neoliberalism"? The intersection of gender and geopolitical contexts in academics' career narratives. *Gender, Work and Organization*.
- Vanholsbeeck, M., Demetriou, Th., Girkontaite, A., Istenic Starcic, A., Keiski, V., Kulczycki, E., Papanastasiou, E., Pölöen, J., Proppe, H., & Vehovec, M. (2019). Senior academics as key negotiators in the implementation of impact policies in the social sciences and humanities. fteval: Journal for Research and Technology Policy Evaluation, 48, 72–79. doi:10.22163/fteval.2019.371

Presentations based on work of this sub-group:

- Lendák-Kabók, K., & Mignot-Gérard, S. (2018). Engendering East and West: narratives of early career investigators across Europe. 10th European Conference on Gender Equality in Higher Education. 20.–22. August 2018, Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland.
- Lendák-Kabók, K., & Mignot-Gérard, S. (2018). Geopolitika és a társadalmi nem: fiatal kutatók narratívái Európában [Geopolitics and gender: narratives of early career investigators in Europe]. 14. Nyelv, ideológia, média konferencia, 2018 [14.

Language, Ideology, Media Conference]. 21.-22. September 2018, Szeged, Hungary.

- Lendák-Kabók, K., Mignot-Gérard, S., & Vanholsbeek, M., (2019), How scholars imagine their careers in a neoliberal work context? A gender perspective., Society for Advancement of Socio – Economics (SASE), 27-29 June, The New School - New York City, USA.
- Ochsner, M., Lendák-Kabók, K. & Šinkūnienė, J. (2019) Early Career Investigators' Views on Evaluation, Research Evaluation in the social sciences and humanities 2019, UPV, Valencia, September 19-20.
- Vanholsbeeck, M. (2017). The contradictions of the European (Open) Science policies with regard to the evaluation of research and publications in the social sciences and the humanities. Paper presented at RESSH 2017 (6 / 7 July 2017: Anvers).
- Vanholsbeeck, M., Demetriou, Th., Girkontaite, A., Istenic Starcic, A., Keiski, V., Kulczycki, E., Papanastasiou, E., Pölöen, J., Proppe, H., & Vehovec, M. (2018). Senior academics as key negotiators in the implementation of impact policies in the social sciences and humanities. Pathways to Impact from SSH research: Austrian EU Council Presidency Conference on "Impact of Social Sciences and Humanities for a European Research Agenda – Valuation of SSH in mission-oriented research", Vienna, 28-29. November 2018.
- Vanholsbeeck, M., Sinkuniene, J., Lendák-Kabók, K., & Gekic, H. (2019). Information ecosystems in early academic career building: how do researchers in the social sciences and humanities learn the tricks of the trade? Abstract session presented at RESSH (Research Evaluation in Social Sciences and Humanities) 2019(19-20 / 09 / 2019: Valencia)

5. Research Practices and Evaluation

Evaluation must be linked to research practices. Therefore, it is important to study research practices to improve and adapt evaluation practices. At the same time, evaluations aim at influencing research practice by incentivising certain behaviours. This sub-group studies the two phenomena and their interaction. A first important characteristic of SSH research is the book. In close collaboration with WG3 and the Special Interest Group Books, a special issue on book publication entitled "scholarly books and their evaluation context in the social sciences and humanities" in the Aslib Journal of Information Management was organised.

In this context, a workshop on the topic was organised in Copenhagen by the SIG book

evaluation, including contributions by all WGs. After the meeting, the group visited the Danish Ministry of Higher Education and Science in Copenhagen and discussed possible collaborations and how ENRESSH can provide knowledge to the Ministry.

To study the effect of one important aspect of evaluation, reporting, on researchers' behaviour, an STSM was conducted in January 2018. Agnė Girkontaitė and Michael Ochsner collected data and conducted interviews on what scholars at FORS produce, what they report and how their works are represented in databases and reports. After the STSM, Agnė collected comparable data for the Department of Sociology at Vilnius University and analysed the quantitative as well as the qualitative data. The work led to several presentations and the insights of the project were used by FORS to improve its annual reporting for 2018.

Data is very important for any scientific work, but data production has so far not received much attention in the SSH. This might be linked to the issue that data citations are not standardised. Given the call to open data, giving credit to data producers and data stewards becomes more and more important as it takes a lot of work to reposit data correctly. An STSM at FORS Lausanne in January 2020 by Elina Late set out to investigate if and how data is used and cited in secondary data analysis. First, the host institution's data repository was used to investigate how often reposited data, i.e. data that has been created by a researcher or a team for their own purpose, is downloaded and whether and how authors re-using such data that was made "open" by individual researchers cite these sources. Second, it was investigated how data is cited that is created for secondary analysis, i.e. comparative surveys. Results show that data from repositories are used, some quite extensively. However, most data are not properly cited but rather mentioned, thus not properly giving credit to data producers. Given that the STSM ended just before the Corona Crisis and the end of the Action, no output has yet been produced but the collaboration continues and a paper and presentations are planned.

Open Science as a hot topic regarding SSH research and research evaluation has been discussed in several WG sessions and has led to scientific presentations and invitations to comment on Open Science policies from the perspective of SSH research and to an input publication for the Swiss Science Council's position on Open Access.

Publications linked with this sub-group

- Ochsner, M. (2019). Open Access vision and implementation on international and Swiss levels. A critical appraisal of "Plan S" and "Swissuniversities Action Plan".

Confidential report to the Swiss Science Council. 9. January 2019.

- Zuccala, A. A., Giménez-Toledo, E., & Peruginelli, G. (2018). Scholarly books and their evaluation context in the social sciences and humanities. Aslib Journal of Information Management, 70(6), 586-591.

Presentations using the work of this sub-group

- Ochsner, M. (2020). Public statement on video about the Swiss Academies Factsheet "Open Science in Switzerland: Opportunities and Challenges" from the perspective of the SSH research evaluation. https://youtu.be/mpsGvaahfAo
- Girkontaitė, A., & Ochsner, M. (2019). How reporting requirements can shape research activities. Presentation at the 3rd International Conference on Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and Humanities (RESSH), Polytechnical University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain, 20.09.2019.
- Girkontaitė, A., & Ochsner, M. (2018). „Bet aš jau du metus nesipublikavau" arba Ko nemato vertintojai? [„But I haven't published for two years" or What is not visible for evaluators?]. X-oji nacionalinė Lietuvos sociologų draugijos konferencija [10th National Conference of the Lithuanian Sociological Society], 12-13 October 2018, Klaipėda, Lithuania.
- Galleron, I., Williams, G., Giménez-Toledo, E., Mañana-Rodríguez, G., & Basso, A. (2017). The language of books in the SSH: publication trends in France, Italy and Spain. Presentation at the 2nd International Conference on Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and Humanities (RESSH). University of Antwerp, 6 July 2017. Antwerp, Belgium.
- Williams, G., Bar-Ilan, J., Holm, J., Kulczycki, E., & Vanhaverbeke, H. (2017). Book evaluation. Panel discussion at the 2nd International Conference on Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and Humanities (RESSH). University of Antwerp, 6 July 2017. Antwerp, Belgium.
- Vanholsbeeck, M. (2017). The contradictions of the European (Open) Science policies with regard to the evaluation of research and publications in the social sciences and the humanities. Presentation at the 2nd International Conference on Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and Humanities (RESSH). University of Antwerp, 6 July 2017. Antwerp, Belgium.

6. Ethics of Research Evaluation

Judging others' work involves ethical issues. While the need for clear ethical principles in

research evaluation is known for a while, it seems that the discussion of ethics in research evaluation has not progressed much. This is why Aldis Gedutis and Maria Teresa Biagetti set out to investigate in an STSM in Rome in January 2019 what ethical principles are employed in research evaluation. Whereas there is not much work on ethics of research evaluation, there are works on ethics of research and ethics of evaluation. These works can be used to develop an ethics of research evaluation. After having analysed the existing scientific and grey literature including many guidelines on research ethics and evaluation ethics, Aldis and Teresa teamed up with Lai Ma for a second STSM in December 2019 in which available principles from the fields of research ethics and evaluation ethics were extracted, conceptualised and applied as a basis for tentative set of ethical principles for research evaluation: responsibility, common good, respect for dignity and diversity, fairness, credibility, honesty, free of bias, transparency etc. The project led to a presentation at the International Conference for Research Evaluation in the SSH and an article is ready to be submitted. It was also planned to organise an international conference on ethics in research evaluation in Rome in the fall 2020, but this plan has been annihilated by the Corona Crisis and the plans have been postponed.

Presentation out of this sub-group:

- Gedutis, A., & Biagetti, T. M. (2019). Towards Ethical Principles of Research Evaluation in SSH. Presentation at the 3rd International Conference on Research Evaluation in the Social Sciences and Humanities (RESSH), Polytechnical University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain, 19.09.2019.

7. The Role of Learned Societies

Science policy is currently struck by two concepts: societal impact and open science. Both concepts are not well-defined, especially with regard to research evaluation. However, both of them have an impact on learned societies. Learned societies have played an important role to structure research in a discipline. It is argued that they lost their importance during the last decade due to other ways of building connections. At the same time the open access movement poses problems to many learned societies as they financed themselves often through publications. At the same time, the relevance of societal impact could be a factor for learned societies regaining an important place in academia: While it doesn't make sense that each individual project strives at having a societal impact, the shift of focus from scientific papers to actual societal impact creates the need of an entity to produce established knowledge out of many individual projects

and disseminate this knowledge to the public. Learned societies would be a natural entity for such a task. However, not much is known about how learned societies see their own roles and whether they are prepared for open science and the communication of established knowledge to the public. Based on a Finnish initiative, a questionnaire for learned societies in the SSH was developed and addresses collected in several countries. Besides Finland, the survey was fielded in Switzerland in February 2020 and it was supposed to be fielded in the other countries in March. However, the Corona Crisis hit many involved countries just before the start of fieldwork and it was decided to postpone the survey until the situation has calmed down a bit in order not to overload the representatives of the learned societies in the current crisis. The fieldwork will take place later this year. There is a presentation planned at the anniversary of the Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences in 2021.

Potential follow-on activities

There are many activities foreseen for the coming years regarding WG1 work. The WG has collected abundant data that waits to be analysed. All sub-groups have papers in progress to be published later this year. A few projects, however, will be in the focus of a longer lasting collaboration between the WG members: The national evaluation systems book and the survey of learned societies.

For the first, a proposal is drafted and the contact with the publisher established (in case of unforeseen problems, another international publisher has as shown strong interest in publishing the book). The first step will be to prepare all country reports taking into account all the evaluation procedures indicated in the inventory. The second step will be to analyse commonalities and differences regarding different aspects. Groups of authors for such thematic chapters have already been formed.

Regarding the second, the survey offers a lot of data to be explored. Besides open science and societal impact, also questions of how learned societies face changes in membership, financial security etc.

Regarding quality perceptions, a survey project is ongoing that will investigate perceptions of research quality, obstacles on conducting research and the risk of brain drain in Bosnia Herzegovina and compare it with the results from Macedonia.

Furthermore, in collaboration with the SIG ECI, the survey on evaluation and career will

be fielded in 2020 and provide rich data on career, evaluation and the interaction between the two, leading to further collaborations of the members of the network in the coming years.

In collaboration with WG2, an edited volume on the evaluation of societal impact in the SSH in different countries is in the evaluation state at the publisher.

Summary of Work Group 2 activities

Achievements and work in GP1

The Management Committee meeting in Brussels, April 2016, approved the appointment as co-ordinator of Paul Benneworth, Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS) at the University of Twente, the Netherlands. The MC also formally approved the preliminary working plan for the four year period and also the interim working plan for Year 1.

The first WG meeting (Brussels, April 2016) agreed that WG members would provide two inputs to the WG over the course of the year. The first of these was to undertake a short preliminary questionnaire to scope a common understanding of the domain area – the valorization of SSH research. This was circulated in draft form amongst WG members, responses were given, finalised and circulated in final form. A total of 23 WG members completed this questionnaire and returned them to the co-ordinators, a total of 19 questionnaires contained substantive returns and there were a total of 24,000 words of responses that formed the basis for the initial analysis.

At the Poznan meeting (July 2016), the Work Group discussed the results of initial analysis of the preliminary scoping questionnaire. This was presented to the working group by Paul Benneworth and Julia Olmos Peñuela (Assistant Professor, University of Valencia). The WG then discussed these findings and identified a number of key areas requiring inclusion in any protocol for collecting standardised information on SSH Impact. Poznan concluded by identifying 10 of these areas for standardised information, and the mandating group coordinators to develop a standardised reporting fiche. Across both WG sessions there were an average of 25 WG participants active in the meetings.

This was produced in draft form in late July 2016, and in August 2016 this was submitted

to a pilot group for attempted completion and further comment. A total of five sets of comments and one completed fiche were returned by the pilot group in September 2016. In October 2016, the questionnaire was circulated to all WG members, to a number of ENRESSH participants in other WGs with specialised relevant knowledge as well as to the other WG and SIG co-ordinators.

Achievements and work in GP2

The period from July 2017 has involved the continued exploitation of the 65 fiches generated in the first grant period and working towards a scientific publication. The main activities undertaken in this period involved 2 STSMs, a collaborative session in Finland with the Early Career SIG and planning for the WG2 Training School (13th- 16th February 2018 in Zagreb, Croatia). More information on these activities is provided below, and has been reported in the two newsletters that have been produced in this period.

In GP 3, WG2 will work closely with the SIG on Early Career Researchers to explore the issue of societal impact as a shaper of the early career experience. Two activities have been undertaken in the period as preparatory to that activity. Firstly, at the Trans Working Group meeting in Finland 8th November, representatives of WG2 attended the ECI SIG meeting to discuss the extent to which impact would feature as an element of the survey. Secondly, representatives of WG2 and the SIG met the following week in Porto to create a concrete plan for the activity. The plans agreed in Lisbon involve data gathering at the Training School (see below), an STSM in Twente to analyse the data, and a discussion and dissemination session at the Trans WG meeting in Copenhagen in November 2018. These preliminary plans were subsequently validated by the respective executives of WG2 and SIG ECIs.

A final element has been the preparation of the Training School to be delivered in February 2018. The call closed on 30th November 2017, and a total of 38 applications were received. These were evaluated by the WG executive and a total of 31 participants were invited to attend and receive a bursary to cover their attendance. The programme has now been finalised, and the week is structured around four themes, (i) theories of impact/ value creation (ii) practices to involve partners in impact creation (iii) supportive research council policies for impact and (iv) constructively engaging with the impact agenda in a scientific career. Each of these days will involve presentations from ENRESSH activities, an invited keynote speech from a Trainer, the performing of an assignment and then a concluding discussion of the assignment. Trainers have now been appointed for

these days, namely Gemma Derrick, Paul Benneworth, Leonie van Drooge, Jack Spaapen, Heidi Dybesland and Jon Holm. The Training School will take place on 13th-16th February 2017 (with an initial welcome session on the Monday evening). The Training School is being hosted by Ivo Pilar Institute of Social Science Research in Croatia, and the social programme involves a Gala Dinner, a guided city tour and a science slam communications.

Achievements and work in GP3

In this grant period activity has focused on the consolidating the GP1 work (identifying common definitions of SSH Impact & developing a typology of SSH Impact) and identify the avenues of future work for the WG in GP3-4. Activity undertaken within the WG includes:

- WG2 sessions at ENRESSH meetings (Antwerp, July 2017; Lisbon, April 2018)
- WG2 participation at the Book Evaluation session in Helsinki (Nov 2017)
- A special session on evaluating the societal impact of SSH research
- A Special Issue of Research Evaluation on evaluating the societal impact of SSH research
- 3 STSMs completed with a fourth approved to begin at the start of following Grant Period
- The Winter Training School on Evaluating SSH Impact in Croatia (12-15 February 2018).
- The launch of the "Careers and Research Evaluation Systems for societal impact" initiative (CARES), jointly with SIG Early Career Investigators
- Development of a panel session on Evaluating SSH Research Impact in Societal Context, for the Austrian EU Presidency SSH Impact Conference, 29-30 November 2018.

Achievements and work in GP4

RESSH Special Session (06.07.2017)

A special session was held within the Research Evaluation in Social Sciences and the Humanities conference (6-7 July 2017, Antwerp, Belgium), entitled Societal Impact of Social Sciences and Humanities. Five papers were presented at this special session:

- Nelius Boshoff and Mpho Sefatsa Creating impact through 'productive interactions': An example from South African research on maritime piracy

- Eiríkur Smári Sigurðarson Drowning by Numbers: Evaluating Social Capacities
- David Budtz Pedersen, Jonas Grønvad and Rolf Hvidtfeldt Mapping the societal impact of SSH – a literature review
- Gunnar Sivertsen & Ingebord Meijer Frameworks for understanding the societal relevance of the humanities
- Paul Benneworth, Julia Olmos-Peñuela and Reetta Muhonen Towards a common understanding on the societal impact of SSH research

Special Issue of *Research Evaluation*

Arising from the special session of WG2 in the RESSH conference, Jack Spaapen and Gunnar Sivertsen arranged with the journal Research Evaluation for the production of a special issue on "Evaluating the impact of SSH research". All five of the participants in the RESSH Session submitted a paper as well as one additional paper which came out of the STSM held immediately after the RESSH conference.

Achievements and Work in GP4

The main activity has been the CARES project ("Careers and Research Evaluation Systems for societal impact"). A survey of 108 early career researchers across Europe was completed before the start of this reporting period, and this reporting period has involved analysing the data, including through 2 STSMs around 7 working themes. These themes are being prepared for papers for presentation at the RESSH Valencia conference and will be submitted for a special issue next year.

Steering effects of research evaluation on SSH early career researchers: Paul Benneworth, Julia Olmos-Peñuela and Elena Castro-Martínez

We ask the question of what are the effects of the evaluation of societal impact of research on SSH researchers at the early stage of their career. This paper presents some preliminary descriptive statistics from the survey to understand the effects of impact evaluation processes as respondents took prospective and contemporary research decisions in the hope that that research would be regarded as 'good'. The research had two main findings. The first finding was that impact is a consideration for SSH ECR: most were aware of the idea of impact, and understood its significance for their own research activities Secondly, there were three mismatches in the effects of impact evaluation on

ENRESSH

SSH ECR. Researchers felt creating impact was important for science, but not did that they had been successful in creating impacts; motivation to deliver impact was high, but training received to deliver that impact was low; finally , there was little principled opposition to creating impact, but there were opportunistic barriers, (a shortage of time) necessary to create impact.

Professional factors affecting career and engagement success for Early Career Researchers: Julia Olmos-Peñuela and Paul Benneworth

In this paper, we address the issue of the effects of increasingly intense research evaluation systems on early career SSH researchers' willingness to engage with societal partners. To do this we ask the specific operational research question of which are the professional factors leading to ECR's engagement success? To address this question, we construct a model for early career researcher willingness to engage with societal partners as being shaped by the following conditions, namely, the training they have had in engagement, the institutional environments in which they are operating (university environment) the extent to which being involved in engagement practices creates problems for them. We also contend that their engagement will be affected by the quality of the environment, and in particular the generalised demand for their knowledge coming from society.

Early Career Researchers and Societal Impact: Motivations and Structural Barriers · Corina Balaban, Marta Wróblewska and Paul Benneworth

This study shows that many early career researchers (ECRs) are highly motivated to do research that has a positive impact on society. However, there are many structural barriers that prevent them from doing so: they are employed on short-term contracts; they relocate frequently; and they have their junior academic status to take into account. This paper explains what these structural barriers are and reflects on how they might be addressed. First, we briefly outline the background for this project; second, we explained how we conducted our study; third, we discuss the key findings regarding motivations of ECRs to do 'impactful' research and the barriers that they encounter; and lastly, we argue that good impact requires SSH researchers to develop stable identities as engaged researchers.

Diversity in impact conceptualization and engagement: accounting for social, epistemic and local contexts within the social sciences and humanities: Marc Vanholsbeeck, Karolina Lendák-Kabók and Alexis Dewaele

This paper considers the different ways in which there is a framing of the creation of impact by ECRs in different social, epistemic and local contexts. The paper seeks to look at the way that early career researchers position themselves with regard to impact, the kinds of activities associated with the creation of impact (teaching, media experience, policymaking, working with local audiences) and the associations that researchers have with notions of impact. The paper identifies four broad and contested framings for impact by ECRs; firstly, that impact exists in opposition to excellence, secondly that it is in tension with fundamental research, thirdly that it I complementary to but distinct from fundamental research, and finally that it is part of the research activity.

Does impact have gender? Gendered definitions and framings of impact in social sciences and humanities: Karolina Lendák – Kabók, Marc Vanholsbeeck and Alexis Dewaele

This article is based on the Careers and Research Evaluation Systems for Societal Impact (CARES) survey, which was distributed in 29 European countries. It focused on investigating the attitudes of Early Career Investigators (ECI) toward societal impact. One hundred and six questionnaires were filled in by ECI's across Europe who were either still preparing or already completed their PhD's in the field of social sciences and humanities (SSH). The questionnaire consisted of 14 close-ended and 14 open-ended questions, which aimed to make sense of the complex environment within which ECIs are doing their research and creating societal impact. The questions were focusing on the following topics: definition of impact, pathways to impact, creation of impact, difficulties during the creation of impact and motivation for creating impact. For this study we focused on two specific topics: gendered difference between the definition of impact among ECIs' and their attitude towards impact. The preliminary results are based on the sample of 30 analysed questionnaires.

Early Career Researchers' experiences with impact encouragement and support: insights from across Europe Reetta Muhonen, Stefan De Jong and Nataša Jermen

In a previous study (De Jong & Muhonen 2018), we found that SSH scholars from Eastern Europe operate in a less developed impact ecosystem, which is anticipated to negatively affect their ability to successfully respond to European level funding calls, like Horizon 2020. In this article, we study SSH early career researchers' (ECR) experiences concerning the 1) support of impact practices by their home institution and national science policy, and 2) challenges in impact generation. In analyzing the survey consisting of 104 responds from ECRs across 29 European countries we also pay attention to 3) differences

in impact ecosystems between scholars coming from widening and experienced European countries (See more De Jong & Muhonen 2018).

Hurdles in the Research Impact Ecosystem: Power and Agency for Early Career Investigators: Bradley Good, Rita Faria & Paul Benneworth

In 2018 and 2019, the EU COST Action ENRESSH commissioned a broad survey of 100 Early Career Investigators (ECIs) from across Europe. This survey provides an initial look at both the negative and positive influences on ECIs in producing societal impact. Utilizing a qualitative and quantitative approach, our paper provides an initial analysis of this data from a power-critical perspective, working to highlight factors that either keep ECIs from producing societal impact or that encourage them to do so.

Summary of Work Group 3 activities

Throughout the Action Working group 3 focused on the following tasks:

- To compare publication patterns across countries and disciplines and to analyse characteristics of dissemination channels
- To develop rules and procedures for national bibliographic databases en to design a roadmap for a European SSH research information system
- Develop new metrics to support SSH evaluation

We here report on the achievements for each of these main tasks.

Publication patterns

In order to further the understanding of SSH publication patterns members of WG3 initiated several bilateral and multilateral comparisons of data contained in national comprehensive coverage databases. A comparison of Poland and Flanders resulted in the following conference presentation by Emanuel Kulczycki:

Kulczycki, Emanuel; Engels, Tim C.E.; Nowotniak, Robert (2017). Publication patterns in the social sciences and humanities in Flanders and Poland. 16th International Society of Scientometrics and Informetrics Conference, 16-20 October, 2017, Wuhan, China, p. 1-10.

A further extension of the paper with data from six more countries resulted in the following paper:

Emanuel Kulczycki, Tim C.E. Engels, Janne Pölönen, Kasper Bruun, Marta Dušková, Raf Guns, Robert Nowotniak, Michal Petr, Gunnar Sivertsen, Andreja Istenič Starčič, Alesia A. Zuccala (2018). Publication patterns in the social sciences and humanities: Evidence from eight European countries. Scientometrics, 116 (1), p. 463-486, https://doi.org/10.1007/S11192-018-2711-0.

Work for these papers was initiated through an STSM to Emanuel Kulczycki at the Centre for R&D Monitoring (ECOOM), University of Antwerp, Belgium, during the first Grant Period. Similarly, the STSMs to Michal Petr and Ondřej Daniel at ECOOM-Antwerp resulted in the submission (2020) of the following papers:

Michal Petr, Tim C.E. Engels, Emanuel Kulczycki, Marta Dušková, Raf Guns, Monika Sieberová and Gunnar Sivertsen. Coverage of journal articles in social sciences and humanities in Web of Science and their representation in citation indexes: a comparison of five European countries. Submitted to Scientometrics.
Ondřej Daniel and Robert Kulmiński. Evaluating publication trends and internationalization of selected SSH journals: Evidence from the Czech Republic and Poland. Submitted to Evaluation Theory and Praxis (Czech Republic).

Work initiated through an STSM to Janne Pölönen in Antwerp during GP1 resulted in the presentation of findings at the STI conference in Paris in September 2017. A second presentation on grey zones in peer review will take place at the occasion of the closing conference of the COST-action PeerE, 7-9 March 2018. Furthermore, continued work on this topic resulted in the following paper:

Janne Pölönen, Tim Engels & Raf Guns (2020), Ambiguity in identification of peer-reviewed publications in the Finnish and Flemish performance-based research funding systems, Science and Public Policy, 47:1(2020), p. 1-15, https://doi.org/10.1093/SCIPOL/SCZ041

Collaborative work on the identification of peer-reviewed publications also resulted in the following paper:

Kulczycki, E., Rozkosz, E.A., Engels, T.C.E., Guns, R., Hołowiecki, M., Pölönen, J. (2019) How to identify peer-reviewed publications: Open-identity labels in scholarly book publishing. PLoS ONE 14(3): e0214423. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0214423

A Polish translation of this paper is also available: Nauka i Szkolnictwo Wyższe, 1-2:53-54(2020), p. 183-217,https://doi.org/10.14746/NISW.2019.1-2.6

This collaborative work also fed into the recommendations for evaluation agencies as launched near the end of the action:

Janne Pölönen, Raf Guns, Emanuel Kulczycki, Gunnar Sivertsen & Tim C. E. Engels. National lists of scholarly publication channels: An overview and recommendations for their construction and maintenance. Submitted to Journal of Data and Information Science; preprint available at weblink ENRESSH.

At the end of 2018, a special issue of the Aslib Journal of Information management focused on 'Scholarly books and their evaluation context in the social sciences and humanities'. This special issue was edited by three WG3 participants from Denmark, Spain, and Italy. Five publications in the special issue involved ENRESSH WG3 members. A study of the evolution of shares of book publications in the SSH across five European countries was presented by Tim Engels at the Science and Technology Indicators conference in Leiden:

Engels, T. C. E., Starčič, A. I., Kulczycki, E., Pölönen, J., & Sivertsen, G. (2018). Are book publications disappearing from scholarly communication in the social sciences and humanities? In STI 2018 Conference Proceedings (pp. 774–780). Leiden: Centre for Science and Technology Studies (CWTS). Retrieved from https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/65259

This study was subsequently expanded to a journal paper in the aforementioned ASLIB special issue:

Engels, T. C. E., Starčič, A., I. Kulczycki, E., Pölönen, J., & Sivertsen, G. (2018). Are book publications disappearing from scholarly communication in the social sciences and humanities? Aslib Journal of Information Management, 70(6), 592–607. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJIM-05-2018-0127

Throughout the Action the study of SSH publication patterns remained a focal point. From the beginning of 2019 onwards, members have been active on the topic of multilingualism in scholarly communication, leading to the launch, together with other organisations, of the Helsinki Initiative on Multilingualism in Scholarly Communication on the 3rd of April 2019 (see http://helsinki-initiative.org). A January 2019 STSM to Janne Pölönen facilitated this development as well as the preparation of a manuscript on the use of multiple languages in SSH scholarly publications in 7 European countries:

> Kulczycki, E., Guns, R., Pölönen, J., Engels, T. C. E., Rozkotz, E., Zuccala, A. A., Bruun, K., Eskola, O., Istenic-Starčič, A., Petr, M., & Sivertsen, G. (2020). Multilingual publishing within the social sciences and humanities: a seven-country European study. Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology, https://doi.org/10.1002/ASI.24336

National bibliographic databases

During the first work group 3 meeting in Poznan, members of the WG presented about SSH databases and repositories in (in total) 12 European countries. This formed the first step towards a more systematic approach of getting an overview of databases of SSH research output across Europe. It was decided that a thorough overview of existing databases would be created. A 'database fact sheet' (a survey) was created as the product of an intensive collaborative effort by (in alphabetical order) Tim Engels, Raf Guns, Sven Hug, Jorge Mañana Rodríguez, Linda Sīle, and Gunnar Sivertsen. The survey consists of two main parts: a part about the general context and a part specific to national databases. It was sent out to representatives of all 36 countries included in the COST action. Based on the answers received, members of WG3 published the following report:

> Sīle, L., Guns, R., Sivertsen, G., & Engels, T. C. E. (2017). *European Databases and Repositories for Social Sciences and Humanities Research Output.* Antwerp: ECOOM & ENRESSH. Retrieved July 9, 2017, from https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5172322.v2

Following the presentation of the report during the ENRESSH-WG3 meeting in Antwerp, results of this survey were also presented at the Science and Technology Indicators (STI) conference in Paris, September 2017.

A second survey focusing on the comprehensiveness of 13 of the databases for SSH research output was completed and resulted in the publication of the following manuscript:

> Linda Sīle, Janne Pölönen, Gunnar Sivertsen, Raf Guns, Tim C.E. Engels, Pavel Arefiev, Marta Dušková, Lotte Faurbæk, András Holl, Emanuel Kulczycki, Gustaf Nelhans, Michal Petr, Marjeta Pisk, Sándor Soós, Jadranka Stojanovski, Ari Stone, Jaroslav Šušol, Ruth Teitelbaum (2018). Comprehensiveness of national bibliographic databases for social sciences and humanities: Findings from a European Survey. *Research Evaluation*, 27 (4), 310-322, https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvy016

Work on this paper was facilitated through an STSM to Linda Sīle, allowing her to spend two months with Gunnar Sivertsen at NIFU, Oslo, Norway. On 30 January 2018 the main findings were presented by Linda Sīle during her keynote lecture "National bibliographic databases for research output in the Social Sciences and Humanities: Implications for research evaluation" (Conference: "Science Online XXI. Electronic sources of information for science and education [elektronnye informacionnye resursy dlja nauki i obrazovanija]". January 27 – February 3, 2018. Bad Gastein, Austria. Organiser: Scientific Electronic Library - eLIBRARY.RU (Moscow, Russia)).

WG3 also launched the interactive website https://ecoom.uantwerpen.be/sshdatabases/, which provides an up-to-date overview of national bibliographic databases and repositories for SSH research output in Europe. Currently the overview provides information on 21 databases in Europe and Israel. In the future, it is planned to continuously enrich as well as update this information on each database. Similarly, the overview can be expanded adding more databases. The website was presented for the first time at a workshop in Antwerp (10-11 September 2018), a report of which is available on the LSE Impact Blog (http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2018/11/13/towards-more-consistenttransparent-and-multi-purpose-national-bibliographic-databases-for-research-output/).

WG3 also set out to elaborate a good practice manual for national bibliographic databases. After further discussion of the good practices during the WG meeting in Valencia September 17th & 18th 2019, Linda Sile and Dragan Ivanovic presented the manual at the

occasion of the training school in Poznan:

Sīle, L., Guns, R., Ivanović, D., Pölönen J., and Engels T.C.E. (2019). Creating and maintaining a national bibliographic database for research output: manual of good practices. ENRESSH & ECOOM: Antwerp. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.9989204

In view of the objective to prepare a roadmap for a European database of outputs of SSH research, the proposal for the VIRTA-ENRESSH pilot was launched during the ENRESSH MC meeting in Sofia, March 2017. During the ENRESSH meeting in Antwerp, July 2017, the proposal was discussed and finalized. Data collection from seven institutions in Belgium, Finland, Norway and Spain took place August-September 2017. The results and outline of the report were discussed during a focused meeting in Helsinki, 7 November 2017. The report of this proof of concept was finalized and made public in the third Grant Period:

Puuska, H.-M., Guns, R., Pölönen, J., Sivertsen, G., Mañana-Rodríguez, J., & Engels, T. C. E. (2018). Proof of Concept of a European database for social sciences and humanities publications: Description of the VIRTA-ENRESSH pilot. Helsinki: CSC & ENRESSH. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5993506

The VIRTA-ENRESSH pilot was presented by Hanna-Mari Puuska at the EuroCRIS2018 conference (18–22 June 2018) in Umeå, Sweden. Furthermore, the STSM of Joshua Eykens in Espoo, Finland has further explored the data collected in the pilot to characterize the internationality of peer-reviewed journal articles in the data – this has resulted in the submission of the paper *An integrated European research space for the Social Sciences and Humanities? English language publishing, the use of European journals and shared journal spaces.* The STSM by Dragan Ivanovic to Espoo, Finland has allowed to align the VIRTA-ENRESSH infrastructure with the requirements of OpenAIRE. The results of this STSM have been presented at the EuroCRIS membership meeting (26-28 November 2018) in Warsaw, Poland. Work on the setup of the VIRTA-ENRESSH data infrastructure continued through a June 2019 STSM to Joonas Nikkanen. Among other things this resulted in the design of a CERIF and OpenAIRE compliant data model (see https://wiki.eduuni.fi/display/cscvirtajtp/Summary+of+European+Publication+Information+Infrastructure+Data+Model). Results of the development of the infrastructure were also presented by Dragan Ivanonic at the occasion of the ICIST conference 2019:

Ivanović, D., Puuska, H., Nikkanen, J., Hellsten, L., Eskola, O. (2019). Implementation of OpenAIRE Guidelines for CRIS managers to Finnish VIRTA Publication

Information Service. In: Konjović, Z., Zdravković, M., Trajanović, M. (Eds.) ICIST 2019 Proceedings, p. 53-57, http://www.eventiotic.com/eventiotic/library/paper/449 .

In fall 2019 members of WG3 involved in the VIRTA-ENRESSH pilot submitted an application in view of securing EU-funding for a European Scholarly Publication Infrastructure to CEF (Connecting Europe Facility).

Develop new metrics to support SSH evaluation

An extension of the article '**Taking scholarly books into accoun**t' (http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11192-016-1886-5) to 19 European countries was facilitated through a survey conducted within WG3. First results were presented and discussed during the Antwerp meeting in July 2017. The following paper presenting the results of the survey appeared in Scientometrics:

Giménez-Toledo, E., Mañana-Rodríguez, J., Engels, T. C. E., Guns, R., Kulczycki, E., Ochsner, M., Pölönen, J., Sivertsen, G., & Zuccala, A. A. (2019). Taking scholarly books into account (II): A comparison of the role of scholarly books in evaluation in 19 European countries. Scientometrics, 118(1), p. 233-251, https://doi.org/10.1007/S11192-018-2956-7.

In parallel research on scholarly book publishers also resulted in a presentation during the ISSI conference in Wuhan (China, October 2017) and, by the same authors, the following journal article:

Giménez-Toledo, E., Manana-Rodriguez, J., Sivertsen, G. (2017). Scholarly book publishing: Its information sources for evaluation in the social sciences and humanities. *Research Evaluation, 26*, p91-101, https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvx007

The **ENRESSH register of book publishers** was first proposed at the WG meeting in Ljubljana (July 2018). Work continued on this international register of academic book publishers, also known as ABP: Academic Book Publishers, a global and multilingual register, see https://enressh.eu/working-group-3/abp/. The development of a database underpinning the register was facilitated through an STSM completed by Peter Aspeslagh in June 2019. The infrastructure developed will be presented and discussed during the Valencia meeting September 2019. Meanwhile, the register was presented at the 17th

international conference on Scientometrics & Informetrics, ISSI2019:

> Gimenez-Toledo, E., Sivertsen, G. & Manana-Rodriguez, J. (2019). International Register of Academic Book Publishers (IRAP): overview, current state and future challenges. Rome, ISSI2019 conference, paper 297.

On the topic of journal **data policies and data citation**, work initiated by Andreja Istenič Starčič, Marc Vanholsbeeck and Tim Engels was presented during the Nordic workshop on bibliometrics and research policy, 8-9 November 2017, Helsinki. As a result of continued collaborative work on this topic the following paper appeared:

> Vanholsbeeck, M., Engels, T.C.E., & Istenič Starčič, A. (2019). Guidelines for data sharing and data citation in social sciences and humanities journals: perspectives and insights from the COST action ENRESSH. Archives et bibliothèques de Belgique, 106, p. 83-96. https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02124973/

Since February 2019 members of WG3 started to collaborate on the transnational study of **open access**. This resulted in two presentations at the ISSI2019 conference in Rome:

> Pölönen, J., Guns, R., Kulczycki, E., Laakso, M., & Sivertsen, G. (2019). Open access challenge at the national level: comprehensive analysis of publication channels used by Finish researchers in 2016-2017. Rome, ISSI2019 conference, paper 300.

> Sivertsen, G., Guns, R., Kulczycki, E., & Pölönen, J. (2019). The use of Gold Open Access in four European countries: an analysis at the level of articles. Rome, ISSI2019 conference, paper 269.

Currently a paper by these WG3 members is under review with the MIT journal Quantitative Studies of Science.

Summary of Early Career Investigators Special Interest Group activities

Research activities and achievements

Transversal Special Interest Group (SIG) for Early Career Investigators (ECI) has been created within the Action with the goals to gather experiences and reflections of ECI from different countries and across different disciplines of SSH, to identify the most problematic areas in SSH evaluation policies from ECI perspective, to voice ECI interests in SSH evaluation, to identify success factors in ECI career paths, as well as to address other issues relevant for young scholars in SSH. One of the major goals of the SIG ECI was to generate ideas for TS2 co-organized with WG1 as well as to prepare guidelines for ECI support.

In the initial stages of SIG ECI activities an interview grid was developed and then piloted in 16 semi-structured interviews in different countries of Europe on the above-mentioned topics. During the following stages, SIG participants thoroughly discussed the pilot interview grid (SWOT analysis) and their experiences with the pilot interviews. As a result of the discussion, the interview grid has been slightly amended and confirmed as the final grid for further interviews. The profile of the respondent was also finalized with the attention paid to a more or less equal distribution between genders and disciplines. SIG ECI members spent considerable time discussing potential avenues for the analysis of empirical data, and further work on conducting, transcribing and translating the transcribed interviews into English. Together with WG1, a methodology on how to analyse and compare these interviews was developed. Several smaller groups have been formed, aimed at exploiting specific aspects of the interviews in view of co-authored publications. SIG participants also discussed various methodological options and guidelines for coding, categorizing and analysis of the interviews.

The final outcome of SIG ECI activities was 60 semi-structured interviews conducted with ECIs (PhD + 8) from 17 countries around Europe (Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, France, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia and Switzerland). The interviews were conducted in the respective national languages and translated into English. 29 interviewees were male ECIs, 31 interviewees were female young scholars. The interviewees represented diverse SSH disciplinary fields: Geography, History, Psychology, Economics, Communication, Sociology, Physical Education, Law, Political Sciences, Educology, Philosophy, Business, Gender Studies, Hungarology, Social & Health Policy, Agroeconomics, Literature, Linguistics, Ethnology, Management, Civil Engineering, Folklore Studies.

The results of the analysis of the interviews facilitated preparation of the thematic focus

and materials for Training School 2. Based on experiences of Early career investigators, guidelines for Early career investigator support have been developed specifically targeting several groups (early career investigators themselves, PhD supervisors, policy makers/funders, decision makers at universities/research institutes, peer reviewers). These guidelines will be submitted in the form of Evidence based recommendations paper to a special issue (*Challenging Evaluation in SSH*) of an interdisciplinary journal *Darbai ir Dienos* (*Deeds and Days*) (ISSN 1392-0588, eISSN 2335-8769) to be published in 2020.

A number of STSMs were performed with the aim to analyse the interview data (see STSM section).

The results of the studies have been presented in the following conferences / conference proceedings:

- Lendák – Kabók, K., Mignot-Gérard, S. (2018). Geopolitika és a társadalmi nem: fiatal kutatók narratívái Európában, 14. Nyelv, ideológia, media konferencia, 2018. Szeptember 21-22. Szeged, Book of Abstacts, pp. 20-21.
- Lendák – Kabók, K., Mignot-Gérard, S. (2018). Engendering East and West: narratives of early career investigators across Europe, 10th European Conference on Gender Equality in Higher Education, August 20-22, Trinity College, Dublin, Book of Abstracts, p. 39.
- Lendák – Kabók, K., Mignot-Gérard, S., & Vanholsbeek, M. (2019). How scholars imagine their careers in a neoliberal work context? A gender perspective. Society for Advancement of Socio-Economics (SASE), 27-29 June, The New School-New York City, USA.
- Ochsner, M., Lendák – Kabók, K., & Šinkūnienė, J. (2019). Early career investigators' views on evaluation. 19-20 September, RESSH 2019, Valencia, Spain.
- Vanholsbeeck, M., Šinkūnienė, J., Lendák – Kabók, K., & Gekic, H. (2019). Information ecosystems in early academic career building: how do researchers in the social sciences and humanities learn the tricks of their trade? 19-20 September, RESSH 2019, Valencia, Spain.

Potential follow-on activities:

Several research articles based on conference talks are still in progress either in a peer review stage or in a pre-submission stage.

When the Guidelines for ECI support are published, they will be disseminated to various stakeholders in Europe.

Dissemination activities

The purpose of workgroup 4 was to manage the dissemination for the entire action. As such, it both gathered information and ensured its dissemination both between members of the action and its stakeholders. It was responsible for managing the website, social media ([Twitter](); >650 followers and [Facebook](); >220 friends) and it managed articles and information destined to stakeholders, including the action's seven newsletters (245 subscribers).

The action's website (https://enressh.eu/) served as the hub for its dissemination activities. News items were posted on a frequent basis, academic and professional publications and presentations resulting from the website were posted as was the newsletter, working papers and materials from the three training schools. Furthermore, the website included spaces dedicated to individual members and their areas of expertise as well as spaces for working groups and special interest `

ENRESSH published a total of 19 academic papers, six reports, three blog posts, two conference proceedings (RESSH 2017 and RESSH 2019), two policy briefs (2018 and 2020), a bibliographic database, a manifesto (available in eight European languages), and a database of national level organizations involved in research evaluation of the social sciences and humanities.

ENRESSH organized three stakeholder meetings. The first was organized in Prague (January 2017). Its purpose was to introduce the action to its stakeholders and to receive input for the action's work and activities. A second meeting was organized in Amsterdam (July 2019) to receive input on dissemination of the concluding messages. A third meeting was organized in Paris (February 2020) to showcase and discuss the action's results. Additionally, ENRESSH's Belgian members teamed up to organize a Belgian ENRESSH day (April 2019) and many individual ENRESSH members were invited to discuss the action in their home countries and home institutions.

Training Schools

Three training schools were organized within the time-span of the Action, with over 100 trainees and trainers attending from all over Europe. All three training schools were hosted in Inclusiveness Target Countries. Most of the trainees were early career investigators, some of them at a very early outset of their careers. Key issues concerning evaluation in SSH addressed in the training schools have, no doubt, contributed to increasing the knowledge of young scholars on SSH impact, engagement with society, links between evaluation procedures and career development, the role of national bibliographic databases in understanding and evaluating research. The training schools have also provided network development opportunities for early career investigators as well as encouraged their professional development through engaging them in a number of activities and group work sessions. Another obvious benefit is that training schools not only facilitated knowledge sharing and transfer, but also stimulated further ideas for Short term scientific missions, conference presentations or policy papers developed within ENRESSH. Finally, calls to participate in the training schools were widely disseminated across all European countries through disciplinary networks and universities, thus adding not only to the visibility of ENRESSH, but also to the visibility of COST in general. Training school materials available online in open access alongside other outcomes (for example, video with statements by trainers and trainees about the goals and outcomes of the training school) contribute to the global exchange of best practices developed in the Action.

Below is the summary of each training school in more detail:

Training School 1 (TS1): Understanding and stimulating SSH impact and engagement with society

Host: Institute of Social Sciences Ivo Pilar (Croatia)
Dates: 12/02/2018 - 16/02/2018

The focus of TS1 was a think-tank reflecting on the conceptual, policy and practical implications of the evaluation of SSH impact; each day included a mix of keynote lectures, practical group exercises and discussion seminars. The School also included a public

engagement event, the "Social Science Slam", hosted by the Croatian Ministry of Education. The 6 trainers for this were Leonie van Drooge, Judith Bar-Ilan, Paul Benneworth, Jack Spaapen, Reetta Muhonen & Jon Holm. There were 30 participants drawn from across Europe and one participant from South Africa. One of the practical exercises has been turned into a working paper by four authors, and was submitted to the SSH Impact conference (Vienna, 2018). As well as including contributions from three WG2 STSMS (Muhonen, Girkontaite & De Jong), a presentation was also given based on a RESSH 2017 presentation from Wrolebska. This presentation and subsequent discussions led to the creation of the STSM 3-2-1, analysis of orientations of SSH researchers towards impact generation.

Training School 2 (TS2): Evaluation procedures and their impact on SSH careers

Host: Vilnius University, Faculty of Philology (Lithuania)
Dates: 07/01/2019 - 11/01/2019

TS2 addressed issues relating to evaluation procedures and their impact on SSH careers. 29 participants and 7 teachers from 14 countries (and even more nationalities), representing 24 disciplines, composed of 15 men and 21 women formed a highly diverse and very active TS2 group. Two of the participants and four of the trainers were members of ENRESSH. TS2 was organised in lectures and hands-on sessions. The hands-on sessions were held in fixed groups of 5 trainees and each product of a hands-on session would be re-used in later hands-on sessions. On the first day, the trainees were asked to provide spontaneous associations with research evaluation and were filling in a questionnaire for Early Career Investigators. On the second day, they were introduced into the topic by lectures by Aldis Gedutis (research evaluation), Michael Ochsner (national research evaluation systems, quality criteria and measurement in research evaluation) an Agnė Girkontaitė (Scientific work and reporting). In the hands-on session, the trainees developed a fictive interdisciplinary research proposal for a call entitled "Culture & Innovation". The second day was devoted to Bibliometrics and Altmetrics with lectures by Thed van Leeuwen and Alesia Zuccala. In the hands-on sessions the trainees could apply what they learned using the references in their proposals. The third day focused on peer review practices. Lectures by Wojciech Sowa covered what is peer review in the SSH and how to write and how to interpret reviews, while the lecture by Michael Ochsner explained the issues of peer review. In the hands-on session, each group wrote reviews for the proposal of two other groups. The final day was devoted to how to take up and

interpret the reviews and how to improve evaluation for early career investigators. For the first part, the groups were presented the reviews of their proposals by the other groups. For the second part, a lecture on evaluation and early career investigators (by Jolanta Šinkūnienė) led to a discussion on how to improve the situation for early career investigators. A summary by Agnė Girkontaitė finalized TS2.

The evaluations of TS2 by the participants showed that the information is dearly needed, and the early career investigators lacked opportunities to gain knowledge about how to use evaluations and how to prepare themselves for evaluations. Also, it helped the early career investigators to understand how peer review functions and how research quality can be conceptualised. Furthermore, they received state-of-the-art knowledge about bibliometrics and altmetrics and about the opportunities and limitations of research metrics. Finally, TS2 helped to establish the awareness of the topic at Vilnius University by including 6 local PhD students and Master's degree holders among the participants who will bring the information on to their peers at VU. A summary article of the training school was published on the website of Vilnius University (http://naujienos.vu.lt/jaunieji- mokslininkai-aiskinosi-moksliniu-tyrimu-vertinimo-kriterijus/) giving the importance of the topic more visibility at Vilnius University. On the other hand, working groups of ENRESSH were able to gain valuable data from the early career investigators: free associations of how young scholars see evaluation, data for a pilot for the questionnaire for early career investigators, and plenty of written information on how young scholars see evaluation and career.

Training school 3 (TS3): National bibliographic databases and their uses for evaluating and understanding research

Host: Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań (Poland)
Dates: 21/10/2019 – 25/10/2019

TS3 covered good practices in setting up national bibliographic databases, new dimensions of databases as well as quality assurance and analysis of data. It was especially beneficial for researchers involved in setting-up or maintaining national bibliographic databases as well as users of such databases. The number of participants was over 20, and the trainers included such well known scholars of the field as Sophie Biesenbender (DZHW Berlin), Tim Engels, Raf Guns and Linda Sīle (University of Antwerp), Ying Huang

(Wuhan University), Christina Huidiu (Digital Science), Dragan Ivanović (University of Novi Sad), Emanuel Kulczycki (Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań), Janne Pölönen (Finish Federation of Learned Societies), Gunnar Sivertsen (NIFU, Oslo) and Jadranka Stojanovski (University of Zadar).

Short Term Scientific Missions

Short-term scientific missions (STSM) were exchange visits between researchers involved in ENRESSH COST Action, allowing scientists to visit an institution or laboratory in another COST Member state. During the lifetime of the ENRESSH project, there were 12 calls for STSM positions and one call for suggesting topics and host institutions. Topics were developed within the four working groups and the Early career investigator interest group.

The most active periods were the third one with 16 accomplished STSMs and the fourth one with 12. There were five and ten STSMs in the first and the second period, respectively. Altogether, 37 scholars have the opportunity of carrying out part of their research work abroad profiting by working with experienced scholars; seven of them undertook their research visit twice. Most (i.e. 17) of STSMs were accomplished within working group 3, followed by 11 working group 2 and 10 in working group 1. Four STSMs were accomplished within ECI and one within working group 4. 13 STSM were hosted by working group leaders, others by active action members.

All home institutions and all but one host institutions were located in the COST member states. Scholars from 19 countries were involved (Eastern Europe two, Northern Europe six, Southern Europe seven and Western Europe four). Almost half of the scholars (21) came from Northern Europe (according The UN Statistics Division https://www.worldatlas.com) with two countries taking the lead: UK with seven and Finland with five STSM respectively. Eleven scholars came from Southern, eight from Western Europe and four from Eastern Europe. Twenty-seven institutions served as host institutions, mostly from Western and Northern Europe, coinciding with working group leaders. Topics studied convey a wide variety of issues dealing with within the ENRESSH project.