



# **Evaluation of Research Careers fully acknowledging Open Science Practices**

Rewards, incentives and/or recognition for researchers  
practicing Open Science

## **Evaluation of Research Careers fully acknowledging Open Science Practices**

Rewards, incentives and/or recognition for researchers practicing Open Science

### **European Commission**

Directorate-General for Research and Innovation  
Directorate B — Open Innovation and Open Science  
Unit B.2 — Open Science and ERA Policy

Contact: Fabienne GAUTIER

E-mail: Fabienne.Gautier@ec.europa.eu  
RTD-PUBLICATIONS@ec.europa.eu

European Commission  
B-1049 Brussels

Manuscript completed in July 2017.

This document has been prepared for the European Commission however it reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

More information on the European Union is available on the internet (<http://europa.eu>).

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2017

PDF

ISBN 978-92-79-70515-1

doi: 10.2777/75255

KI-01-17-729-EN-N

© European Union, 2017.

Reuse is authorised provided the source is acknowledged. The reuse policy of European Commission documents is regulated by Decision 2011/833/EU (OJ L 330, 14.12.2011, p. 39).

For any use or reproduction of photos or other material that is not under the EU copyright, permission must be sought directly from the copyright holders.

# Evaluation of Research Careers fully acknowledging Open Science practices

*Rewards, incentives and/or recognition for researchers  
practicing Open Science*

**Conor O'CARROLL - Chair**

Research Policy & Funding Consultant at SciPol and chair of the Steering Group  
on Human Resources and Mobility (SGHRM)

**Bernard RENTIER – Vice-Chair**

Recteur honoraire de l'Université de Liège - EUA Expert on Open Science

**Cecilia CABELLO VALDES**

FECYT – Spanish Foundation for Science and Technology

**Fulvio ESPOSITO**

University of Camerino

**Eva KAUNISMAA**

Ministry of Education and Culture

**Katrien MAAS**

League of Research Universities - LERU

**Janet METCALFE**

CRAC – Head of Vitae

**David McALLISTER**

Head of Skills & Careers at BBSRC/RCUK

**Karen VANDEVELDE**

University of Ghent

Contributions:

**Isabelle HALLEUX** - R&D Executive Director - University of Liege

**Caroline Lynn KAMERLIN** - Uppsala University

**Norbert LOSSAU** - member of OSPP/EUA – Vice-President of Göttingen University

**Wainer LUSOLI** - European Commission - RTD A6

**Frank MIEDEMA** - Utrecht University - chair of the MLE experts 'altmetrics and rewards'

**Céline RAMJOUE** - Head of Sector DG CNECT C3 - Digital Sciences

**Sylvia SCHREIBER** - PARISBERLIN EU correspondent Bureau Brussels

**Paul WOUTERS** - Leiden University



## Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	5
1. INTRODUCTION .....	9
2. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT .....	11
2.1 Context of European Open Science policy and European Research Area policy .....	11
2.2 Open Science and Researcher Assessment .....	11
2.3 Open Science and the Researcher Career Framework .....	12
2.4 Open Science .....	12
3. ASSESSMENT AND RESEARCHER CAREER PROGRESSION .....	13
3.1 Researcher Assessment .....	13
3.2 Beyond the Impact Factor .....	14
3.3 New Means of Measuring Quality .....	15
4. OPEN SCIENCE AND RESEARCHER CAREER PROGRESSION .....	16
4.1 Towards a comprehensive research career assessment - the Open Science Career Evaluation Matrix (OS-CAM) .....	16
4.2 Recognising and Rewarding Researchers in the Context of Open Science .....	18
4.3 Researcher Career Policy and Open Science .....	19
4.4 The Human Resources Strategy for Researchers (HRS4R) .....	19
5. OPEN SCIENCE RECOGNITION/REWARDS – SURVEYS AND GOOD PRACTICE .....	21
5.1 Survey overview .....	21
5.2 Results of the Survey .....	21
5.3 Summary of the Survey Results .....	25
5.4 Examples of good practice and potential for mutual learning .....	26
APPENDIX 1 - OS REWARDS WORKING GROUP DETAILS .....	30
APPENDIX 2 - OS REWARDS WORKING GROUP MANDATE .....	32
APPENDIX 3 - THE OPEN RESEARCH DATA PILOT IN HORIZON 2020 .....	33
APPENDIX 4 - SURVEY CONTENT .....	34
APPENDIX 5 - REWARDS – A SHORT LEXICON .....	73
APPENDIX 6 - REWARDS – RECOMMENDED READING .....	74



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Open Science represents an approach to research that is collaborative, transparent and accessible<sup>1</sup>. There are a wide range of activities that come under the umbrella of Open Science that include open access publishing, open data, open peer review and open research. It also includes citizen science, or more broadly, stakeholder engagement, where non specialists engage directly in research. Open Science goes hand in hand with research integrity and requires legal and ethical awareness on the part of researchers. A driver for Open Science is improving the transparency and validity of research as well as in regards to public ownership of science, particularly that which is publicly funded.

Researchers across Europe already practise Open Science to some extent through, for example, open access to their publications. Some already provide open data, engage in open peer review, and stakeholder engagement or citizen science. Researchers advance in their career through assessment and this is the key factor to ensure that Open Science becomes mainstream. The exclusive use of bibliometric parameters as proxies for excellence in assessment by most funding agencies and universities/research organisations does not facilitate Open Science. Researchers' engagement in Open Science will increase through encouragement and incentives from employers and funders through assessment.

Open Science offers researchers the means for greater transparency, reproducibility, dissemination and transfer of new knowledge<sup>2</sup>. OS provides greater access to data and publications which can improve the effectiveness and increased productivity of researchers (allowing more research from the same data). In an open environment there can be a more accurate verification of research results. These are examples of good reasons for researchers to practise OS.

In order to increase the practice of Open Science, it is critical that researchers, who are the key agents of change towards OS, are encouraged and incentivised. If OS practices (particularly open access, open data and stakeholder/citizen engagement) are to become mainstream then,

- Research Performing Organisations (RPOs) should be strongly encouraged to include OS practices in the evaluation of performance and of career development,
- Research Funding Organisations (RFOs), at regional, national, EU and international level, should be strongly encouraged to include OS practices in the evaluation criteria for funding proposals and as part of the assessment of the researchers.

The Open Science Working Group on Rewards/Recognition was created with the mandate (approved by the Open Science Policy Platform) to make recommendations in order that all researchers in Europe are recognised and rewarded for practising Open Science.

The following tasks were taken on:

- Promote a discussion with stakeholders on the current reputation system in the context of the standing ERAC groups and the Open Science Policy Platform (OSPP) which will work on the concretisation of a European Open Science Agenda;
- Within the OS environment, reflect about and propose alternative methods to recognise contributions to OS, including 'rewards and incentives' taking into account diversity in experience and career paths, while guaranteeing fair and equal career development of individual scientists;
- Propose new ways/standards of evaluating research proposals and research outcomes taking into consideration all OS activities of researchers, possibly recommending to pilot them under certain calls of Horizon 2020;
- Identify existing good practices on how OS issues are already taken up by researchers, research performing institutions and research funding institutions in Europe.

The results of the OS Rewards WG are practical recommendations that can be adopted by policy makers, funders, employers and researchers to promote the practice of Open Science. Funding agencies and research performing organisations must work in tandem to ensure that researchers are recognised and rewarded for practising Open Science. The report focuses on recommendations at policy and practical level to promote the engagement of researchers in Open Science. It provides a clear plan for incentivising and encouraging researchers to practise Open Science through recognition and rewards for recruitment, career progression and funding grants.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/index.cfm?pg=home&section=monitor>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.fosteropenscience.eu/content/impact-open-science>  
<https://www.innovationpolicyplatform.org/content/rationales-and-impact-open-science>

## The Career Evaluation Matrix

It is important to go beyond Open Science and frame this discussion in the broad context of the evaluation of researchers. European and indeed national policy across Europe promotes the mobility of researchers across borders, disciplines and sectors. Combined with Open Science, this can only be achieved if a far more comprehensive assessment of researchers by their employers and funders is introduced. For example, researchers who spend time in industry are clearly hindered in attempting to move back to academia, as they do not focus on academic publications as part of their industry work. To take into account this broad agenda requires a multidimensional approach that includes a range of evaluation criteria for researchers in all sectors, in all scientific domains and at all career stages. This also applies to the recognition of Open Science activities. In terms of the focus of the ERA Priority 3, the recognition of Open Science in the recruitment process of researchers will be critical. The same must hold for career progression and research grant assessment.

There is often a focus on the emerging generation of doctoral candidates and postdoctoral researchers. However any changes to how researchers are evaluated must permeate through all stages of the researcher's career; in terms of the European Framework for Research Careers (EFRC) from First Stage Researcher (R1) through Recognised Researcher (R2) and Established Researcher (R3) to Leading Researcher (R4). This will be absolutely necessary if the practice of Open Science is to be embedded in the entire researcher community. In developing a system to evaluate and recognise engagement in Open Science, the full spectrum of OS activities must be taken into account. These include open access to publications, open data, open peer review, research integrity, citizen science and stakeholder engagement.

In general, evaluating a researcher cannot be reduced to a number because their merits and achievements are a complex set of different variables, difficult to be summarised by a single figure. A better approach is through multi-dimensional criteria evaluation, taking into consideration what is expected from a researcher and what is relevant for his/her career/recruitment.

The Open Science Career Assessment Matrix (OS-CAM) in Figure 1 represents a possible, practical move towards a more comprehensive approach to evaluating researchers through the lens of Open Science. This incorporates broader aspects of being an excellent researcher, such as service and leadership, research impact and contribution to teaching, many of which are starting to be included in research performing organisations' job descriptions and promotion criteria. The OS Career Assessment Matrix (OS-CAM) describes how these broader aspects can be taken into account in the context of recognising researcher's contributions to Open Science.

<b>Open Science Career Assessment Matrix (OS-CAM)</b>	
<i>Open Science activities</i>	<i>Possible evaluation criteria</i>
<b>RESEARCH OUTPUT</b>	
<b>Research activity</b>	Pushing forward the boundaries of open science as a research topic
<b>Publications</b>	Publishing in open access journals Self-archiving in open access repositories
<b>Datasets and research results</b>	Using the FAIR data principles Adopting quality standards in open data management and open datasets Making use of open data from other researchers
<b>Open source</b>	Using open source software and other open tools Developing new software and tools that are open to other users
<b>Funding</b>	Securing funding for open science activities
<b>RESEARCH PROCESS</b>	
<b>Stakeholder engagement / citizen science</b>	Actively engaging society and research users in the research process Sharing provisional research results with stakeholders through open platforms (e.g. Arxiv, Figshare) Involving stakeholders in peer review processes
<b>Collaboration and Interdisciplinarity</b>	Widening participation in research through open collaborative projects Engaging in team science through diverse cross-disciplinary teams
<b>Research integrity</b>	Being aware of the ethical and legal issues relating to data sharing, confidentiality, attribution and environmental impact of open science activities Fully recognizing the contribution of others in research projects, including collaborators, co-authors, citizens, open data providers
<b>Risk management</b>	Taking account of the risks involved in open science
<b>SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP</b>	
<b>Leadership</b>	Developing a vision and strategy on how to integrate OS practices in the normal practice of doing research Driving policy and practice in open science Being a role model in practicing open science
<b>Academic standing</b>	Developing an international or national profile for open science activities Contributing as editor or advisor for open science journals or bodies
<b>Peer review</b>	Contributing to open peer review processes Examining or assessing open research
<b>Networking</b>	Participating in national and international networks relating to open science



<b>RESEARCH IMPACT</b>	
<b>Communication and Dissemination</b>	Participating in public engagement activities Sharing research results through non-academic dissemination channels Translating research into a language suitable for public understanding
<b>IP (patents, licenses)</b>	Being knowledgeable on the legal and ethical issues relating to IPR Transferring IP to the wider economy
<b>Societal impact</b>	Evidence of use of research by societal groups Recognition from societal groups or for societal activities
<b>Knowledge exchange</b>	Engaging in open innovation with partners beyond academia
<b>TEACHING AND SUPERVISION</b>	
<b>Teaching</b>	Training other researchers in open science principles and methods Developing curricula and programs in open science methods, including open science data management Raising awareness and understanding in open science in undergraduate and masters' programs
<b>Mentoring</b>	Mentoring and encouraging others in developing their open science capabilities
<b>Supervision</b>	Supporting early stage researchers to adopt an open science approach
<b>PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE</b>	
<b>Continuing professional development</b>	Investing in own professional development to build open science capabilities
<b>Project management</b>	Successfully delivering open science projects involving diverse research teams
<b>Personal qualities</b>	Demonstrating the personal qualities to engage society and research users with open science Showing the flexibility and perseverance to respond to the challenges of conducting open science

**Figure 1: Open Science Career Assessment Matrix (OS-CAM) representing the range of evaluation criteria for assessing Open Science activities**

The matrix provides a framework that can be used to develop evaluation systems that can be applied in various contexts: at individual level for the purpose of recruitment and promotion, at individual or group level in the evaluation of grant and fellowship applications or adapted to develop institutional funding allocation models or incentives focused on building open science capacity.

The criteria are expressed as “doing” Open Science, but can be adapted to recognise a more introductory or advanced level. For example, they could range from “learning about OS” for First Stage Researchers, to “doing OS” for Recognised Researchers, “supporting others in OS” for Established Researchers and eventually to “shaping policy and practice in OS” for Leading Researchers.

An important aspect of this approach is that the weighting for each criterion should reflect the background of the researcher being evaluated. For example, if a researcher is seeking a position in academia from industry then it will be unlikely that he/she has been heavily engaged in publications or open data, but will bring strengths in other areas. The open science criteria in this matrix illustrate the broad range of activities of researchers involved in Open Science. It is not expected that every researcher will be doing all of these activities.

While the **OS-CAM** can be populated with numbers and weighting this can only be part of the process. In any evaluation process, the wide diversity of researchers’ experiences and capabilities are such that good decisions require qualitative judgement, preferably by a panel of independent researchers who, respecting the principles of openness, transparency and merit<sup>3</sup>, assess the range of a researcher’s achievements, whether this be for a new position, career advancement or for a funding grant.

## Conclusions

For the practice of Open Science to become mainstream, it must be embedded in the evaluation of researchers at all stages of their career (R1-R4). This will require universities to change their approach in career assessment for recruitment and promotion. It will require funding agencies to reform the methods they use for awarding grants to researchers. It will require senior researchers to reform how they assess researchers when employing on funded research projects. This is about changing the way research is done, who is involved in the process and how it is valued; evolving from a closed competitive system to one that is more open and collaborative. Overall, a cultural change is needed in organisations and in the research community for the promotion of and engagement in Open Science.

<sup>3</sup> [https://cdn1.euraxess.org/sites/default/files/policy\\_library/otm-r-finaldoc\\_0.pdf](https://cdn1.euraxess.org/sites/default/files/policy_library/otm-r-finaldoc_0.pdf)

Evaluating a researcher cannot be reduced to a number because their merits, achievements, usefulness are a complex sets of different variables, impossible to be summarised by a single figure. It should be made clear that a multi-dimensional approach to the evaluation is by far more reliable than the 'single figure' one and it provides a more realistic proxy of the measurement of quality. It should be done through multi-dimensional evaluation criteria. The OS Career Assessment Matrix (OS-CAM) can be used for this purpose, taking into consideration what is expected from a researcher and what is relevant for the specific post, grant or career advancement.

This new approach will take time, needs to be well-planned and its implementation continuously monitored and improved. The outcome of this change must be to improve the quality of science in its own right in a manner that ensures research integrity and greater peer and public engagement in research. Most importantly, it must mainstream the practice of Open Science through incentivising researchers with recognition and rewards.

This will require feasibility studies and pilot exercises to ensure that the approach achieves the desired outcome. It must be recognised that there cannot be a one size fits all approach, given the difference between disciplines and institutional structures.

## Recommendations

1. To change the culture and further engage the entire researcher community in the practice of Open Science a more comprehensive recognition and reward system incorporating Open Science must become part of the **recruitment criteria, career progression and grant assessment procedures** for researchers at all levels (R1-R4).
2. Where needed, there should be a review of **ERA policies, ERA roadmaps and National Action Plans through the lens of Open Science**. If necessary, policies must be updated in order to ensure compatibility with Open Science.
3. At European level all means to **encourage and incentivise researcher participation in Open Science** through support and funding mechanisms should be pursued. This should include,
  - The **Human Resources Excellence in Research Award (HRS4R)**<sup>4</sup> integrating Open Science assessment criteria for researcher recruitment, career progression and grant evaluation;
  - Open Science activity by researchers should become **a cross cutting theme in all of the Work Programmes of Horizon 2020 and, most importantly, in the future Framework Programme, FP9**.
  - At **national, regional and institutional** level, best efforts should be made to integrate the recognition and rewards for researchers engaging in Open Science into existing and future funding mechanisms.
4. The assessment of researchers during recruitment, career progression and grant evaluation should be structured to encompass the full range of their achievements including Open Science. This **multi-dimensional approach could be implemented using the instrument OS-Career Assessment Matrix (CAM)** that takes into consideration the full range of achievements to reflect diverse career paths. There should also be a validation process on the content and feasibility of the OS-Career Assessment Matrix (CAM) in researcher assessment at European, national, regional and organisational level as well as taking into account the wide spectrum of disciplines, research funding and research performing organisations.

---

<sup>4</sup> <https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/jobs/hrs4r>

# 1. INTRODUCTION

---

*"Policies to promote Open Science should include incentives and not just mandates"*

Carlos Moedas 2017

Open Science represents an approach to research that is collaborative, transparent and accessible<sup>5</sup>. There are a wide range of activities that come under the umbrella of Open Science that include open access publishing, open data, open peer review and open research. It also includes citizen science, or more broadly, stakeholder engagement, where non specialists engage directly in research. Open Science goes hand in hand with research integrity and requires legal and ethical awareness on the part of researchers. A driver for Open Science is improving the transparency and validity of research as well as in regards to public ownership of science, particularly that which is publicly funded.

Researchers across Europe already practise Open Science to some extent through, for example, open access to their publications. Some already provide open data, engage in open peer review, and stakeholder engagement or citizen science. Researchers advance in their career through assessment and this is the key factor to ensure that Open Science becomes mainstream. The exclusive use of bibliometric parameters as proxies for excellence in assessment by most funding agencies and universities/research organisations does not facilitate Open Science. Researchers' engagement in Open Science will increase through encouragement and incentives from employers and funders through assessment.

The expected results of the OS Rewards WG<sup>6</sup> are practical recommendations that can be adopted by policy makers, funders, employers and researchers to promote the practice of Open Science by researchers. Funding agencies and research performing organisations must work in tandem to ensure that researchers are recognised and rewarded for practising Open Science. The report focuses on recommendations at policy and practical level to promote the engagement of researchers in Open Science. It provides a clear plan for incentivising and encouraging researchers to practise Open Science through recognition and rewards for recruitment, career progression and their evaluation in funding grants.

Researchers at all levels are the key to practising Open Science and it will be important that European and national policies that relate to their career development ensure that they are still compatible with Open Science. For example, the overarching European policy for researchers is the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for their Recruitment<sup>7</sup>. This policy document was published in 2005 and is a set of general principles and requirements which specifies the roles, responsibilities and entitlements of researchers as well as of employers and/or funders of researchers. While the term "Open Science" does not appear in the Charter and Code its principles are consistent with the pursuit of Open Science.

Open Science itself is not a new initiative but has been a trend in many disciplines for a number of years. The move to open access to publications (also under ERA Priority 5<sup>8</sup>) has been under development in many countries and there is for example the EU project OpenAIRE<sup>9</sup>. This has been accompanied by an explosion in the numbers of online open publications, the PLoS range<sup>10</sup>, for example. Indeed some disciplines like physics started this trend many years ago, by using almost systematically ArXiv, a preprint (or prepublication) open platform freely accessible on the Web which turned out to be suitable as an open discussion forum. Even the traditional "prestige publishers" recognise the need to move to Open publications, including Nature Communications, ACS Omega, Royal Society Open Science and Scientific Reports.

The move to open data has been more recent. It proceeds from the same spirit of sharing, in order to facilitate reproducibility of results, a major concern in science, and to allow reuse of data as a springboard for further research. However, open data raises a number of challenges from the complexity of sharing large data in a meaningful way and generates issues pertaining to confidentiality, particularly in the medical field.

Researchers are also becoming more open in the way they conduct their research. The drive to demonstrate the impact of research has led to researchers engaging more closely with research users. There has been significant growth in engaging society in, for example, the formulation of research questions, in the composition of evaluation panels for research, or in stakeholder panels steering the research process.

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/index.cfm?pg=home&section=monitor>

<sup>6</sup> See Appendix I for details

<sup>7</sup> <https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/jobs/charter>

<sup>8</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/era\\_communication\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/era_communication_en.htm)

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.openaire.eu>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.plos.org>

Researchers become “open” when they conduct their research to ensure that:

- their publications are made available through open access;
- their data is made available through open data;
- their research is utilising open platforms, tools and services;
- their research is being conducted in an open collaborative manner; or
- engage in open peer review and citizen science

However in doing so, they must be acutely aware of the need to sustain quality, take into account commercial interests, privacy, security and research integrity. All of these require training that should begin at latest during the doctorate. This creates a greater demand on institutions to provide the necessary skills training which is dealt with in a parallel Open Science Working Group on Skills. Enhanced infrastructure is needed to store high volumes of data along with new staff technical expertise data stewardship and management.

Changing practice from the traditional approach in most disciplines will require a fundamental change in the way scientists carry out research. In order for this to be encouraged and incentivised, this changed approach must be recognised and rewarded by both employers (when recruiting and promoting researchers) and research funders (when performing peer review of researchers in grant applications). Moreover senior researchers must play a key role in this change as they are highly influential in the recruitment/promotion of researchers and conduct of peer review both for funding agencies and publishers.

The approach of the group to this issue of recognition and rewards is rooted firmly in the context of researcher career development and closely linked with ERA Priority 3, an open labour market for researchers<sup>11</sup>.

Chapter 2 provides background information on Open Science in relation to ERA policy, researcher assessment and career framework. It also describes different aspects of Open Science including Open Data, Open Peer Review and Citizen Science. In Chapter 3, the limitations of current recognition and reward processes are presented, with suggestions on how to alleviate these and how new paradigms can be envisioned and implemented.

An illustration of taking a comprehensive approach to researcher assessment using the Open Science Career Assessment Matrix (OS-CAM) that recognises Open Science is presented Chapter 4. There is a brief analysis of the ERA Partnership policies and how Open Science can be included in the Human Resources Strategy for Researchers. Chapter 5 presents the results of a survey carried on Research Funding and Research Performing Organisations focusing on their approach to recognition and rewards for researchers engaged in Open Science. In addition, some good practice examples from across Europe are given.

---

<sup>11</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/era\\_communication\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/era_communication_en.htm)

## 2. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

"Open Science represents a new approach to the scientific process based on cooperative work and new ways of knowledge distribution using digital technologies and new collaborative tools." (OSPP<sup>12</sup>)

### 2.1 Context of European Open Science policy and European Research Area policy

At one level, Open Science is often perceived as simply the sharing of research results through open access to publications and data. This is only a partial view of Open Science as the practice of Open Science brings about a fundamental change in how researchers carry out their work and disseminate the results. From a policy perspective we need to ensure that Open Science is firmly linked to ERA policy as the latter is anchored in the TFEU<sup>13</sup>. Linkages exist in particular through Priority 3 of ERA, "Open Labour Market for Researchers" and Priority 5, "Optimal Circulation and transfer of Scientific Knowledge". As the implementation of ERA is through the multi annual Framework Programmes, these can also be a vehicle for implementing Open Science policy. The current Framework Programme, Horizon 2020, provides an opportunity for pilot measures. The long term opportunity is embedding recognition and rewards for Open Science in FP9, the next Framework Programme.

Focusing on the open labour market for researchers, current policies stretch back to the original ERA concept (Lisbon Agenda 2000<sup>14</sup>) of striving for a Europe with the freedom of movement of people and knowledge. This has over the intervening years resulted in a number of initiatives at European level from hard to soft law. For example the Third Country Directive (2005)<sup>15</sup>, a legally binding requirement, and the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for their Recruitment<sup>16</sup>, that is voluntary. The latter has been strengthened in recent years with its inclusion as a requirement within the Model Grant Agreement for Horizon 2020. The Charter and Code require that researchers have access to professional development opportunities; these can include those skills necessary for Open Science.

The concept of an open labour market is to ensure that researchers can move freely across borders, sectors and disciplinary boundaries. Open Science is a new way for researchers to work in an open collaborative manner, sharing data and publications. Collaboration stretches beyond the scientific community to engage citizens in the research process. The practice of working openly and collaboratively also promotes far greater integrity in the research process itself. If a researcher works in a scientifically open manner, research integrity will be preserved/monitored 'more easily' by their peers. This is a far more comprehensive view of Open Science rather than simply the practice of sharing data.

### 2.2 Open Science and Researcher Assessment

Researchers are motivated by curiosity and the desire to advance their subject area. However in order to progress their work must be recognised through assessment leading to the reward of a, for example, a funding grant, new job or promotion. The ERA Priority 3 promotes greater transparency and openness in recruitment of researchers and their career development. However the current mechanisms for recruitment, career progression and access to research funding grants is limited as it often focuses on a very narrow aspect of research activity, namely publications as a unique indicator of research quality in "prestigious" journals .




Figure 2. Research Reward Cycle

<sup>12</sup> European Commission Open Science Policy Platform:

<http://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/index.cfm?pg=open-science-policy-platform>

<sup>13</sup> Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A12012E%2FTXT>

<sup>14</sup> [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/lis1\\_en.htm](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/lis1_en.htm)

<sup>15</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/en/TXT/?uri=celex%3A32005L0071>

<sup>16</sup> <https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/jobs/charter>

There should be a system in place that drives the virtuous cycle summarised in Figure 2 in the context of Open Science. There should be a clear focus on the researcher and on the quality of his/her scientific production more than on its quantitative measurement. Harmonisation of recognition and reward of researchers with the basic aims of Open Science is a necessary condition for promoting research excellence.

### 2.3 Open Science and the Researcher Career Framework

Researchers are not an amorphous community but fall into clearly defined categories as encapsulated in the European Framework for Research Careers (EFRC)<sup>17</sup>, from First Stage Researcher (R1) through Recognised Researcher (R2) and Established Researcher (R3) to Leading Researcher (R4). Open Science needs to be embedded in the evaluation of researchers at all stages of their career (R1-R4). This will require universities and research institutes to change their approach in career assessment for recruitment and promotion. Funding agencies will have to reform the methods they use for awarding grants to researchers as well. However, the needs and responsibilities of each category will be different.

Collectively, senior researchers (R4) are in a position to change the current evaluation system. They assess researchers on behalf of their employer for recruitment and career progression. They also assess researchers and their work for funding agencies and publishers through peer review. Research Performing and Research Funding Organisations together with senior researchers should take the lead and change how quality is measured so as to incorporate Open Science (and other achievements of quality). This will incentivise researchers to practise Open Science.

### 2.4 Open Science

Open science encompasses a wide range of activities including open access to publications, open data, open peer review and stakeholder engagement or citizen science. Open data, for example, is quite different from open access to publications as it is relatively easy to place these on an open access repository. Sharing data is not in the habits of many of the scientific community<sup>18</sup> and often subject to legal and financial constraints, although widely recognised as essential to accelerate the progress of science and to prevent scientific fraud. A good example of the reluctance of researchers to engage in Open Science is the Open Data Research Pilot (ORD Pilot) in Horizon 2020<sup>19</sup>. This was designed to promote the opening up of data from H2020 projects. However many researchers did not see any incentive to invest time and funds to making their data open and opted out (see Appendix 3). Open sharing of research data is important<sup>20</sup> if crucial information is not to be lost<sup>21</sup> but does require concerted institutional management<sup>22</sup>. An important part of increasing the sharing of data is access of researchers to Open Science skills<sup>23</sup> and the development of the European Open Science Cloud (EOSC)<sup>24</sup> to provide the infrastructure store data.

Open peer review should be seen as an umbrella term for a number of overlapping methods that adapt peer review models in line with the ethos of Open Science, including making reviewer and/or author identities open, publishing review reports or enabling greater participation in the peer review process<sup>25</sup>. According to some experts<sup>26</sup> open and transparent peer reviewing is increasing<sup>27</sup> and some have launched attempts in this direction<sup>28</sup>.

---

<sup>17</sup> <https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/europe/career-development/training-researchers/research-profiles-descriptors>

<sup>18</sup> Note that there are disciplines, including astronomy and genomics, where the immediate sharing of research data is expected and provides significant benefits

<sup>19</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants\\_manual/hi/oa\\_pilot/h2020-hi-oa-pilot-guide\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/hi/oa_pilot/h2020-hi-oa-pilot-guide_en.pdf)

<sup>20</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants\\_manual/hi/oa\\_pilot/h2020-hi-oa-pilot-guide\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/hi/oa_pilot/h2020-hi-oa-pilot-guide_en.pdf)

<sup>21</sup> [http://www.upi.com/Science\\_News/2013/12/19/80-percent-of-scientific-data-from-publicly-funded-research-is-lost-within-two-decades/8781387477327/#ixzz3PYcUxswu](http://www.upi.com/Science_News/2013/12/19/80-percent-of-scientific-data-from-publicly-funded-research-is-lost-within-two-decades/8781387477327/#ixzz3PYcUxswu)

<sup>22</sup> <http://www.dcc.ac.uk/resources/briefing-papers>

<sup>23</sup> This is the subject of another OSPP expert group that focuses on Open Science Skills.

<sup>24</sup> <https://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/index.cfm?pg=open-science-cloud>

<sup>25</sup> What is open peer review? A systematic review, Ross-Hellauer (2017)

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5437951/>

<sup>26</sup> <http://www.nature.com/nature/peerreview/debate/nature04991.html>

<sup>27</sup> <http://blog.f1000research.com/2014/05/21/what-is-open-peer-review/>

<sup>28</sup> *The Self Journal of Science* (<http://www.sjscience.org/>); RIO (<http://riojournal.com/about>) and a few others: <http://www.openscholar.org.uk/open-peer-review/>; <http://rsos.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/open-peer-review-royal-society-open-science> ; [http://p2pfoundation.net/Open\\_Peer\\_Review](http://p2pfoundation.net/Open_Peer_Review)

### 3. ASSESSMENT AND RESEARCHER CAREER PROGRESSION

Researchers will fully engage in Open Science if they are motivated through recognition and reward through recruitment, career progression and funding agency evaluation processes.

#### 3.1 Researcher Assessment

In the past scientific excellence was quickly recognised by peers but that was in the context of a small research community. Already in the period 2007 to 2015 the global population of researchers (Figure 3) increased by 20% to an estimated total of 7.5 million<sup>29</sup>. Europe has 22% of this total making it the largest labour market for researchers in the world. The change over time is due to an expansion on the size of the research system that has increased investment in research and as a consequence an increased investment in the number of researchers. Governments invest significant amounts of public funds in research and require accountability (Figure 4). Funding agencies have the mandate to distribute research funding in an efficient and effective manner.




Figure 3. Estimated number of researchers in selected region




Figure 4. Gross domestic expenditure on R&D by the US, Europe and a number of leading countries between 1981 and 2013

The conflation of these goals has led to a move to a system based on metrics facilitated by the growth of bibliometrics that provide seemingly simple numbers to estimate quality. Every procedure of evaluation – and, in particular, the use of metrics-based indicators – induces researchers in developing career strategies favouring quantity over quality. This strong trend can lead to over production of research publications, duplications, plagiarism and scientific fraud.

<sup>29</sup> UNESCO Science Report Towards 2030 [http://en.unesco.org/unesco\\_science\\_report](http://en.unesco.org/unesco_science_report)

Today, both evaluation and selection are often resting on prestige<sup>30</sup>, which has always been a major criterion of judgment in society. Prestige is partly built on real values and specific qualities (strength, intelligence and skills) but it can be strongly influenced by indirect factors (heredity, courtship or clubbing). Prestige-based assessment of research and researchers can be misleading<sup>31</sup>, and it can reinforce the dominant power of publishing companies<sup>32</sup>.


With the development of Open Science, new evaluation criteria are needed to further support researchers' careers and recruitment. Assessment must be fair and must offer all guarantees of treating every applicant equally.

In order to reduce costs and administrative overhead, some funding agencies are moving away from panel based reviews. The plethora of publication data available on various platforms and the use of remote evaluation through online systems make evaluations more efficient (from a process point of view). While metrics may provide an indication of researchers' experience and excellence, the collective view of a panel of peers can arrive at a more comprehensive and accurate evaluation.

### 3.2 Beyond the Impact Factor

In terms of metrics, evaluation is mainly based on researchers' prestige, which, very often, is inferred from the prestige of the journals in which researchers publish their works. The journals' prestige is in turn based mainly (if not only) on the Journal Impact Factor (JIF). Several works demonstrate clearly the disruptive value of the JIF: the vast majority of authors are taking advantage of the citations gathered by a small minority. Due to the shape of the frequency distribution of the number of citations (an over-dispersed distribution, where a few articles have a very high number of citations, and the vast majority articles have a few or, even, zero) calculating an 'average' figure and attributing it to all articles makes no sense<sup>33</sup>.

For example, a study was carried out on all 1,944 articles published in Nature in 2012 and 2013 and looked at how many times each one has been cited in 2014. Only 75 of them (3.8%) provide 25% of the journal's citations, hence of the journal's impact factor (IF = 41.4) and 280 (14.4%) do account for half of the total citations & IF while 214 (11%) get 0 or 1 citation. The graphic representation in Figure 5 is even more striking.



**Figure 5. Number of 2014 citations for each article published in Nature during 2012-2013**

This goes to show that most Nature authors do benefit from an IF generated by the few (if one admits that citation is a valid assessment indicator, of course). This does not take away the fact that a high impact factor is a legitimate measurement of the prestige of a journal.

<sup>30</sup> <http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/writing/jbiol.htm>; [https://books.google.be/books?id=SW\\_6Q\\_I5R-cC&printsec=frontcover&dq=inauthor:%22Serge+Lehky%22&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi4xpeI973LAhWBkQ8KHSqPD8UQ6AEICjAA#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.be/books?id=SW_6Q_I5R-cC&printsec=frontcover&dq=inauthor:%22Serge+Lehky%22&hl=fr&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwi4xpeI973LAhWBkQ8KHSqPD8UQ6AEICjAA#v=onepage&q&f=false)

<sup>31</sup> <http://occamstypewriter.org/scurry/2015/12/04/jolly-good-fellows-royal-society-publishes-journal-citation-distributions/>; <https://bernardrentier.wordpress.com/2015/12/31/denouncing-the-imposter-factor/>

<sup>32</sup> <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/high-rejection-rates-by-journals-pointless>

<sup>33</sup> Measuring Up: Impact Factors Do Not Reflect Article Citation Rates V. Kremer et al <http://blogs.plos.org/plos/2016/07/impact-factors-do-not-reflect-citation-rates/>  
Time to remodel the journal impact factor, Nature Editorial, Nature, VOL 535 | 28 JULY 2016  
<http://www.nature.com/news/time-to-remodel-the-journal-impact-factor-1.20332>



### 3.3 New Means of Measuring Quality

Several authors<sup>34</sup> have called for an alternative to the journal impact factor (JIF). In 2013, the American Society for Cell Biology and several scientific journals launched the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment, DORA<sup>35</sup>, intended to end the practice of using the impact factor of journals to assess individual researchers or research groups or even institutions. To date, close to 13,000 institutions and individuals worldwide have signed the DORA, pledging to stop the JIF for inappropriate use such as individual researcher evaluation or assessment of research projects<sup>36</sup>. And yet only a handful of institutions who have signed it have actually implemented it. Review committees, assessment juries, funding organizations and academic authorities have continued using the journal impact factor as a determining element of judgement on the output of scientific research.

The DORA makes several suggestions, such as BioRxiv<sup>37</sup>. The British HEFCE has analysed<sup>38</sup> the question and Altmetric<sup>39</sup> has developed new methods. The Metric Tide<sup>40</sup> report provides a strong basis for developing the notion of responsible metrics. In tandem with the Leiden Manifesto<sup>41</sup> it includes the proposal that *"that quantitative evaluation should support – but not supplant – qualitative, expert assessment"*. Most importantly in the context of this report, both recommend a *"range of indicators to reflect and support a plurality of research and researcher career paths across the system"*.

Science must go back to cooperative rather than competitive processes and researchers must take advantage of the Internet revolution to do so<sup>42</sup>. The reading time will surely remain competitive – and even more so because of the growing scientific production<sup>43</sup>.

These developments present an ideal opportunity for RFOS and RPOs to introduce a far more comprehensive assessment of researchers that will encourage and incentivise their participation in Open Science.

---

<sup>34</sup><http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2126010/pdf/9056804.pdf>  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11953682>  
<http://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.0030291>

<sup>35</sup> <http://www.ascb.org/dora/>

<sup>36</sup> <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2013.00291>

<sup>37</sup> <http://biorxiv.org>

<sup>38</sup> [www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/Year/2015/metrictide/Title,104463](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/Year/2015/metrictide/Title,104463)

<sup>39</sup> <https://www.altmetric.com>

<sup>40</sup> <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/year/2015/metrictide>

<sup>41</sup> <http://www.nature.com/news/bibliometrics-the-leiden-manifesto-for-research-metrics-1.17351>

<sup>42</sup> <https://www.digital-science.com/blog/quest/collective-collaborative-complementary-that-is-what-makes-the-oan-unique/> ; <https://www.force11.org/about/manifesto>

<sup>43</sup> <http://www.cdnsiencepub.com/blog/21st-century-science-overload.aspx>

## 4. OPEN SCIENCE AND RESEARCHER CAREER PROGRESSION

### 4.1 Towards a comprehensive research career assessment - the Open Science Career Evaluation Matrix (OS-CAM)

To encourage and recognise Open Science activities, it is important to go beyond Open Science and frame this discussion in the broad context of the evaluation of researchers. European and indeed national policy across Europe promotes the mobility of researchers across borders, disciplines and sectors. Combined with Open Science, this can only be achieved if a far more comprehensive assessment of researchers by their employers and funders is introduced. For example, researchers who spend time in industry are clearly hindered in attempting to move back to academia, as they do not focus on academic publications as part of their industry work. To take into account this broad agenda requires a multidimensional approach that takes into account a range of evaluation criteria for researchers in all sectors, in all scientific domains and at all career stages. This also applies to the recognition of Open Science activities. In terms of the focus of the ERA Priority 3, the recognition of Open Science in the recruitment process of researchers will be critical. The same must hold for career progression and research grant assessment.

There is often a focus on the emerging generation of doctoral candidates and postdoctoral researchers. However any changes to how researchers are evaluated must permeate through all stages of the researchers' career; in terms of the European Framework for Research Careers (EFRC) from R1 to R4. This will be absolutely necessary if the practice of Open Science is to be embedded in the entire researcher community. In developing a system to evaluate and recognise engagement in the full spectrum of Open Science activities must be taken into account. These include open access to publications, open data, open peer review, research integrity, citizen science and stakeholder engagement.

To demonstrate the challenges ahead for introducing recognition of engaging in Open Science, take the case of skills for researchers. The broader skills that researchers acquire as part of the research process and those learnt formally (during their university curricula) are strongly promoted. For example, this is a requirement in the H2020 Marie Skłodowska Curie Actions and for many national funders of research across Europe. Advocating skills such as leadership and project management, for example), that support researchers in academia for moving to other employment sectors. However the skills acquired are not always included in researcher evaluation for promotion or funding. This is despite the fact that many of these skills are acquired through formal training and have associated ECTS or a professional qualification.

In general, evaluating a researcher cannot be reduced to a number because their merits and achievements are a complex set of different variables, difficult to be summarised by a single figure. A better approach is through multi-dimensional criteria evaluation, taking into consideration what is expected from a researcher and what is relevant for his/her career/recruitment.

The **Open Science Career Assessment Matrix (OS-CAM)** in Figure 6 represents a possible, practical move towards a more comprehensive approach to evaluating researchers through the lens of Open Science. This incorporates broader aspects of being an excellent researcher, such as service and leadership, research impact and contribution to teaching, many of which are starting to be included in research performing organisations' job descriptions and promotion criteria. The matrix illustrates how these broader aspects could be taken into account in the context of recognising researcher's contributions to Open Science.

<b>Open Science Career Assessment Matrix (OS-CAM)</b>	
<i>Open Science activities</i>	<i>Possible evaluation criteria</i>
<b>RESEARCH OUTPUT</b>	
<b>Research activity</b>	Pushing forward the boundaries of open science as a research topic
<b>Publications</b>	Publishing in open access journals Self-archiving in open access repositories
<b>Datasets and research results</b>	Using the FAIR data principles Adopting quality standards in open data management and open datasets Making use of open data from other researchers
<b>Open source</b>	Using open source software and other open tools Developing new software and tools that are open to other users
<b>Funding</b>	Securing funding for open science activities
<b>RESEARCH PROCESS</b>	

<b>Stakeholder engagement / citizen science</b>	Actively engaging society and research users in the research process Sharing provisional research results with stakeholders through open platforms (e.g. Arxiv, Figshare) Involving stakeholders in peer review processes
<b>Collaboration and Interdisciplinarity</b>	Widening participation in research through open collaborative projects Engaging in team science through diverse cross-disciplinary teams
<b>Research integrity</b>	Being aware of the ethical and legal issues relating to data sharing, confidentiality, attribution and environmental impact of open science activities Fully recognizing the contribution of others in research projects, including collaborators, co-authors, citizens, open data providers
<b>Risk management</b>	Taking account of the risks involved in open science
<b>SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP</b>	
<b>Leadership</b>	Developing a vision and strategy on how to integrate OS practices in the normal practice of doing research Driving policy and practice in open science Being a role model in practicing open science
<b>Academic standing</b>	Developing an international or national profile for open science activities Contributing as editor or advisor for open science journals or bodies
<b>Peer review</b>	Contributing to open peer review processes Examining or assessing open research
<b>Networking</b>	Participating in national and international networks relating to open science
<b>RESEARCH IMPACT</b>	
<b>Communication and Dissemination</b>	Participating in public engagement activities Sharing research results through non-academic dissemination channels Translating research into a language suitable for public understanding
<b>IP (patents, licenses)</b>	Being knowledgeable on the legal and ethical issues relating to IPR Transferring IP to the wider economy
<b>Societal impact</b>	Evidence of use of research by societal groups Recognition from societal groups or for societal activities
<b>Knowledge exchange</b>	Engaging in open innovation with partners beyond academia
<b>TEACHING AND SUPERVISION</b>	
<b>Teaching</b>	Training other researchers in open science principles and methods Developing curricula and programs in open science methods, including open science data management Raising awareness and understanding in open science in undergraduate and masters' programs
<b>Mentoring</b>	Mentoring and encouraging others in developing their open science capabilities
<b>Supervision</b>	Supporting early stage researchers to adopt an open science approach
<b>PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE</b>	
<b>Continuing professional development</b>	Investing in own professional development to build open science capabilities
<b>Project management</b>	Successfully delivering open science projects involving diverse research teams
<b>Personal qualities</b>	Demonstrating the personal qualities to engage society and research users with open science Showing the flexibility and perseverance to respond to the challenges of conducting open science

## **Figure 6 Open Science Career Assessment Matrix (OS-CAM) illustrating the range of evaluation criteria for assessing Open Science activities**

The matrix provides a framework that can be used to develop evaluation systems that can be applied in various contexts: at the individual level for the purpose of recruitment and promotion, at the individual or group level in the evaluation of grant and fellowship applications or adapted for institutional funding allocation models or incentives focused on building open science capacity.

The criteria are expressed as “doing” Open Science, but can be adapted to recognise a more introductory or advanced level. For example, they could range from “learning about OS” for First Stage Researchers, to “doing OS” for Recognised Researchers, “supporting others in OS” for Established Researchers and eventually to “shaping policy and practice in OS” for Leading Researchers.

An important aspect of this approach is that the weighting for each criterion should recognise the background of the researcher being evaluated. For example, if a researcher is seeking a position in academia from industry then it will be unlikely that he/she has been heavily engaged in publications or open data, but will bring strengths in other areas. The open science criteria in this matrix illustrate the broad range of activities of researchers involved in Open Science. It is not expected that every researcher will be doing all of these activities, nor that all of them will be required for an individual position.

While some of the evaluation criteria in the OS-CAM matrix could be translated into numbers, weighting this can only be part of the process. In any evaluation process, the wide diversity of researchers’ experiences and capabilities are such that good decisions require qualitative judgement, preferably by a panel of independent researchers who respecting the principles of openness, transparency and merit<sup>44</sup>, assess the range of a researcher’s achievements, whether this be for a new position, career advancement or for a funding grant. It is important for evaluators to consider profile and balance of the collective criteria.

To test the usability and robustness of the matrix, we are recommending a pilot of the proposed evaluation criteria within existing funding programmes. Specifically they could be piloted (under certain calls of Horizon 2020) based on the experience acquired by a similar pilot already driven by the European Commission<sup>45</sup>.

### **4.2 Recognising and Rewarding Researchers in the Context of Open Science**

Research Performing and Research Funding Organisations must be challenged into developing alternative methods of evaluation, minimising those based on the prestige of the journals where the scholarly articles have been published. It should be stated here that this report does not go into the details of specific metrics as there is another OSPP Expert Group focusing on Altmetrics<sup>46</sup>.

Nevertheless, the ideas behind the Metrics Tide report<sup>47</sup> and the Leiden Manifesto<sup>48</sup> provide a good basis for the development of Open Science evaluation criteria. These documents highlight the risk of misusing impact factors, but they do identify appropriate circumstances and usages acknowledging the value of a combination of bibliometric indicators in highlighting the multidimensional aspects of a scientific career.

It is useful to also state the obvious that “rewards” come in many different forms and shapes, and that Open Science practices can be included in the evaluation criteria of many different phases in a researcher’s career. It should be noted that a “reward” in the narrow sense of the term is an ex-post criterion (giving acknowledgement to something already achieved) but in the broader sense ex-ante “incentives” should also be included (i.e. one does not reward past performance but steer future behaviour). The actual criteria / measuring tools may differ according to these different settings but the Open Science policy principles will remain the same. Example of rewards for Open Science include,

- Science Communication (“giving attention” is the most basic and cost-free type of reward, e.g. on university’s website, in promotional events, etc.)
- Project proposal assessment

---

<sup>44</sup> [https://cdn1.euraxess.org/sites/default/files/policy\\_library/otm-r-finaldoc\\_0.pdf](https://cdn1.euraxess.org/sites/default/files/policy_library/otm-r-finaldoc_0.pdf)

<sup>45</sup> DG CNECT (<http://postgrantoapilot.openaire.eu>)

<sup>46</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/index.cfm?pg=altmetrics\\_eg](https://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/index.cfm?pg=altmetrics_eg)

<sup>47</sup> <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/Year/2015/metrictide/>

<sup>48</sup> <http://media.leidenuniv.nl/legacy/leiden-protocol-for-research-assessments-2015-2021-update-impact-matrix.pdf>

- PhD thesis examination
- Recruitment
- Promotion
- Funding allocation systems (e.g. REF, criteria in allocation models,...)
- Research Evaluation Exercises (e.g. site visits for quality assurance)
- Research prizes

### 4.3 Researcher Career Policy and Open Science

The purpose of ERA policy is to achieve a European unified research area open to the world based on the internal market, in which researchers, scientific knowledge and technology circulate freely. The current ERA policy focuses on the five priorities,

1. More Effective National Research Systems - Boosting investment and promoting national competition.
2. Optimal Transnational Cooperation and Competition - On common research agendas on grand challenges and infrastructures.
3. An Open Labour Market for Researchers - Facilitating mobility, supporting training and ensuring attractive careers.
4. Gender Equality and Gender Mainstreaming in Research - Encouraging gender diversity to foster science excellence and relevance.
5. Optimal Circulation, Access to and Transfer of Scientific Knowledge - To guarantee access to and uptake of knowledge by all.

These policy priorities were agreed in 2012<sup>49</sup> and were a means to focus the broad set of ERA policy initiatives. It is important to stress that they were agreed before Open Science had come to the fore in EU policy. There should be a full review of all ERA policies and in particular, the ERA partnership through the lens of Open Science. If necessary, policies must be changed in order to ensure compatibility with Open Science.

In terms of the mandate for this report, the focus is on priority 3 that concerns policy on researchers. The main policy is the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for their Recruitment. The European Charter for Researchers is a set of 41 general principles and requirements which specifies the roles, responsibilities and entitlements of researchers as well as of employers and/or funders of researchers. The Code of Conduct for the recruitment of researchers consists of a set of general principles and requirements that should be followed by employers and/or funders when appointing or recruiting researchers. The Charter and Code was developed in 2005 and while it has no explicit references to Open Science, it certainly has nothing to hinder Open Science. In broader ERA policy development in the context of Open Science it may be necessary to revisit the Charter and Code with an overarching document or preamble that makes explicit its compatibility with Open Science. That being said there is already the means to implement any changes and in particular ensure that Open Science skills are integrated into institutional training as part of researcher career development.

### 4.4 The Human Resources Strategy for Researchers (HRS4R)

The 'HR Strategy for Researchers' supports research institutions and funding organisations in the implementation of the Charter & Code in their policies and practices. As the application of the Charter and Code is mandatory for all Horizon 2020 contracts (Art. 32 of Model Grant Agreement), the HRS4R is the recommended means for implementation. The 'HR Excellence in Research' award, attained after a thorough analysis of an institution's HR policies for researchers, identifies the institutions and organisations as providers and supporters of a stimulating and favourable working environment for researchers. This can become a means for encouraging the embedding of Open Science in institutional researcher HR policies and practices. A key part of an institution engaging in the HRS4R process is analysing current practice on researchers and identifying gaps. This leads to an action plan for change. This provides an ideal means for institutions to identify a path to fully engaging in Open Science.

Within or outside the HRS4R strategy, any institution can make a checklist to assess the level of institutional support for Open Science. A possible framework for this is the following:

---

<sup>49</sup> 'A Reinforced European Research Area Partnership for Excellence and Growth', SWD(2012) 211 final, [http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/pdf/era-communication/era-communication\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/pdf/era-communication/era-communication_en.pdf)

a) **Facilitate Open Science (focused on removing barriers)**

- Invest in technical infrastructure (Green OA & data management)
- Engage in discussions to remove misunderstandings & misconceptions concerning Open Science.

b) **Support (help those who are already converted)**

- All of the above, plus:
- Provide practical information on e.g. the FAIR principles in data management<sup>50</sup>. Certain conditions may apply, the data may not always be fully open but they should be “as open as possible, as closed as necessary”; transparent and available on request
- Provide practical information on quality processes for stakeholder involvement
- Invest in collaboration, cross-overs, interdisciplinarity, meeting spaces for researchers and stakeholders
- Engage in discussions on Open Innovation

c) **Encourage (convince those who are not yet converted)**

- All of the above, plus:
- Acknowledge Open Science practices alongside other evaluation criteria
- Guide business collaboration in a direction of open innovation
- Set up promotional campaigns within the institution

d) **Enforce (make it compulsory)**

- All of the above, plus:
- Make Open Science practices compulsory in all evaluation criteria for the recruitment and career progression of researchers.

---

<sup>50</sup> <https://www.force11.org/group/fairgroup/fairprinciples>

## **5. OPEN SCIENCE RECOGNITION/REWARDS – SURVEYS AND GOOD PRACTICE**

---

A survey has been launched to obtain feedback from universities on the one hand and from funding agencies on the other hand concerning their involvement and support in favour of the current evolution of scientific research called Open Science (in some instances, universities considered themselves as both academic institutions and funders, when they allocate intramural funds for research). Our main interest was in knowing whether these institutions are currently supporting this evolution and which concrete measures they have set up, if any, in order to encourage researchers to enter the new research paradigm.

*NOTE OF CAUTION:* It should be clear that these surveys cannot be considered as representative of the European scientific community. Questionnaires have been widely dispatched and responses have been sent on a voluntary basis. People with many different statuses have responded and some questions were obviously more targeted to specific groups (researchers or administrative staff of universities, for instance). Hence these enquiries have no ambition of reflecting accurately the opinions of a representative range of stakeholders in research. They have been built and should be viewed as purely indicative. Although no scientific conclusion can be drawn from them, some indications of current trends and awareness have been useful for the group to design recommendations.

For these reasons, the results have not been analysed and exposed in detail in this report, but all the collected data are available in Appendix 4.

The two surveys were conceived similarly but they show differences linked to their specificities. For clarity, we will cover them separately.

### **5.1 Survey overview**

#### ***Universities***

The survey aims at collecting information on European universities' procedures for researcher recruitment, promotion/progression and support in a growing "Open Science" environment, and to get a sense of how much this new evolution has or has not yet been reflected in the evaluation procedures and in the mentalities of the various juries and committees in charge of evaluation of research projects and of individual researchers or research teams. The status of the respondents ranges from administrative staff to level R1-R2-R3-R4 researchers and others.

First, the survey questions the perceived level of autonomy of the Institutions. Besides the intrinsic attractiveness of OS on researchers, less autonomous institutions are, to some extent, lead to align their activities according to what is expected from them by decision makers. A large variety of incentives can be awarded to researchers to encourage them in adhering to the OS principles, but they are dependent on the level the institutional autonomy. If a university has no grasp on whom it hires, at whichever level and with which kind of salary, its range of possible incentives for researchers is rather narrow.

We tried to find out whether universities have developed written merit assessment procedures, a general Open Science policy, clear and transparent criteria for the assessment of researchers' quality, skills, accomplishments, and which weight is being granted to each indicator.

#### ***Funders***

The survey is aimed at perceiving how much funding organisations are supportive of Open Science and which incentives they are setting up in this respect, with what stringency they are controlling the good compliance with OS rules as well as whether and how they recognise merits in these matters.

### **5.2 Results of the Survey**

#### ***Universities***

##### ***Responses***

244 fully completed responses have been received, from 154 universities (the survey allowed for more than one person at the same institution to respond).

A total of 79 % of the responders wished to be kept informed of the results of the survey.

## Status

The largest group was the researchers (54 %) of which two thirds were at the R3-R4 level. Administrative staff represented 44 %.

## Distribution per country

Participation was widespread (37 different countries) although very unevenly distributed.




Figure 7. Distribution by country of survey respondents

## Institutional autonomy

Approximately two thirds of the respondents consider that their institution is completely autonomous for the recruitment of researchers, for the promotion/progression of researchers and for providing financial support to researchers/research teams (grants, space, human resources, logistics, etc.), hence that they have a control on the those incentives, but only 25% declare the same about the setting of the salaries, mostly private universities or research centres. More than half consider that their institution is only partly autonomous in this respect, due to the legal constraints and official regulations, particularly concerning salaries. However, many respondents mentioned that their knowledge of the administrative procedures is too limited to answer questions on institutional autonomy.

## Assessment standards and rules

Approximately one third of the respondents declared that their institution has developed written merit assessment procedures for the recruitment of researchers, for their promotion/progression, the setting of their salaries. 52 % know about written procedures to obtain financial support. However 14% to 20% are not aware of any written procedure for these matters.

## Performance indicators

Research publications appeared to be the major element taken into account for evaluation of researchers' careers (68%), more than patents (35%), capacity to secure external funds (35%), teaching activities (34 %), interacting and collaborating with other researchers (32%) or industry (26%), participation in scientific conferences (31%), supervision of young researchers (25%), awards (23%), contribution to institutional visibility (17%), participation in science popularisation events (17%), community services and involvement (13%), in citizen science projects (12%) or in research commons (12%).

Considering scholarly publishing as an important indicator of quality for research activities, their number came up as the first or largely preferred criterion (80%), followed by the impact factor of the journals in which the work has been published (68%), the number of citations (61%) and the h factor or others (51%)

36% of institutions accounted largely or fully for variation by field in publication and citation practices while 52% do scrutinise indicators regularly and update them.

The assessment is seldom largely or fully based on qualitative evaluation of the research content after reading the publications (23%). It is more often based largely or fully on the journal's reputation such as the impact factor (64%) and not much on the number of citations (38%). Many universities (46%) do not take into account original research content presented outside of a traditional journal publishing framework (participatory websites, blogs, etc.).



Even though the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) has been signed by over 13,000 universities worldwide, 62% of the responders don't know and 26% believe their institution did not. Among those (3%) who claim to know that their institution has signed the DORA, 77% estimate that the recommendations are being followed.

One respondent testified:

*"Our institution has considered signing DORA and held intensive discussions on it. The overall conclusion was it would be unfair to sign a declaration and not be implementing it fully, for two reasons:*

*1) We have a responsibility to inform the younger generation of researchers about career opportunities. In a large number of disciplines, impact factors help to identify prestigious journals. We cannot be blind to this reality: publishing in these journals will enhance their career opportunities more than publishing elsewhere. We have a duty to inform our researchers about this AND at the same time raise awareness about the pitfalls of impact factors.*

*2) Our national funding system weighs publications according to journal rankings. We cannot ignore this context as it has a huge impact on our university's funding allocation. Our university's evaluation policy has made an explicit statement about the sensible use of impact factors, based on the Leiden Manifesto.*

*For previous questions and the next one, we ticked the box "YES" but we are in progress to implement the institutional repository (IR), the guidelines for researchers and the strategy / policy for the institution. The objective is to be operational in January 2018."*

Several responders specified that a limited number of publications chosen by the author are qualitatively assessed, claiming that in their institution, it is the overall collective impression of the research quality that counts mostly.

One respondent claimed that they assess researchers on their

*"Consistent record of published research in peer-reviewed journals and conference publications", and "High quality writing for academic and practitioner audiences, with evidence of ability to publish at national and international level"*

Another respondent wrote:

*"Through the Research Excellence Framework researchers are assessed on things like number of publications, citations, journal impact and other citation-based indicators. While the REF only takes place every 7 years (last in 2014, next in 2021), these same indicators are considered when reviewing a researcher for advancement and promotion, and at annual Performance and Development Reviews."*

Original research content presented outside of a traditional journal publishing framework is generally not taken into account during the researcher's assessment, unless it is also published in a recognised journal. However 27 % consider it should be evaluated positively as it reflects open communication. Among those who admit that it is viewed negatively, a large majority feels it is inappropriate and that such an attitude should be modified in the future. Some consider it is bypassing the necessary guarantee of the peer review.

For humanities, it is generally stated that monographs are the number one criterion.

Most institutions are basing their assessments on the opinion of in-house committee members (65%, only 9% never do), slightly less on that of external experts (59%, while 14% never do).

### **Open Access**

Open Access is well known by the respondents: 73% know how researchers can open the access to their publications. Among the 27% who do not, it is interesting to note that more than half of them (58%) would like to know more about it.

Only 42% of responders claimed that their institution has an official policy on open access to scientific publications (20% don't know). That leaves 38% of institutions whose members consider there is no official in-house policy on this topic.

Concerning institutional repositories, 60% of the responders' universities have one, 17% don't and a surprisingly high number (23%) don't know if there is one. The deposit is mandatory for 31% of the responders' institutions and 68% believe that ignoring to this mandate can have a negative effect in an assessment procedure.

Training sessions on OA are being organised in 46% and official guidelines are provided in a similar number.

Only 36% are aware of an institutional monitoring of which and how many, what proportion, of the publications by their researchers are openly accessible, full text.

Some respondents assume that demand for this issue is low among researchers. When it is high, support and training are sometimes performed outside the university. However, when no specific service is provided and the issue is not on the agenda, researchers work in a fragmented approach, each one for themselves.

### **Open Data (OD)**

Around 20% of the responders are aware of an institutional policy on Open Data in their institution, supported by a committee or a management structure and management plan, with training sessions, guidelines and an official recommendation. However, 32% report having an in-house research data repository available. 40% consider that compliance has an impact on assessment.

### **Open Software, Open Source**

The results for Open Source/Software are similar to those for Open Data (23 % of the responders are aware of an institutional promotion of open software).

### **Open Peer Review (OPR)**

The OPR procedure is known to 40% of the respondents who have participated in one at least once, 11% having done it "often"). However, in this case, the question should be addressed only to the researchers, not the administrative staff or others.

### **Transparency**

Clarity and simplicity are reported as fulfilled by 11% and in part or largely by another 37%.

Half of the respondents think performance is measured against the research mission of their institutions, and one third confirms that the official OA policy is visible and accessible on the institutional website.

### **Institutional values**


Half of the respondents consider that, in their institution research performance is actually being measured taking into account the university's proclaimed missions and values. One out of five does not.

## **5.2.2 Funders**

A total of 28 fully completed responses have been received, from 18 countries.

All those who filled the questionnaires and gave their names considered themselves as "top managers", except 2 "researchers".

82 % of the respondents wished to be kept informed of the results of the survey.



**Figure 8. Number of respondents per country**

### **Assessment standards and rules**

A little over half of the respondents declare that their organisation has developed written merit assessment procedures for the recruitment of researchers, for their promotion/progression, the setting of their salaries and mention that procedures and templates are publicly accessible.

### **Scholarly publications**

Developing scientific collaborations with other academics appears to be the major element taken into account for evaluation of researchers' careers, slightly above the research publications.

Considering scholarly publishing as the second most important indicator of quality for research activities, their number comes up as the first or largely preferred criterion (64%), followed by the

number of citations (47%), the impact factor of the journals that have published the work (43%), and the h factor or others (32%).

43 % of organisations account largely or fully for variation by field in publication and citation practices while 57 % scrutinize indicators regularly and update them.

### **Assessment procedures**

The assessment is seldom largely or fully based on the number of citations (25 %). It is more often based largely or fully on the journal's reputation such as the impact factor (40 %) and a little less on qualitative evaluation of the research content after reading the publications (36 %). Most funding organisations (43 %) do not take into account original research content presented outside of a traditional journal publishing framework (participatory websites, blogs, etc.).

Most organisations base their assessment on the opinion of external experts (57 %), while 7 % never do.

### **Open Access**

Open Access is rather well known by the respondents: 61 % know how researchers can open the access to their publications. Among the 39 % who do not, only 3 % would like to know more about it.

61 % of responders claim that their organisation has an official policy on open access to scientific publications (4 % don't know). That leaves 36 % of institutions whose members consider there is no official in-house policy on this topic.

Only 14 % of the funding organisations have signed the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA) and 7 % state that they have no intention of signing it. Obviously a large proportion does not seem to be well aware of the DORA directives.

### **Open Repositories**

53 % of funders are recommending the use of open repositories, mostly not institutional ones. 36% do not suggest any specific repository.

Only 68% believe that non-compliance with this recommendation can have a negative effect in an assessment procedure.

43% provide official guidelines about Open Access.

Exactly half of the responding organisations measure / monitor the number / percentage of publications with open access in assessment procedures.

### **Open Data (OD)**

39% of the respondents claim that there is an institutional policy on Open Data in their organisation, 25% have a management plan, 32% provide guidelines (webpages, leaflets, videos) on how to open the data adequately. 39% give an official recommendation. 36% consider that compliance has an impact on assessment.

### **Open Software, Open Source (OS)**

29% of the respondents know that their organisation is promoting the use of Open Source / Open Software

### **Open Peer Review (OPR)**

Half of the organisations are encouraging Open Peer Review, the other half are not.

### **Transparency**

Clarity and simplicity are acknowledged as fulfilled by 11% and in part or largely by another 61%. 43% confirm that the official OA policy is visible and accessible on their website.

### **Institutional values**

83% of the respondents consider that, in their institution research performance is actually being measured taking into account the university's proclaimed mission and values.14% do not.

## **5.3 Summary of the Survey Results**

The surveys have generated responses from a wide range of origins (154 universities from 37 countries, 28 funders from 18 countries). However, due to limitations earlier stated the working group does not consider that any statistical conclusion could be drawn from them at the European level. Some large countries are clearly under-represented and also the scope is limited. However the surveys provide useful insight into the level of awareness about Open Science, as well as into the willingness of the responders to see and help things evolve.

There is a definite need for widespread, clear and complete written procedures for evaluation. Two thirds of the respondents from universities and about half of those from funding organisations admitted that it was not current practice in their institution to make such information readily available yet or were not aware of it.

Evaluation criteria are still most often based on scholarly publications and their number is the most widespread indicator of performance. Other criteria such as measuring the impact of the scientific production on the academic community (citations, h index, etc.) are much less assessed and the least used are the purely qualitative evaluations that require critical reading of the publications and assessment of other achievements than scientific production such as openness, sharing, support to the community, team spirit, participation in citizen science and information of the lay public.

Open Access (OA) is the best known aspect of Open Science. Although there are still a few misconceptions about the OA features, the attractiveness of OA is clearly perceptible. However, close to 40 % of the university respondents mentioned that their institution has no official OA policy yet. Surprisingly, almost half of the universities organize training sessions on OA already.

Open Research Data (ORD) is much less well understood, reluctance is still high, official policies, infrastructures and ORD management plans and/or committees are still quite rare. The same conclusions can be drawn for Open Source/Software and Open Peer Review.

Transparency of the procedures is growing but still absent from half of the universities and it is more present in funding organization.

Overall, it can be concluded from these surveys that awareness concerning Open Science and its various components is growing and reaching a quarter to half of the institutions who responded.

#### **5.4 Examples of good practice and potential for mutual learning**

It is important to state that while still much needs to be done to embed Open Science in the research system, there are already many universities, research organisations and research funders across Europe that engage in Open Science.

##### ***Ghent University***

*Ghent University has adopted eight broad principles that must guide every evaluation of research:*

- *The choice of an appropriate evaluation method for research is in line with the objective of the evaluation.*
- *The evaluation takes into account the intended impact of the research; strictly academic, economic, societal, or a combination of these.*
- *The evaluation takes into account the diversity between disciplines.*
- *For each chosen evaluation method, the simplicity of the procedure is weighed up against the complexity of the research.*
- *The evaluation criteria are drawn up and communicated to all stakeholders in advance.*
- *There are sufficient experts on the evaluation committee who are in a position to adequately assess the quality of the research.*
- *The above principles are implemented by means of a smart choice of evaluation indicators and by adopting a holistic approach to peer review.*
- *Any committee or policy measure evaluating research makes a best effort commitment to translate the above principles into practice.*

The full text is available here: <http://www.ugent.be/en/research/research-evaluation.htm>

## **Finnish Open Science and Research Award**

The Finnish Open Science and Research Roadmap (OSR Roadmap) was published in 2014 to support us in making progress towards openness. In the OSR Roadmap, certain objectives and actions were defined, as well as the responsibilities of different stakeholders in policy implementation. To support the monitoring of the implementation of the Roadmap the initiative has conducted evaluations of openness culture twice. The target of this evaluation has been to assess the openness of operational cultures in research organisations and research funding organisations. The key objectives, against which the assessments are made, are defined in the Roadmap. The purpose of the evaluation is to highlight best practices and areas of development while initiating discussions on open science and research at international level. The indicators for research performing organisations in the evaluation were:

- Strategic Steering
- Policies and Principles
- Indicators and Scoring Principles
- Competence Development

In 2015 the two rewarded organisations were the University of Jyväskylä and the University of Helsinki. The University of Jyväskylä received the award for the most comprehensive measures for promoting openness and visibility. The University of Helsinki was awarded for being the highest ranking organisation in the national assessment of operational cultures of higher education institutions.


In 2016 two research performing organisations were rewarded for best progress in openness (improvement by 30 score points in the national evaluation). The two rewarded organisations were Lappeenranta University of Technology and the University of Oulu. In addition to the organizational awards two rewards were given to individuals in two categories. Firstly, for the efforts in promoting the availability of open data sets researchers from the Seinäjoki University of Applied Science were rewarded. Secondly, for efforts in innovative usage of open data a research group from the University of Helsinki were rewarded

More information can be found here: <https://avointiede.fi/web/openscience/openculture>

## **The Finnish Academy**

This funding agency promotes open science based on the following scheme:

### **Research Funding & Open Science**



<http://www.aka.fi/en/funding/responsible-research/open-science/>

### **LERU advice paper on Citizen Science (2016)**

*Citizen science, the active involvement of non-professional scientists in research, is experiencing an upsurge of interest. Activities range from small projects by groups with a common interest to large international projects, which involve professional scientists and research institutions. Citizen science can involve a vast range of activities, from gathering data in remote regions of the planet to crowdsourcing over the internet. LERU recognises the potential of citizen science for research and its role in the open science movement. LERU is aware that modern IT technologies enable citizens to engage in monitoring pollution, collecting data on biodiversity, language studies as well as many other research activities.*

*LERU distinguishes three important trends:*

- a) Increasing coordination and collaboration between citizen science practitioners from different fields, which leads to sharing procedures and best practices, and to the creation of networks and associations.*
- b) Emergence of platforms that support a variety of citizen science projects, creating broader public awareness and encouraging a greater retention of volunteers.*
- c) Expanding the role played by citizens in the projects beyond simple tasks to include greater participation in all phases of the research process from conceptualisation to publication.*

*In its report LERU lists guidelines for researchers and recommendations for research organisations when engaging in citizen science.*

*More information can be found here:*

[http://www.leru.org/files/publications/LERU\\_AP20\\_citizen\\_science.pdf](http://www.leru.org/files/publications/LERU_AP20_citizen_science.pdf)

<http://www.leru.org/index.php/public/news/not-everything-that-can-be-counted-counts/>

### **University College London (UCL)**

*Open Science represents a new paradigm in the way research is undertaken and disseminated. The invention of moveable-type printing in the West in the fifteenth century transformed the ways ideas were shared in Europe. So in the twenty-first century, open approaches to the performance and dissemination of research – with outputs such as publications, research data, software – enable researchers to share their findings and to contribute wise solutions to the challenges which face Society.*

*Many researchers adopt open approaches to research to ensure that the benefits which openness brings – reproducibility, transparency leading to greater research integrity – are available to their subject domain and to Society as a whole. However, it is only fair that such approaches should also deliver a personal reward for individual researchers.*

*In the era of Open Science, research funders and research performing organisations should remodel their HR frameworks to include openness as an explicit criterion for reward and promotion. Such a move would encourage greater take-up of open approaches to the performance and dissemination of research as a result. UCL (University College London) is considering such an approach as part of a wider review of HR frameworks, to ensure that the gains of Open Science can be reflected in its HR policies and frameworks.*

### **Other LERU Universities:**

Many LERU universities have OS policies and resources on their websites – to name just a few:

- Universitat de Barcelona (<http://diposit.ub.edu/dspace/handle/2445/27711>);
- University of Cambridge (<http://www.cam.ac.uk/research/research-at-cambridge/open-access>);
- Università degli Studi di Milano (<http://www.unimi.it/ricerca/air/76762.html>).

Also LERU universities have training courses for students and staff. Some examples:

- The University of Edinburgh, through Edina & Data Library, has developed MANTRA, an open online research data management training course complete with 8 units which map onto the data lifecycle: <http://datalib.edina.ac.uk/mantra/>
- Edina & Data Library also developed the DIY RDM Toolkit for Librarians: <http://datalib.edina.ac.uk/mantra/libtraining.html>

Information Services offer a range of RDM training workshops and courses: <http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/information-services/research-support/data-management/rdm-training>

- The University of Helsinki has a Data Management Planning training course – see <http://www.helsinki.fi/kirjasto/en/home/>
- KU Leuven has a RDM Support Desk:
- <https://www.kuleuven.be/english/research/scholcomm/rdm/index>
- The University of Oxford has an Open Access Oxford Project Group, which among other tasks, advises on information and training for researchers:

<https://www1.admin.ox.ac.uk/researchsupport/researchcommittees/scworkgroups/oao-pg/>

It also has a Research Data Working Group, which among other tasks, supports researchers in taking advantage of the opportunities to stimulate discovery and collaboration and maximise impact through appropriate data sharing and 'intelligent openness' (Royal Society, Science as an Open Enterprise, 2012)

<https://www1.admin.ox.ac.uk/researchsupport/researchcommittees/scworkgroups/rdmopendata/>

## APPENDIX 1 - OS REWARDS WORKING GROUP DETAILS

The Steering Group on Human Resources and Mobility (SGHRM) Working Group on "Recognition/Rewards" (OS Rewards WG) met for the first time in Brussels on the 17th of June 2016, with a specific mandate to prosper a new system to rewards researchers for engaging in Open Science. The aim of this working group is to ensure that the recognition and reward of researchers for Open Science is integral component of researcher career progression through recruitment, promotion and peer review grants.

The OS Rewards WG will work together with the high-level advisory group "Open Science Policy Platform" (OSPP)<sup>51</sup>, which met for the first time on the 19th of September 2016. The OSPP has been established to advise the Commission on how to further develop and implement OS policy, support OS policy formulation and implementation, and also to provide advice and recommendations on any cross-cutting issues that affect Open Science. This group is comprised of 30 members, a full list of which can be found on the European Commission's webpage<sup>52</sup>. In order to aid the OSPP in their work, the Commission has established 8 expert working groups on different issues of relevance to Open Science, including the current working group on Open Science Recognition/Rewards, but also topics such as Open Science Skills, Alternative metrics, FAIR data, the European Open Science Cloud, Research Integrity and Citizen Science. These expert groups work independently, and also independently advise the Commission, but the output of these different WG will ultimately flow directly into the work of the Open Science Policy Platform.

The Group is chaired by Conor O'Carroll, Research Policy & Funding Consultant at SciPol and chair of the Steering Group on Human Resources and Mobility (SGHRM). Other members are Co-Chair Bernard Rentier<sup>53</sup>, Former Rector of Liège University, Belgium; David McAllister<sup>54</sup>, Head of Skills & Careers at BBSRC, RCUK and SGHRM Delegate UK; Katrien Maes, League of Research Universities (LERU); Cecilia Cabello Valdez<sup>55</sup> Director of Operations FECYT and SGHRM Delegate Spain; Janet Metcalfe, Director VITAE UK; Fulvio Esposito<sup>56</sup> Professor Emeritus of Parasitology University of Camerino Italy and SGHRM Delegate; Eeva Kaunismaa SGHRM Delegate Finland; Shane Bergin<sup>57</sup> Science Education University College Dublin Ireland; Karen Vandeveld<sup>58</sup> Research Policy, University of Ghent, Belgium; Isabelle Halleux<sup>59</sup>, R&D Executive Director. University of Liege Belgium,

Staff members of the European Commission with expertise across research, employment, education also joined the group. These included,

Vitalba Crivello, Policy Officer A6, DG RTD, European Commission

Julie Sainz, Policy Officer, DG EAC.C2 'Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions, European Commission.

The group was facilitated by Irmela Brach, Policy Officer DG RTD B2, European Commission. There was also input from Fabienne Gautier, Head of Unit, DG RTD B2 - Open Science and ERA Policy, European Commission and from Annette Bjornsson, Deputy Head of Unit, DG RTD B2 - Open Science and ERA Policy, European Commission.

The group has had a total of five meetings and received presentations and written input from a number of sources including LERU. A survey has been conducted targeting both researchers, funders and employers to gather information on the current status of Open Science skills.

The following presentations were made to the group by members and invited experts,

- The Open Science Agenda and how 'rewards' fit into the picture  
Bernard RENTIER, Former Rector of University Liège (BE)

---

<sup>51</sup> European Commission Open Science Policy Platform:

<http://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/index.cfm?pg=open-science-policy-platform>

<sup>52</sup> Nominated members of the Open Science Policy Platform:

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/pdf/ospp\\_nominated\\_members.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none](http://ec.europa.eu/research/openscience/pdf/ospp_nominated_members.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none)

<sup>53</sup> <https://fr-fr.facebook.com/BRentier/>

<sup>54</sup> <https://www.linkedin.com/in/david-mcallister-aa054617/?ppe=1>

<sup>55</sup> <https://www.linkedin.com/in/cecilia-cabello-6560405/?ppe=1>

<sup>56</sup> [http://www.istruzione.it/allegati/2015/CVEsposito\\_SegrTec.pdf](http://www.istruzione.it/allegati/2015/CVEsposito_SegrTec.pdf)

<sup>57</sup> <http://www.ucd.ie/research/people/educationlifelonglearning/drshanebergin/>

<sup>58</sup> <https://www.linkedin.com/in/karen-vandeveld-818343b/?ppe=1>

<sup>59</sup> <https://www.linkedin.com/in/isabelle-halleux-a0361118/?ppe=1>



- First experiences from the 'open research data' pilot under H2020  
Céline RAMJOUE, Head of Sector DG CNECT C3 - Digital Sciences
- Presentation of the work of the expert group on 'altmetrics'  
P.F. WOUTERS, Leiden University (NL)
- EOSC: what it covers and what are the milestones for achievement  
Wainer LUSOLI, (RTD A6), European Commission
- Research Integrity versus Open Science: a contradiction?  
Sylvia SCHREIBER, PARISBERLIN EU correspondent Bureau Brussels
- What Young Researchers want to be awarded for when applying Open Science practices  
Caroline Lynn KAMERLIN, Uppsala University (SE)
- A glance at the OS Policy Platform and its working modalities; expectations from the OSPP regarding 'OS rewards'  
Norbert LOSSAU, Vice-President, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen (DE) (EUA & OSPP member)
- Defining 'rewards/incentives' in an 'Open Science' environment
- Expectations/ideas on how to reward/incentivise researchers in a fair and equitable way  
Frank MIEDEMA, (Utrecht University & chair of the MLE experts working on 'altmetrics and rewards')
- Open Science issues for HR Managers? Linking OS 'rewards' and 'incentives' to C&C and HRS4R  
Isabelle HALLEUX, Director R&D Administration, Liège University (BE)

## APPENDIX 2 - OS REWARDS WORKING GROUP MANDATE

### ***Evaluation of research careers fully acknowledging Open Science activities***

Acknowledging and incentivising Open Science (OS) is constantly ranked as one of the top priorities for promoting the take up of open science practices. While most researchers appreciate the benefits of OS, on an individual basis they are often reluctant to engage in OS because of the lack of incentives/rewards<sup>60</sup> and 'recognition'. Therefore, there is a need to motivate researchers to engage in OS activities and to set out the expectations and commitments of research funders and public employers in an appropriate framework.

The group will discuss about the most appropriate and effective means to tackle these issues, considering, among others, the possible use of codes of conduct, new policies and/or standards.

Recommendations formulated by the group should be targeted towards identifying incentives and/or rewards as, e.g., direct career benefits, individual reputation and/or recognition for career recruitment/progression and/or research funding. TASKS entrusted to the working group:

- Promote a discussion with stakeholders on the current reputation system in the context of the standing ERAC groups and the Open Science Policy Platform (OSPP) which will work on the concretisation of a European Open Science Agenda;
- Within the OS environment, reflect about and propose alternative methods to recognise contributions to OS, including 'rewards and incentives' taking into account diversity in experience and career paths, while guaranteeing fair and equal career development of individual scientists;
- Propose new ways/standards of evaluating research proposals and research outcomes taking into consideration all OS activities of researchers, possibly recommending to pilot them under certain calls of Horizon 2020;
- Identify existing good practices on how OS issues are already taken up by researchers, research performing institutions and research funding institutions in Europe.

TASKS entrusted to the SGHRM upon preparation by the working group:

- Work with Member States, in particular with Council Presidencies, to follow up on the 2012 Recommendation on Scientific Information to ensure that at European and MS level the research career system(s) supports and rewards researchers working in a culture of OS (sharing results of their research and ensure open access to their publications and underlying data) without discrimination of researchers working on innovation/patents etc.;
- Promote and encourage implementation of good practices of OS issues across Europe, but in particular within the Member States.

#### TIMELINE:

As a general rule, working groups of the SGHRM are active for about 6 months maximum; for this reason, a sound timeline that fits on one hand the rules of the SGHRM and on the other hand the requirements from the Open Science task force (OSTf) and the Open Science Policy Platform (OSPP), is proposed hereafter.

The outcome of the discussion in this working group according to the proposed mandate should be ready in 'draft' version in-time for the February/March 2017 meeting of the OSTf, where a presentation by a representative of the working group is expected.

A quasi-finalised output, having taken into account (if appropriate) comments from the OSTf, should be ready well before the spring meeting of the OSPP. Approval of the finalised output document is expected by the SGHRM in follow-up and as soon as possible in order to strive for MS take-up and implementation at national level.


A Commission Communication on OS being scheduled for 2018, the SGHRM (based on the input from the working group) is expected to contribute if and when appropriate, underlining the importance of the 'rewards' issue in the political context of modernising university curricula, career development and appraisal, as well as the recognition of researchers as 'professionals'.

---

<sup>60</sup> Van den Eynden, V. and Bishop, L. (2014). Incentives and motivations for sharing research data, a researcher's perspective. A Knowledge Exchange Report, available from: <http://www.knowledge-exchange.info/Default.aspx?ID+733>

## APPENDIX 3 - THE OPEN RESEARCH DATA PILOT IN HORIZON 2020

A good example of the reluctance of researchers to engage in Open Science is the Open Data Research Pilot (ORD Pilot) in Horizon 2020<sup>61</sup>. This was designed to promote the opening up of data from H2020 projects. However many researchers did not see any incentive to invest time and funds to making their data open and opted out.



**Figure 1. Reasons for opting out of the Horizon 2020 data pilot**

In contrast to making publications freely available, it is far more complicated for data. In the ORD Pilot, a data management plan (DMP) must be formulated with all of the participants in the research project and then implemented. Researchers need specialised skills and tools to make their data open. There must also be a data infrastructure in place for this to happen. There is no extra funding provided in H2020 and there is no current means of recognition for providing open data. This again is in contrast to open access to publications where the potential readership of a paper is significantly increased and accordingly may raise the number of citations; a clear incentive for any researcher. A total of 34.6% opted out of the data pilot with a third citing IPR issues as the reason for opt-out (see figure above). Since January 2017, Open Access to research data under all thematic areas of Horizon 2020 is now mandatory. However there is still the possibility to opt out for any of the following reasons:

- ◆ participation is incompatible with the obligation to protect results that can reasonably be expected to be commercially or industrially exploited
- ◆ participation is incompatible with the need for confidentiality in connection with security issues
- ◆ participation is incompatible with rules on protecting personal data
- ◆ participation would mean that the project's main aim might not be achieved
- ◆ the project will not generate / collect any research data or
- ◆ there are other legitimate reasons (you can enter these in a free-text box at the proposal stage).

While any of the above can be legitimate reasons, there is little incentive at the moment for universities to encourage their researchers to make their data open. University rankings are based on peer reviewed publications (along with other metrics on teaching and reputation).



<sup>61</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants\\_manual/hi/oa\\_pilot/h2020-hi-oa-pilot-guide\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/hi/oa_pilot/h2020-hi-oa-pilot-guide_en.pdf)

# APPENDIX 4 - SURVEY CONTENT

This survey aims to evaluate European universities' procedures for researcher recruitment, promotion/progression and support in a growing "Open Science" environment. It is set up in the frame of the expert working group on 'Rewards under Open Science' working under the header of the Steering Group Human Resources and Mobility (SGHRM).

## 4.1 SURVEY RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS

244 respondents from 154 institutions



## Section S1 – Status

### N°1 \* What is your status?

R1	<input type="radio"/>	R1 - First Stage Researcher (Up to the point of PhD)	18	7%
R2	<input type="radio"/>	R2 - Recognised Researcher (PhD holders or equivalent who are not yet fully independent)	22	9%
R3	<input type="radio"/>	R3 - Established Researcher (Researchers who have developed a level of independence)	47	19%
R9	<input type="radio"/>	R4 - Leading Researcher (Researchers leading their research area or field)	46	20%
R5	<input type="radio"/>	Administrative Staff	106	43%
R9	<input type="radio"/>	Other .....	5	2%
		Director Central Services, Management Deputy Librarian Established Researcher and Associate Dean of Research Vice-president		

### N°2 \* What is the name of your institution?

### N°3 \*Do you want to be informed of the results of this survey?

R1	<input type="radio"/>	yes	192	79%
R2	<input type="radio"/>	no		

## Section S2 - I. Is your Institution autonomous for...

### N°1 \* ... the recruitment of researchers? N=244

R1	<input type="radio"/>	Not at all	9	3,5%
R2	<input type="radio"/>	Partly	58	24%
R3	<input type="radio"/>	Completely	168	69%

R4  I don't know 9 3,5%

**N°2 \* ... the promotion/progression of researchers? N=244**

R1  Not at all 9 4%

R2  Partly 78 32%

R3  Completely 150 61%

R4  I don't know 7 3%

**N°3 \* ... providing financial support to researchers/research teams (grants, space, human resources, logistics, etc.) ? N=244**

R1  Not at all 18 8%

R2  Partly 154 63%

R3  Completely 64 26%

R4  I don't know 8 3%

**N°4 \* ... setting staff salaries ? N=244**

R1  Not at all 43 18%

R2  Partly 132 54%

R3  Completely 63 26%

R4  I don't know 6 2%

**N°5 Comments**

We are a fully private institutions and we have complete freedom on how to allocate our resources.

We do of course apply for external grants from public research funds, but our research is independent.

- recruitment and promotion/progression are somewhat regulated by law
- a substantial amount of financing comes from outside the university
- staff salaries are negotiated with the unions

Some researchers are more financially supported, but we do not know the criteria for such selection

We are in the process of HR.

The people that are answering these questions are not in a central university position, and therefore not able to answer questions about assessment. We are experts on Open

Access/bibliometrics.
These questions are administrative and should be asked to the university directly, not to the researchers.
I do not have internet access to internet at work. I buy stick for internet by myself. Also I do not have computer at work.
Staff salaries parameters are defined by our Government
The University is obliged to set staff salaries according to the legislation on public salaries system
There are any financial and logistic supports for researchers in my Department. (School of Law). I am waiting for reimbursement by January 2017.
By law, salaries and selection and recruitment processes (for permanent researchers and tenure-track positions) are determined by strict rules and procedures. For temporary researchers, salaries are also fixed by law, but there are some flexibility in selection and recruitment processes.
We consider Chalmers University of Technology to be autonomous with regard to provision of financial support to researchers as ~80% of the total funding originates from public funding. One consideration to keep in mind is that >60% of research funding is external. Staff salaries are set within the framework agreed with the unions.
All Dutch universities follow the Collective Labour Agreement. This agreement contains minimum financial conditions for researchers. So we are not completely free to set staff salaries.
For the setting of staff salaries, the salaries falls within the salary scale of public universities (even if our university is a private one). That is compulsory by law.
In Finland, HE legislation is rather comprehensive. Autonomy of institutions have been widened since the last decennium.
The majority of our researchers are funded by external funders (e.g. research councils, charitable trusts, with a minority funded in-house through scholarships for PhD students for example)
In France Scientist are civil servant, the salary at different stages (junior > senior) of the career is defined by the government. INRA can act on the transition from one stage to the following one on the base of criteria it has defined.
The availability of staff positions depend mainly from received research projects and contracts (and financing) by research groups from third side stakeholders (national and EU public agencies, private sector...). Such financing is base for salaries and in some step also for carrier development
My institution is autonomous in making these decisions, but not completely, since it is part of larger business group and depends of its financial situation.
Some regulations are set on a national level
Salaries are set up nationally (Ministry of Education) - there is a table of various salary categories according to career status and length of work in academia.
When I answered "partly" I think about governmental rules which exist in Poland and according to the law regulations.
There are no finance support from our University, only logistics, space and organizing research teams. I find this as a problem. In such situation we try to do our best, usually making partnership with other universities and other institution or organisation. I believe that Programs (bilateral, IPA, AdRION and others) are our chance to do some research. Hope that it will be better in future.
Our institution is autonomous in election of persons to scientific positions, but neither the institute nor Ventspils University College can award PhD degree in astronomy, physics, mathematics and similar branches of science. All the financial matters are finally decided by Ventspils University College, but the institute has de

facto substantial autonomy in planning staff salaries etc. But the major limiting factor is the overall availability of money, which is unstable. Consequently the salaries are unstable as well.
The University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Western Switzerland (HES-SO) is the largest university of applied sciences (UAS) in Switzerland and the second largest higher education institution of the country. With near 20'000 students and 28 schools in 7 cantons, HES-SO is organized in six faculties (namely Design & Fine Arts, Business Management & Services, Engineering & Architecture, Music & Performing Arts, Health and Social Work). The governance structure varies across HES-SO's faculties and schools.
we have to stick to the governmental payment scheme and also to regulations regarding educational levels for certain payment groups. However, there are small performance based additions to the base salary. But bonuses are mostly given in form of personal supporting a researcher, not by personal income.
My organization, as public university, is autonomous for many issues, but some other issues depend on Regional and/or National Government
Salary scales, promotions and hiring are still under review after public sector agreements resulting from the EC/ECB/IMF 'bailout' of Ireland
We have a collective labour agreement with rules how to use salary scales etc.
There are differences between my Institute and University level of autonomy.
We have limited budget from the Ministry
In Denmark we have a set of regulations on recruitment, promotion and salaries for researchers. All human resource processes ensures a transparent and professional handling of staff.
Most of the issues mentioned are regulated by different legal documents at the national or at the university level.
Additional engagement is accepted, especially to the young researchers.
We depend on the government politics

### Section S3 - II. Has your Institution developed written merit assessment procedures for:

#### N°1 \* ...the recruitment of researchers? N=244

- R1  Yes                      **163**        **67%**
- R2  No                                **42**        **17%**
- R3  I don't know            **39**        **16%**

#### N°2 \* ... the promotion/progression of researchers N=244

- R1  Yes                                **160**        **66%**
- R2  No                                    **50**        **20%**
- R3  I don't know            **34**        **14%**

#### N°3 \* ... financial support to researchers/research teams (space, human resources, logistics, etc.) ? N=244



R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<b>127</b>	<b>52%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>74</b>	<b>30%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>43</b>	<b>18%</b>

**N°4 \* ... setting staff salaries ? N=244**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<b>148</b>	<b>61%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>63</b>	<b>26%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>33</b>	<b>13%</b>

**N°5 Are the procedures/templates publicly accessible? N=244**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<b>126</b>	<b>52%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>61</b>	<b>25%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>52</b>	<b>21%</b>
	No answered	<b>5</b>	<b>2%</b>

**Section S4 - III. Researchers' assessment taken into account in your Institution**

**N° \* 1. In your Institution, on a score from 1 to 4 (5 standing for "I don't know"), to what extent is researchers' assessment taking into account each of the criteria set below:**

1 = none, 2 = small, 3 = some, 4 = large, 5 = I don't know

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
R1 ... research publications?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>20</b>
	<b>6%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>8%</b>
R2 ... patents?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	<b>30</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>39</b>
	<b>12%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>16%</b>
R3 ... awards?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	<b>26</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>28</b>

		<b>11%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>11%</b>
R4	... securing external funding?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<b>15</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>23</b>
		<b>6%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>9%</b>
R5	... participation in national and international scientific conferences?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<b>18</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>15</b>
		<b>7%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>6%</b>
R6	... developing scientific collaborations with other academic researchers?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<b>20</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>16</b>
		<b>8%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>6%</b>
R7	... developing scientific collaborations with researchers from industry?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<b>32</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>15</b>
		<b>13%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>6%</b>
R8	... teaching activities?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<b>24</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>15</b>
		<b>10%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>6%</b>
R9	... supervising young researchers?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<b>20</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>9</b>
		<b>8%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>4%</b>
R10	... community services/administration/third mission ?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<b>37</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>26</b>
		<b>15%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>11%</b>
R11	... increasing the Institution's visibility towards the general public through media coverage of the research work (TV, news websites, newspapers, radio, etc.)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<b>35</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>13</b>
		<b>14%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>6%</b>
R12	... participation in science popularization events (open doors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

days, "fête de la science", school visits, etc.)?

**42 65 80 41 16**  
**17% 27% 33% 17% 6%**

R13 ... developing citizen science projects ?

**48 66 60 30 40**  
**20% 27% 25% 12% 16%**

R14 ... research common?

**34 52 69 29 60**  
**14% 21% 28% 12% 25%**

**Section S5 - IV. A. Specific criteria used in the assessment of researchers regarding quantitative analysis of publications**

1 = none, 2 = small, 3 = some, 4 = large, 5 = I don't know

**N°1 \* In your Institution, to what extent, on a score from 1 to 5, are the following specific criteria used in the assessment of researchers regarding quantitative analysis of publications:**

**1 2 3 4 5**

R1 ... number of publications ?

**11 11 46 149 27**  
**4,5% 4,5% 19% 61% 11%**

R2 ... number of citations ?

**23 47 59 89 26**  
**9% 19% 24% 37% 11%**

R3 ... journal impact factors ?

**15 31 58 108 32**  
**6 % 13% 24% 44% 13%**

R4 ... individual h factor or other citation-based indicator?

**31 45 61 64 43**  
**13% 18% 25% 26% 18%**

**N°2 Other** (please explain):

<p>The institution has a significant government funding based on research output quality, which is measured mostly based on number of papers in publications with an impact factor. Otherwise it wouldn't care for scientific output at all.</p>
<p>Number of publications indexed by SCOPUS or Web of Science - 4</p>
<p>Researchers are subject to different evaluations with different purposes. In these responses (for sections III, IV.B,IV.E; IV.D n.9.2 ), reference was made to the two main local procedures (so called "Regolamento per l'attribuzione delle classi stipendiali" and "Valutazione della Ricerca di Ateneo (VRA)")</p>
<p>Following DORA and Leiden Manifesto IF not principal in evaluation, rather stability of publication in Q1-Q2 level journals against Q3-Q4 Publications is evaluation in common context with received research projects and financing</p>
<p>H factor considered only for top senior positions</p>
<p>number &amp; IF is the main and primary measure</p>
<p>In medical and life sciences, JIF's are crucial, not so much in other fields.</p>
<p>Please note that all the answers regarding assessments in sections 04/09 to 07/09 are a combination of the different types of assessments at Chalmers. We assess researchers prior to recruitment, when they are considered for promotion, in connection with external evaluations of areas/subjects, and when preparing large applications for funding and on a yearly basis. The yearly based assessment is mainly on aggregated departmental level. Research assessments are not made yearly for individuals.</p>
<p>We have a performance based system in which fund allocation and - to a very limited degree - also personal income depends on the academic achievements, mainly publications and grants, to a lesser degree also societal interactions and teaching /education. However, when hiring scientists and in tenure track procedures all the other factors are evaluated, too. So I gave these a lower ranking because they are not always considered.</p>
<p>Ranking of journals based on impact factor, e.g. top 25% journals or top 5% journals (= not absolute impact factors)</p>
<p>In many cases a limited number of publications, chosen by the author, are qualitatively assessed. It is the overall, collective impression of the Research quality that counts the most. Evaluation committees are usually formed on faculty level.</p>
<p>Not only numbers count but it gives an indication of the competency level of the researcher.</p>
<p>medical field - various contexts considered</p>
<p>Not only the quantitative analysis, but also the qualitative ones are taken into account.</p>
<p>Also use the "publication points" from the Norwegian National Publication Indicator</p>
<p>For humanities are different indicators, for example, monographs (4)</p>
<p>Number of publication is combined with number of citation and IF, never separately</p>
<p>Financial reward for publication in a short and unavailable list of elite journals, with zero reward for any other journal. (This is one incentive among other greater ones.)</p>
<p>These questions do not take into account the difference by disciplines/faculties in our university. That is why I have answered section 3 with do not know. They differ extremely per faculty/institution.</p>
<p>Publications are weighted according to the Ministry of Science and Higher Education regulations regarding the evaluation of faculties</p>

for qualitative analysis we have to publish in scientific reviews selected as level A (top level double blind peer review).
The scientific excellence is the most important criterion in assessing the potential of individual researchers as well as research groups.
Among others, we assess researchers on their "consistent record of published research in peer-reviewed journals and conference publications", and "High quality writing for academic and practitioner audiences, with evidence of ability to publish at national and international level". Through the Research Excellence Framework researchers are assessed on things like number of publications, citations, journal impact and other citation-based indicators. While the REF only takes place every 7 years (last in 2014, next in 2021), these same indicators are considered when reviewing a researcher for advancement and promotion, and at annual Performance and Development Reviews.
The criteria considered according to Research fields / topics
Journal- scope & geographical area covered
I personally disagree that the quantification should be prioritized in the assessment of research. It overlooks the essence of the particular research (its role, qualitative impact), and promotes pseudoscience - "I quote you, you quote me", which, unfortunately, is a widespread practice and corrupts researchers by dichotomizing them into us and them. I think qualitative assessment should prevail over the quantitative indicators. Quantitative indicators are convenient for administrators and bureaucrats when they prepare reports. The myth of expressing research in terms of numbers bypasses essential factors such as content, context, gist.
At our University the assessment of researchers work is done according the standards which are posed into the appropriate law and regulative which come from the law.

**N°3 \* Do your institution account for variation by field in publication and citation practices?**

R1 <input type="radio"/>	Not at all	<b>19</b>	<b>8%</b>
R2 <input type="radio"/>	Partly	<b>88</b>	<b>36%</b>
R3 <input type="radio"/>	Largely	<b>61</b>	<b>25%</b>
R4 <input type="radio"/>	Fully	<b>28</b>	<b>11%</b>
R5 <input type="radio"/>	I don't know	<b>48</b>	<b>20%</b>

**N°4 \* Do your institution scrutinize indicators regularly and update them?**

R1 <input type="radio"/>	Yes	<b>126</b>	<b>52%</b>
R2 <input type="radio"/>	No	<b>51</b>	<b>21%</b>
R3 <input type="radio"/>	I don't know	<b>67</b>	<b>27%</b>

**Section S6 - IV. B. Specific criteria used in the assessment of researchers regarding qualitative analysis of publications**

**N°1 \* Is the assessment based on qualitative evaluation of the research content after reading the publications?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Not at all	<b>70</b>	<b>29%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> Partly	<b>86</b>	<b>35%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> Largely	<b>43</b>	<b>18%</b>
R4	<input type="radio"/> Fully	<b>12</b>	<b>5%</b>
R5	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>33</b>	<b>13%</b>

**N°2 \* Is the assessment based on the journal's reputation (impact factor)?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Not at all	<b>5</b>	<b>2%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> Partly	<b>74</b>	<b>30%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> Largely	<b>106</b>	<b>44%</b>
R4	<input type="radio"/> Fully	<b>49</b>	<b>20%</b>
R5	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>10</b>	<b>4%</b>

**N°3 \* Is the assessment based on the number of citations?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Not at all	<b>97</b>	<b>40%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> Partly	<b>35</b>	<b>14%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> Largely	<b>73</b>	<b>30%</b>
R4	<input type="radio"/> Fully	<b>19</b>	<b>8%</b>
R5	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>20</b>	<b>8%</b>

**N°4 \* Whenever original research content is presented outside of a traditional journal publishing framework (participatory websites, blogs, etc.), how is this evaluated during the researcher's assessment?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Positively	<b>65</b>	<b>27%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> Negatively	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> Not taken into account	<b>113</b>	<b>46%</b>
R4	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>63</b>	<b>26%</b>

**N°5 Please explain why**

**I don't know**

I think the role of popular science is overlooked in the academia. It helps link different stakeholders, and promotes the viability of the particular science.
It depends on the individual assessor: different assessments are made by different individuals
In fact it depend if the research content is published at the same time through traditional pathway! If it is the case it is evaluated positively! But as a first step for results dissemination it is not a widespread mechanism
In case question 4 intends to address those cases where this is the only type of publication of original research, it may be considered negative to not publish in a way that most likely reaches the researchers in the area. On the other hand, when an area/subject is evaluated this can be positive in case there is such a tradition within the area. When it is done as a complement to publishing in a journal it is most likely positive.

**Positively**

Increases the research visibility
It constitutes an added value
Our institution values positively societal impact of the research we produce
It allowed to expand the knowledge base of university staff
We gain certain numbers for election for higher scientific titles based on publishing our researches and scientific papers. It is awarded better if it is presented internationally.
It is accounted in evaluation for next upgrading (ass.... prof. full prof)
But no increase in salary for that
We want our researchers to publish for the public as well as for other researchers
There is no way to provide an impartial way of evaluation of such sources - but it can be taken into account as "additional activity"
Evaluation is positive because it is included as indicator in many international projects (dissemination and publicity).
This will add to the portfolio where relevant
My University is new one and needs a time for developing international criteria.
We are an applied university and the projects and other research collaboration initiatives brought on with industrial partners and association, which are mainly communicated with these type of channel and Platform, have a strong relevance in the researcher portfolio
we need recognition on a broader context. Visibility of research activities in general, beyond scientific community is also relevant.

**Not taken into account**

Mostly because of ignorance and to protect mediocrity.
Formally, University of Tampere has no solid policy concerning altmetrics, so far. That is, however, in the process, and suitable tools have been taken in use.
In my topic (criminal law and criminology) the board of supervisors doesn't 't take into account online publications for the lack of scientific and selected committee
No objective basis available

National criteria
Only top scientific journals and publications (CC, WoS, Scopus) with high IF are taken i to account. Other forms of publications are ignored in all assessments.
We are developing new indicators for this kind ot "dissemination"
A lack of standards for measuring this type of content
i believe it is not taken as a scientific contribution and therefore does not have necessary value
It is not evaluated in national scale for obtaining national research grants
Unless there's some sort of impact in society with immediate return, such as a top politician coming to visit the institute as a result.
Because it is not included in the standard assessment practices of the University
It is not written in University rule book
Based on research field, such publication can be used for assessment, however most fields do not recognize such effort
Our evaluation scheme is still based on peer reviewed outputs, i.e. journal articles and peer reviewed monographs. We find it difficult to assess the quality of original research presented outside the traditional publishing framework.
Is not "not taken into account" but it the other factors are scientifically peer reviewed and with that "quality marked" and are stronger. It is more difficult to publish in that environment.
Websites and blogs cannot be even compared with scientific papers in refereed journals. Everybody can publish everything in a blog.
time constraints for peer review what's not in the database cannot be "counted" and therefore does not "count"
There is no way of assessing credibility.
Only publications in journals having impact factors are taken into account
Because there is no institutional policy regarding this.
This non- traditional publishing doesn't have measurable indicators
Because the evaluation criteria take into account only research outputs eligible for the national research assessment exercise
Such new forms of publication as participatory websites, blogs, etc. up to present moment was not taken in to account

**N°6 \* To which extent is the assessment based on the opinion of in-house committee members?**

R1 <input type="radio"/>	None	<b>23</b>	<b>9%</b>
R2 <input type="radio"/>	Small	<b>35</b>	<b>14%</b>
R3 <input type="radio"/>	Some	<b>85</b>	<b>35%</b>
R4 <input type="radio"/>	Large	<b>72</b>	<b>30%</b>



R5  I don't know **29** **12%**

**N°7 \* To which extent is the assessment based on the opinion of external experts?**

R1  None **34** **14%**

R2  Small **40** **16%**

R3  Some **93** **38%**

R4  Large **50** **21%**

R5  I don't know **27** **11%**

**Section S7 - IV. C. Specific criteria used in the assessment of researchers regarding Open Access to publications**

**N°1 \* Do you know how researchers can open the access to their publications?**

R1  Yes **177** **73%**

R2  No **20** **8%**

R3  No, but I'm interested to know more about it **47** **19%**

**N°2 \* Has your institution an official policy on open access to scientific publications ?**

R1  Yes **104** **42%**

R2  No **92** **38%**

R3  I don't know **48** **20 %**

**N°3 \* Has your institution signed the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)?**

R1  Yes **9** **3,2%**

R2  No **63** **26%**

R3  No, it has no intention of signing it **2** **0,8%**

R4  No, but it intends to sign it in the next two years **19** **8%**

R5  I don't know **151** **62%**

If answered yes to N°3

**N°3.1 \* To what extent do you estimate that the recommendations made in this declaration are being effectively followed implemented in your Institution?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> None	<b>1</b>	<b>11%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> Small	<b>0</b>	
R3	<input type="radio"/> Some	<b>4</b>	<b>44%</b>
R4	<input type="radio"/> Large	<b>3</b>	<b>33%</b>
R5	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>1</b>	
	Total	<b>9</b>	

If answered no to N°3

**N°3.1 Why not? No answer**

**N°4 \* Is there an institutional repository (IR) within your institution ?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<b>146</b>	<b>60%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>41</b>	<b>17%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>57</b>	<b>23%</b>

If answered yes to N°4

**N°4.1 \* Is your institution promoting the use of other existing repositories (thematic, regional, national) towards its researchers?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<b>18</b>	<b>44%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>23</b>	<b>56%</b>
	Total	<b>41</b>	

**N°4.2 Which one(s)? no answer**

**N°5 \* Is there an official requirement to deposit in an IR and to ensure open access to all publications?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<b>75</b>	<b>31%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>100</b>	<b>41%</b>

R3  I don't know **69** **28%**

If answered yes to N°5

**N°5.1 \* Do you believe non-compliance with this recommendation could have a negative influence on a researcher's assessment for career progression?**

R1 <input type="radio"/>	Yes, sometimes	<b>40</b>	<b>53%</b>
R2 <input type="radio"/>	Yes, systematically	<b>11</b>	<b>15%</b>
R3 <input type="radio"/>	No	<b>24</b>	<b>32%</b>
	Total	<b>75</b>	

If answered yes to N°5.1

**N°5.2 \* To which extent can non-compliance have a negative influence on a researcher's assessment for career progression?**

R1 <input type="radio"/>	Minor	<b>9</b>	<b>18%</b>
R2 <input type="radio"/>	Rather minor	<b>17</b>	<b>33%</b>
R3 <input type="radio"/>	Rather significant	<b>39</b>	<b>76%</b>
R4 <input type="radio"/>	Significant	<b>6</b>	<b>12%</b>
	Total	<b>51</b>	

If answer no to N°5.1

**N°4.1 \* Is your institution planning to implement such measures in the next two years?**

R1 <input type="radio"/>	Yes	<b>28</b>	<b>28%</b>
R2 <input type="radio"/>	No	<b>10</b>	<b>10%</b>
R3 <input type="radio"/>	I don't know	<b>62</b>	<b>62%</b>
	Total	<b>100</b>	

**N°6 \* Does your institution provide training sessions for researchers to learn how to ensure open access to publications?**

R1  Yes **112** **46%**

R2  No **83** **34%**

R3  I don't know **49** **20%**

**N°7 \* Does your institution provide guidelines (webpage/leaflet/videos) for researchers to learn how to ensure open access to publications?**

R1  Yes **109** **45%**

R2  No **79** **32%**

R3  I don't know **56** **23%**

**Why not?**

I know what to do to ensure open access to my publications (use arXiv, for instance).
We had no request
I wasn't interested before. I assume that demand for this issue is low among researchers
As far as I know each journal has its own policy in connection with open access publications. The primary goal is to publish the paper in a respected journal.
The vice-rector for sciences has been rather inactive in promoting all branches of sciences throughout the university. Researchers work in a fragmented approach, each for him/herself.
At this moment we have other, also very important problems.
Taking into account size of institution and its capacities the development of researchers skills in the fields of 3 Open (Science, Data and Access) remain on its own side. We popularize vents and training outside institution or researchers to learn how to ensure open access to publications.
Academic freedom and the higher an IF, the better the result for the PHD
We don't have repository system, but only library.
We have approved the official policy for open access publication and we have institutionally deposited the publications of our research centre in an IR but we have not started the training of our researchers at an individual level yet. We are currently working on training material and the dissemination of support measures for open access publication
Actually I do not know why we do not have guidelines.
This issue is not high in the agenda
The Institute is very positive about Open Access policy and it will undertake steps to introduce the relevant in-house system in the nearest future.
Not there yet
Young researchers are guided by 'mentors'; others are accustomed with the systems
We have set this task as an implementation measure of our new strategy development map for the next four years
I think there is no interest at open access to publications.

For now this is not priority
do not have capacity, trained human resource
No enough capacities both financial and human
The institution is only interested in contracting research projects for the purpose of justifying its subsistence and as a means to increase wages for the board of directors, and change corporate cars (for personal use, mind you)
We provide some information about open access in University, but not consistently.
There are no personal who is engaged in that.
According to the questions 2 and 7, I answered No, because on that moment haven't official policy and website but we are intensively preparing both. We plan to adopt new e-system which helps us to implement fully OA to the end of this year.
Our institution has considered signing DORA and held intensive discussions on it. The overall conclusion was it would be unfair to sign a declaration and not be implementing it fully, for two reasons: (1) We have a responsibility to inform the younger generation of researchers about career opportunities. In a large number of disciplines, impact factors help to identify prestigious journals. We cannot be blind to this reality: publishing in these journals will enhance their career opportunities more than publishing elsewhere. We have a duty to inform our researchers about this AND at the same time raise awareness about the pitfalls of impact factors. (2) Our national funding system weighs publications according to journal rankings. We cannot ignore this context as it has a huge impact on our university's funding allocation. Our university's evaluation policy has made an explicit statement about the sensible use of impact factors, based on the Leiden Manifesto.
For previous questions and the next one, we ticked the box "YES" but we are in progress to implement the institutional repository (IR), the guidelines for researchers and the strategy / policy for the institution. The objective is to be operational in January 2018.

**N°8 \* Does your institution measure/monitor the number/percentage of publications with open access ?**

R1 <input type="radio"/>	Yes	<b>87</b>	<b>36%</b>
R2 <input type="radio"/>	No	<b>95</b>	<b>39%</b>
R3 <input type="radio"/>	I don't know	<b>62</b>	<b>25%</b>

**Section S8 - IV. D. Specific criteria used in the assessment of researchers regarding Open Research Data**

**N°1 \* Do you know how researchers can open their research data?**

R1 <input type="radio"/>	Yes	<b>133</b>	<b>55%</b>
R2 <input type="radio"/>	No	<b>35</b>	<b>14%</b>
R3 <input type="radio"/>	No, but I'm interested in knowing more about it	<b>76</b>	<b>31%</b>

**N°2 \* Has your institution an official policy on open research data ?**

- R1  Yes                    **52**            **21%**
- R2  No                            **120**           **49%**
- R3  I don't know            **72**            **30%**

**N°3 \* Is there an open research data committee or management structure in your institution ?**

- R1  Yes                    **49**            **20%**
- R2  No                            **130**           **53%**
- R3  I don't know            **65**            **27%**

**N°4 \* Is an in-house research data repository available ?**

- R1  Yes                    **78**            **32%**
- R2  No                            **105**           **43%**
- R3  I don't know            **61**            **25%**

**N°5 \* Is a research data management plan (DMP) template available to researchers in your Institution?**

- R1  Yes                    **51**            **21%**
- R2  No                            **109**           **45%**
- R3  I don't know            **84**            **34%**

**N°6 \* Has your institution developed a policy on what is the fate of a researcher's data if/when he/she leaves the institution?**

- R1  Yes                    **22**            **9%**
- R2  No                            **123**           **50%**
- R3  I don't know            **99**            **41%**

If answered yes to N°6

**N°6.1 Which policy?**

The intellectual property belongs to the University, thus if the data are acquired in the University, they belong to the University.
There is the internal Regulation of Ventspils University College on intellectual property rights.
Only in terms of IPR (director's ordinance)

Intellectual property policy
General policy, research results belongs to institution
The policy is that data generated by employees of the university belongs to the institution and shall consequently be safely stored there. The policy is currently in process of being implemented on the institution level.
It in PhD regulation of the institution
University Code of Research Conduct
This is handled by procedures and guidelines on the research department level
The data are to be left in the depository
In case the group member responsible for data production changes location, the original documentation stays at the location of production; if necessary, copies might be made or access rights might be granted. Further details must be individually determined. For a publication the listed address of an author is the institution where the main work for a publication was done. In case of change of employment or in other exceptional cases (e.g. the author is employed at two institutions) it is possible to list more than one. But if just minor work (e.g. minor revisions for a reviewed manuscript) had been conducted at an institution, it is only listed as recent address or as mailing address. Such a publication cannot be included in the work record of this institution, as no relevant work or resources were used. Analogous to the standards for authorship, at least two of the named criteria of 5.1 should be realized at the institute. full rules at <a href="http://www.igb-berlin.de/sites/default/files/media-files/download-files/IGB%20good%20scientific%20practice%202015.pdf">http://www.igb-berlin.de/sites/default/files/media-files/download-files/IGB%20good%20scientific%20practice%202015.pdf</a>
"Research Data Management Policy"
Part of institutional research data management policy. Still work to do on enabling effective working of this to account for complexity of different circumstances.
Policy is available on: <a href="http://www.rug.nl/research/search/research-data-office/policy/documents/2015-research-data-policy.pdf">http://www.rug.nl/research/search/research-data-office/policy/documents/2015-research-data-policy.pdf</a> Research institutes may add further and more specific policies, especially when they are considered to be best practice in their research field.

**N°7 \* Does your institution provide training sessions for researchers to learn how to open their research data?**

- R1  Yes **53 22%**
- R2  No **129 53%**
- R3  I don't know **62 25%**

**N°8 \*Does your institution provide guidelines (webpage/leaflet/videos) for researchers to learn how to open their research data?**

- R1  Yes **60 25%**
- R2  No **122 50%**
- R3  I don't know **62 25%**

**N°9 \* Is there an official recommendation to make research data open ?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<b>48</b>	<b>20%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>141</b>	<b>58,%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>55</b>	<b>22%</b>

If answered yes to N°9

**N°9.1 \* Does following this recommendation have a positive influence on a researcher's assessment for career progression?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes, sometimes	<b>3</b>	<b>6%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> Yes, systematically	<b>24</b>	<b>50%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>21</b>	<b>44%</b>
	Total	<b>48</b>	

**N°9.2 \* To which extent can following it have a positive influence on a researcher's assessment for career progression?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Minor	<b>22</b>	<b>46%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> Rather minor	<b>11</b>	<b>23%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> Rather significant	<b>15</b>	<b>31%</b>
R4	<input type="radio"/> Significant	<b>0</b>	
		<b>48</b>	

**N°9.3 \* Does noncompliance with this recommendation have a negative influence on a researcher's assessment for career progression?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes, sometimes	<b>12</b>	<b>25%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> Yes, systematically	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>23</b>	<b>48%</b>
R4	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>12</b>	<b>25%</b>



48

**N°9.4 \* To which extent cannot complying with it have a negative influence on a researcher's assessment for career progression?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Minor	20	42%
R2	<input type="radio"/> Rather minor	9	19%
R3	<input type="radio"/> Rather significant	7	15%
R4	<input type="radio"/> Significant	2	4%
R5	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	10	21%

48

**N°9.5 \* Is your institution planning to implement such measures in the next two years?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	68	28%
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	18	7%
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	158	65%

**N°9.6 \* Will participation to open research data be then taken into account in the researchers assessment for career progression?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	27	40%
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	8	12%
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	33	49%
	total	68	

**N°10 \* Is your institution promoting the use and development of Open Source softwares?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	56	23%
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	85	34,8%
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	103	42,2%

If answered yes to N°10

### N°10.1 Can you explain in which ways?

Provide recommendations for softwares, if we ask to buy something first of all offers free options
It used to promote Linux and similar initiatives
There is an Open Source Office, which provides training, access and support
We promote the development of OS softwares within the Statistics and Bioinformatics field
Only the Faculty of Information Technology
Generally, on an individual-by-individual, or group-by-group basis
Open Aires project
Guidelines
No financial support
<a href="https://www.library.universiteitleiden.nl/research-and-publishing/open-access">https://www.library.universiteitleiden.nl/research-and-publishing/open-access</a>
It hosts a Software Sustainability Institute
using in courses
Providing institutional Open Source Software and using it for institutional purposes
By participating in the national Open science projects.
Promotes software carpentry and work with Software Sustainability Institute. Effective use of open source software part of training. Some departments have staff and students who develop open source software.
By organizing open -door days, trainings, etc with researches...
Open SW policy and less financial support for commercial SW
by spreading information on intranet.
Dspace, OJS and other tools
Promotion of the use of open softwares
The library has chosen to use Open Source Software for several services
We use open source softwares in different projects, library, educational area, we help to developed some of them, we organise testing of this software.
training on open source software (R, GIMP, QGIS...), installation and help by IT, systematic support to switch. checking when buying new licences for open source alternatives
In planning and internal communication, and through financial support
Depends on the discipline/department - When relevant code and data should be accessible together - "as open as possible, as closed as necessary"
We recommend using a JISC tool: DMPOnline to create data management plans, we also have a software provider for our online portal of data and papers.

**N°11 \* Have you engaged in « open peer review » as a reviewer ? \*(peer review : either the reviewer's identity is made known to the author and/or the full peer review text is made public to the future readers of the article)?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes, often	27	11%
R2	<input type="radio"/> Yes, occasionally	56	23%
R3	<input type="radio"/> Yes, just once	14	6%
R4	<input type="radio"/> No, never	147	60%

**Section S9 - IV. E. Specific criteria used in the assessment of researchers regarding evaluation principles**

**N°1 \* Are collection of information on the assessed persons and analytical processes kept open, transparent and simple : are the evaluated allowed to verify data and analysis?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Not at all	20	8%
R2	<input type="radio"/> Partly	64	26%
R3	<input type="radio"/> Largely	64	26%
R4	<input type="radio"/> Fully	26	11%
R5	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	70	29%

**N°2 \* Is performance measured against the research missions of the organisation and the values it promotes ?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Not at all	50	21%
R2	<input type="radio"/> Partly	79	32%
R3	<input type="radio"/> Largely	25	10%
R4	<input type="radio"/> Fully	17	7%
R5	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	73	30%

**N°3 \* Is the official OA policy also visible and accessible for everybody on the website?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	80	33%
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	72	30%

R3  I don't know **92** **37%**

## 4.2. SURVEY RESERACH FUNDERS

---

**N°1 \* What is the name of your organisation?**

**N°2 \* What is your function in this organisation?**

**N°3 \*Do you want to be informed of the results of this survey?**

R1  yes **23** **82%**

R2  no **5** **18%**

**N°4 - What is your email address?**

**Section S2 - I. Has your organisation developed written merit assessment procedures for:**

**N°1 \* ...the recruitment of researchers?**

R1  Yes **15** **54%**

R2  No **12** **43%**

R3  I don't know **1** **4%**

**N°2 \* ... the promotion/progression of researchers**

R1  Yes **16** **57%**

R2  No **10** **36%**

R3  I don't know **2** **7%**

**N°3 \* ... financial support to researchers/research teams (space, human resources, logistics, etc.)?**

R1  Yes **17** **61%**

R2  No **10** **36%**

R3  I don't know **1** **4%**

**N°4 \* ... setting staff salaries ?**

- R1  Yes **16 57%**
- R2  No **11 39%**
- R3  I don't know **1 4%**

**N°5 Are the procedures/templates publicly accessible?**

- R1  Yes **15 54%**
- R2  No **11 39%**
- R3  I don't know **2 7%**

**Section S3 - II. Researchers' assessment taken into account in your organisation**

**N° \* 1. In your organisation, on a score from 1 to 4 (5 standing for "I don't know"), to what extent is researchers' assessment taking into account each of the criteria set below:**

1 = none, 2 = small, 3 = some, 4 = large, 5 = I don't know

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
R1 ... research publications?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>
	<b>7%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>7%</b>
R2 ... patents?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>14%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>11%</b>
R3 ... awards?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>14%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>11%</b>
R4 ... securing external funding?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>
	<b>7%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>11%</b>
R5 ... participation in national and international scientific conferences?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

		<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>
		<b>7%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>11%</b>
R6	... developing scientific collaborations with other academic researchers?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>2</b>
		<b>4%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>7%</b>
R7	... developing scientific collaborations with researchers from industry?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>
		<b>4%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>11%</b>
R8	... teaching activities?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
		<b>18%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>14%</b>
R9	... supervising young researchers?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>
		<b>0</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>14%</b>
R10	... community services/administration/third mission ?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
		<b>18%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>14%</b>
R11	... developing citizen science projects ?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>
		<b>25%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>21%</b>
R12	... research common?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
		<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>
		<b>18%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>29%</b>

**Section S4 - III. A. Specific criteria used in the assessment of researchers regarding quantitative analysis of publications**

1 = none, 2 = small, 3 = some, 4 = large, 5 = I don't know

**N°1 \* In your organisation, to what extent, on a score from 1 to 4 (5 standing for "I don't know"), are the following specific criteria used in the assessment of researchers regarding quantitative analysis of publications:**

	1	2	3	4	5
R1 ... number of publications ?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	5	3	6	12	2
	18%	11%	21%	43%	7%
R2 ... number of citations ?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	8	4	8	5	3
	29%	14%	29%	18%	11%
R3 ... journal impact factors ?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	7	7	5	7	2
	25%	25%	18%	25%	7%
R4 ... individual h factor or other citation-based indicator?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	11	6	5	4	2
	39%	21%	18%	14%	7%

**N°2 Other (please explain):**

<p>The given grades do vary from discipline to discipline and are also dependent on the particular reviewers of the funding applications. Therefore, it is misleading to give such simple grades are impossible. Rather, I would advise you to check our guidelines for reviewing applications and decision making. They are available at: <a href="http://www.aka.fi/en/review-and-funding-decisions/how-applications-are-reviewed/review-criteria/">http://www.aka.fi/en/review-and-funding-decisions/how-applications-are-reviewed/review-criteria/</a> and: <a href="http://www.aka.fi/en/review-and-funding-decisions/funding-decisions/decision-criteria/">http://www.aka.fi/en/review-and-funding-decisions/funding-decisions/decision-criteria/</a></p>
<p>We think that University metrics are divisive and exclude citizens</p>
<p>We fund all subject areas and the publication patterns differ between these, fax number of publications, citations and JIF is important in assessing grant applications in Natural and life sciences, but not in humanities. May I comment on the survey? The first five questions were not possible to answer since we don't recruit researchers, we fund researchers being recruited by the HEI:s.</p>
<p>Participation in the development of National Clinical Guidelines is another area where researchers are involved also national programmes that are charged to deliver particular projects. Also researchers would be involved in policy development. There are a lot of collaborative projects with NGOs, research organisations and the academic sector.</p>
<p>We don't use the h factor but we do use normalized citation - (e.g RCR from the NIH) Citation numbers on their own are not used -- we only make use of normalised citations</p>
<p>Highly cited papers (HCP) An HCP is any of the citable documents in the top 1% most cited publications in the world per document type and publication year</p>
<p>We use a scientific index that considers the normalized impact of publications as the ratio between received and expected citations according to the subject category of the WOS for the journals in which the researcher publish.</p>
<p>It is imperative to understand that the HEA does not provide competitive research funding. Therefore the majority of these questions are not applicable (hence the 'I don't know's). The HEA monitors the overarching research performance of the institutions through its Strategic Dialogue process, within which research and innovation forms one of seven system-level objectives.</p>

We are a funding institution - not many of these questions seem to apply. I wonder if i clicked on the right link (for funders) - apologies if that's not the case. Sorry.

**N°3 \* Do you account for variation by field in publication and citation practices?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Not at all	<b>6</b>	<b>21%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> Partly	<b>8</b>	<b>29%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> Largely	<b>7</b>	<b>25%</b>
R4	<input type="radio"/> Fully	<b>5</b>	<b>18%</b>
R5	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>2</b>	<b>7%</b>

**N°4 \* Do you scrutinize indicators regularly and update them?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<b>16</b>	<b>57%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>11</b>	<b>39%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>1</b>	<b>4%</b>

**Section S5 – III. B. Specific criteria used in the assessment of researchers regarding qualitative analysis of publications**

**N°1 \* Is the assessment based on qualitative evaluation of the research content after reading the publications?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Not at all	<b>7</b>	<b>25%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> Partly	<b>8</b>	<b>29%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> Largely	<b>8</b>	<b>29%</b>
R4	<input type="radio"/> Fully	<b>2</b>	<b>7%</b>
R5	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>3</b>	<b>11%</b>

**N°2 \* Is the assessment based on the journal's reputation (impact factor)?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Not at all	<b>4</b>	<b>14%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> Partly	<b>11</b>	<b>39%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> Largely	<b>8</b>	<b>29%</b>



R4  Fully 3 11%

R5  I don't know 2 7%

**N°3 \* Is the assessment based on the number of citations?**

R1  Not at all 7 25%

R2  Partly 10 36%

R3  Largely 4 14%

R4  Fully 3 11%

R5  I don't know 4 14%

**N°4 \* Whenever original research content is presented outside of a traditional journal publishing framework (participatory websites, blogs, etc.), how is this evaluated during the researcher's assessment?**

R1  Positively 9 32%

R2  Negatively 1 4%

R3  Not taken into account 12 43%

R4  I don't know 6 21%

**N°5 Please explain why**

**Positively :**

Tends to be more of a divulging nature - easier to see overall relevance for panel specialists (not always fully familiar with the nature of the research being assessed)
Information of research results should be presented to wider audience. However this takes place only after publishing results in journals
Journal impact factors are flawed and pernicious
scientific work serves as a foundation for applied economic policy. Progress there is only in part dependent on publication.
Altmetrics is becoming a reliable useful tool for research impact assessment
For SSH it is our obligation to take into account as alternative form of publications - scientific books, chapter of books, participation in issuing of composed works, work as editors For natural, engineering and life sciences it is additional value, positively evaluated, but never replace journal publishing participatory websites, blogs, etc. at present moment are not taken into account into evaluation of researchers

**Negatively :** "If the results are publishable, the first option should be to publish them on a peer-review journal. Other ways of communication can come latter".

**Not taken into account**

For the evaluation, we only consider the publications on journals with impact factor.
Difficult to measure impact in a homogeneous way
ICT infrastructure is ad hoc and most researchers are also practicing clinicians and health professionals they tend to affiliate closely with academic partners and not the HSE and therefore would not use the HSE website, staff newsletters etc. However many senior HSE staff are active on twitter and there is more cross discipline engagement on social media platforms such as twitter.
It is not popular among our researchers; besides, there are no guidelines how to assess.
Who does? We are fully aware of that we need to change how we assess grant applications if the goal is open access (hybrids are not a solution as we see it) but, we have not yet developed new ways to evaluate researchers. A goal is to create incentives for open access-publishing, we are there yet though. One way could be to underline the importance of the suggested research-project, which is actually very much the case in SSH. An effect is that JIF does not become an important factor which in turn give opportunities for researchers to publish in open access-journals, that is newer journals with an low impact factor, which is fine as long as the quality of the peer review process is good.

## I don't know

Again, the given questions do not really fit to the principles of evaluation and funding decisions of the Academy of Finland and therefore they are impossible to answer for.

Re Q4 - we do take into account outputs such as data which has been shared or code what have had been shared.  
HSS take into account course syllabus etc.

It depends on disciplinary panels

Again, please note that the HEA does not support individual researchers. So these responses reflect the extent to which indicators are included by the institutions in their performance compacts with the HEA... and thus overarching assessment at the level of institution.

## Section S6 - III. C. Specific criteria used in the assessment of researchers regarding Open Access to publications

### N°1 \*Has your organisation an official policy on open access to scientific publications?

- R1  Yes **17 61%**
- R2  No **10 36%**
- R3  I don't know **1 4%**

### N°2 \* Has your organisation signed the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA)?

- R1  Yes **4 14%**
- R2  No **13 47%**
- R3  No, it has no intention of signing it **2 7%**
- R4  No, but it intends to sign it in the next two years **4 14%**
- R5  I don't know **5 18%**

(if answered yes to N°2 )

### N°2.1 \* To what extent do you estimate that the recommendations made in this declaration are being effectively followed implemented in your organisation?

- R1  None
- R2  Small
- R3  Some **2 7%**
- R4  Large **2 7%**
- R5  I don't know

Non applicable      **14**      **50%**

**N°3 \* Is your organisation promoting the use of repositories (institutional, thematic, regional, national) towards its researchers?**

- R1  Yes      **15**      **54%**
- R2  No      **10**      **36%**
- R3  I don't know      **3**      **11%**

answered yes to N°3

**N°3.1 Which one(s)?**

All Swedish HEI:s has repositories and we mandate the researchers to use these
all that are listed in re3data; Europe PMC, arxiv and OAPEN (DOAB) and the FWF E-Book Library are financially supported
Biblioteca virtual del SSPA
CSIC conciencia and Digital CSIC
Europe PMC and well recognised data respositories (e.g. ENU, GenBank)
HAL
Institutional
institutional and a few national
Lenus.ie
Moodle
RECERCAT www.recercat.cat
Sistema de Información Científica de Andalucía (SICA, <a href="https://sica2.cica.es/">https://sica2.cica.es/</a> ), OpenAIRE
The full list is available at: <a href="http://www.aka.fi/en/funding/responsible-research/open-science/">http://www.aka.fi/en/funding/responsible-research/open-science/</a> Note that we do not offer a comprehensive list but leave room for scientific communities to act.
Zenodo

**N°4 \* Does your organisation officially require to deposit all publications in an institutional repository and to ensure open access?**

- R1  Yes      **10**      **36%**
- R2  No      **15**      **54%**
- R3  I don't know      **3**      **11%**

If answered yes to N°4

**N°4.1 \* Do you believe noncompliance with this recommendation could have a negative influence on a researcher's assessment for career progression?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes, sometimes	<b>7</b>	<b>25%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> Yes, systematically	<b>1</b>	<b>4%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>2</b>	<b>7%</b>
	Non applicable	<b>18</b>	<b>64%</b>

If answered yes to N°4.1

**N°4.2 \* To which extent can noncompliance have a negative influence on a researcher's assessment for career progression?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Minor	<b>2</b>	<b>7%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> Rather minor	<b>4</b>	<b>14%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> Rather significant	<b>4</b>	<b>14%</b>
R4	<input type="radio"/> Significant		
	Non applicable	<b>18</b>	<b>64%</b>

If answer no to N°4

**N°4.1 \* Is your organisation planning to implement such measures in the next two years?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<b>7</b>	<b>25%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>6</b>	<b>21%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>2</b>	<b>7%</b>
	Non applicable	<b>13</b>	<b>46%</b>

**N°5 \* Does your organisation provide guidelines (webpage/leaflet/videos) for researchers to learn how to ensure open access to publications?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<b>12</b>	<b>43%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>15</b>	<b>54%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>1</b>	<b>4%</b>

**N°6 \* Does your organisation measure/monitor the number/percentage of publications with open access?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<b>14</b>	<b>50%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>14</b>	<b>50%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know		

**Section S7 - III. D. Specific criteria used in the assessment of researchers regarding Open Research Data**

**N°1 \* Has your organisation an official policy on open research data ?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<b>11</b>	<b>39%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>14</b>	<b>50%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>3</b>	<b>11%</b>

**N°2 \* Is a research data management plan (DMP) template available to researchers in your organisation?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<b>7</b>	<b>25%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>18</b>	<b>64%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>3</b>	<b>11%</b>

**N°3 \* Does your organisation provide guidelines (webpage/leaflet/videos) for researchers to learn how to open their research data?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<b>9</b>	<b>32%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>18</b>	<b>64%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>1</b>	<b>4%</b>

**N°4 \* Is there an official recommendation to make research data open?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<b>11</b>	<b>39%</b>
R2	<input type="radio"/> No	<b>15</b>	<b>54%</b>
R3	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	<b>2</b>	<b>7%</b>

If answered yes to N°4

**N°4.1 \* Does following this recommendation have a positive influence on a researcher's assessment for career progression?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes, sometimes	2	18%
R2	<input type="radio"/> Yes, systematically	2	18%
R3	<input type="radio"/> No	7	64%
	Non applicable	17	

**N°4.2 \* To which extent can following it have a positive influence on a researcher's assessment for career progression?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Minor		
R2	<input type="radio"/> Rather minor	2	50%
R3	<input type="radio"/> Rather significant	2	50%
R4	<input type="radio"/> Significant		
	Non applicable	24	

**N°4.3 \* Does noncompliance with this recommendation have a negative influence on a researcher's assessment for career progression?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Yes, sometimes	1	25%
R2	<input type="radio"/> Yes, systematically	1	25%
R3	<input type="radio"/> No	1	25%
R4	<input type="radio"/> I don't know	1	25%
	Non applicable	24	

**N°4.4 \* To which extent cannot complying with it have a negative influence on a researcher's assessment for career progression?**

R1	<input type="radio"/> Minor		
R2	<input type="radio"/> Rather minor	1	50%
R3	<input type="radio"/> Rather significant	1	50%
R4	<input type="radio"/> Significant		

R5  I don't know

Non applicable **26**

If answered no to N°4

N°4.1 \* Is your organisation planning to implement such measures in the next two years?

R1  Yes **8** **53%**

R2  No **4** **27%**

R3  I don't know **3** **20%**

Non applicable **13**

N°4.2 \* Will participation to open research data be then taken into account in the researchers assessment for career progression?

R1  Yes **4** **50%**

R2  No **1** **12%**

R3  I don't know **3** **38%**

Non applicable **20**

**N°5 \* Is your organisation promoting the use and development of Open Source softwares?**

R1  Yes **8** **29%**

R2  No **14** **50%**

R3  I don't know **6** **21%**

If answered yes to N°5

**N°5.1 Can you explain in which ways?**

"We require that Academy-funded projects commit to open access publishing. We also work to promote open access to research data and methods. The goal is to make research publications, data and material, metadata and methods widely available for reuse. The principles of open science must be pursued with due attention to research ethics and law."

All our code over 20 years is Open Source



funds can be applied in normal funding programmes
information for software businesses
The costs associated with sharing data/software are permissible expenses. We do not require open source, but we encourage grants holders to think about making their code open as a way of allowing others to build on their work

**N°6 \* In your organisation encouraging the Open peer review?**

R1 <input type="radio"/>	Yes, often	<b>8</b>	<b>29%</b>
	Yes, occasionally	<b>6</b>	<b>21%</b>
R2 <input type="radio"/>	No	<b>14</b>	<b>50%</b>
R3 <input type="radio"/>	I don't know	<b>2</b>	<b>7%</b>

If answered yes to N°6

**N°6.1 Can you explain in which ways? No answer**

**Section S8 - III. E. Specific criteria used in the assessment of researchers regarding evaluation principles**

**N°1 \* Are collection of informations on the evaluatees and analytical processes kept open, transparent and simple : are the evaluatees allowed to verify data and analysis ?**

R1 <input type="radio"/>	Not at all	<b>3</b>	<b>11%</b>
R2 <input type="radio"/>	Partly	<b>9</b>	<b>32%</b>
R3 <input type="radio"/>	Largely	<b>8</b>	<b>29%</b>
R4 <input type="radio"/>	Fully	<b>3</b>	<b>11%</b>
R5 <input type="radio"/>	I don't know	<b>5</b>	<b>18%</b>

**N°2 \* Is performance measured against the research missions of the organisation and the values it promotes?**

R1 <input type="radio"/>	Not at all	<b>4</b>	<b>14%</b>
R2 <input type="radio"/>	Partly	<b>10</b>	<b>36%</b>
R3 <input type="radio"/>	Largely	<b>8</b>	<b>29%</b>

R4  Fully **5** **18%**

R5  I don't know **1** **4%**

**N°3 \* Is the official OA policy also visible and accessible for everybody on the website?**

R1  Yes **12** **43%**

R2  No **13** **46%**

R3  I don't know **3** **11%**

## **APPENDIX 5 - REWARDS – A SHORT LEXICON**

- **Recognition**

In general : acceptance as true or valid, as of a claim ; attention or favourable notice. In this context : consideration given to all the accomplishments of a researcher or a group of researchers taking into account the various qualities expected from them.

- **Acknowledgement**

In general : The act of admitting the existence or truth of something ; an expression of thanks or appreciation. In this context : consideration given for the contribution of a researcher to a collective work, regardless of their statute (scientist, technician, lab personnel).

- **Conditions**

In general : Existing circumstances influencing, permitting or limiting the range of initiatives of an individual or a group. In this context : all elements, positive and negative setting the scene for the development of a research career.

- **Incentives**

In general : a motivating influence, a stimulus, such as the fear of punishment or the expectation of reward, that induces action or motivates effort. Always based on some form of assessment. In this context : positive elements influencing the quest for excellence, the strongest of which is recognition of merits, originality, creativity and, occasionally genius.

- **Reward**

In general : A consequence that happens to someone as a result of worthy behaviour ; the return for performance of a desired behaviour; recompense usually given in gratitude for a service rendered. In this context : whole set of elements building a positive reinforcement in a researcher's career.

## APPENDIX 6 - REWARDS – RECOMMENDED READING

### On the use of alternative metrics:

[http://sagepubs.blogspot.com/2016/07/altmetrics-metrics-or-index\\_7.html](http://sagepubs.blogspot.com/2016/07/altmetrics-metrics-or-index_7.html)

### On the peer reviewing system:

<https://www.sciencebasedmedicine.org/is-scientific-peer-review-a-sacred-cow-ready-to-be-slaughtered/>

<https://unlockingresearch.blog.lib.cam.ac.uk/?p=188>

### On the open peer reviewing system:

<http://blogs.biomedcentral.com/bmcblog/2016/06/15/challenges-open-peer-review/>

### On a public publishing platform:

"I have been surprised to discover that early career researchers seem to be more digitally engaged and willing to experiment with online publishing formats, even though they have much less security than their senior colleagues since they are entering the job market at a very difficult and competitive time. So, in a sense, they often don't have the luxury of being able to submit their work to be published in new ventures and are obliged to stick with well-known, "traditional" journals to give themselves the best chance of landing a job, or achieving tenure. But, despite this stark fact of job insecurity, younger scholars are nevertheless clearly interested in publishing their work open access and trying out the digital innovations that it can offer. They have also quickly realised how citations become multiplied when you publish online, which can really help a younger scholar's career in its early stages."

<http://scilog.fwf.ac.at/en/article/4482/the-gold-route-to-open-science>

Concordat On Open Research Data - Research Councils UK

<http://www.rcuk.ac.uk/documents/documents/concordatopenresearchdata-pdf/>

Van den Eynden, V. and Bishop, L. (2014). Incentives and motivations for sharing research data, a researcher's perspective.

<http://www.knowledge-exchange.info/projects/project/research-data/sowing-the-seed>

The Metric Tide: Report of the Independent Review of the Role of Metrics in Research Assessment and Management

<http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/Year/2015/metrictide/Title,104463,en.html>

Measuring Up: Impact Factors Do Not Reflect Article Citation Rates V. Kremer et al., <http://blogs.plos.org/plos/2016/07/impact-factors-do-not-reflect-citation-rates/>

Time to remodel the journal impact factor, Nature Editorial, Nature, VOL 535 | 28 JULY 2016

<http://www.nature.com/news/time-to-remodel-the-journal-impact-factor-1.20332>

On the cutting edge of Research: the Open Access Challenge.

<http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications-homepage-list/eua-cde-bulletin-on-the-cutting-edge-of-research-the-open-access-challenge.pdf?sfvrsn=8>

On Open Science as a new paradigm : Rentier, B. « Open Science: a Revolution in Sight? » (2016) Interlending and Document Supply (ILDS) Vol. 44 Issue: 4, pp.155-160,

<https://doi.org/10.1108/ILDS-06-2016-0020> <http://orbi.ulg.ac.be/handle/2268/198865>

On the abusive use of the Journal Impact Factor as a performance indicator:

<https://bernardrentier.wordpress.com/2015/12/31/denouncing-the-impostor-factor>





## **Getting in touch with the EU**

### **IN PERSON**

All over the European Union there are hundreds of Europe Direct Information Centres. You can find the address of the centre nearest you at: <http://europa.eu/contact>

### **ON THE PHONE OR BY E-MAIL**

Europe Direct is a service that answers your questions about the European Union. You can contact this service

- by freephone: 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (certain operators may charge for these calls),
- at the following standard number: +32 22999696 or
- by electronic mail via: <http://europa.eu/contact>

## **Finding information about the EU**

### **ONLINE**

Information about the European Union in all the official languages of the EU is available on the Europa website at: <http://europa.eu>

### **EU PUBLICATIONS**

You can download or order free and priced EU publications from EU Bookshop at: <http://bookshop.europa.eu>. Multiple copies of free publications may be obtained by contacting Europe Direct or your local information centre (see <http://europa.eu/contact>)

### **EU LAW AND RELATED DOCUMENTS**

For access to legal information from the EU, including all EU law since 1951 in all the official language versions, go to EUR-Lex at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu>

### **OPEN DATA FROM THE EU**

The EU Open Data Portal (<http://data.europa.eu/euodp/en/data>) provides access to datasets from the EU. Data can be downloaded and reused for free, both for commercial and non-commercial purposes.

Changing practice from the traditional approach in most disciplines will require a fundamental change in the way scientists carry out research in an Open Science environment. In order for this to be encouraged and incentivised, this changed approach must be recognised and rewarded by both employers (when recruiting and promoting researchers) and research funders (when performing peer review of researchers in grant applications). Moreover senior researchers must play a key role in this change as they are highly influential in the recruitment/promotion of researchers and conduct of peer review both for funding agencies and publishers.

The approach of the group is rooted firmly in the context of researcher career development and closely linked with ERA Priority 3, an open labour market for researchers.

The report provides background information on Open Science in relation to ERA policy, researcher assessment and career framework. It also describes different aspects of Open Science including Open Data, Open Peer Review and Citizen Science. The limitations of current recognition and reward processes are presented, with suggestions on how to alleviate these and how new paradigms can be envisioned and implemented.

An illustration of taking a comprehensive approach to researcher assessment using the Open Science Career Assessment Matrix (OS-CAM) that recognises Open Science is developed. There is a brief analysis of the ERA Partnership policies and how Open Science can be included in the Human Resources Strategy for Researchers. Finally, the results of a survey carried out on Research Funding and Research Performing Organisations focusses on their approach to recognition and rewards for researchers engaged in Open Science. In addition, some good practice examples from across Europe are given

*Studies and reports*