How can research assessment in the social sciences and humanities consider open science?

Collaborative notes:

From [website](): "The SCOPE framework for research evaluation is a five-stage model for evaluating responsibly. It is a practical step-by-step process designed to help research managers, or anyone involved in conducting research evaluations, in planning new evaluations as well as check existing evaluations. SCOPE is an acronym, where S stands for START with what you value, C for CONTEXT considerations, O for OPTIONS for evaluating, P for PROBE deeply, and E for EVALUATE your evaluation."

- Is "widening the scope of research outputs" particular to SSH when reflecting on research assessment? How is it specific to the field?
    - Monographs
    - Multilingualism
- Matters of scale: how can (e.g.) regional research be appreciated / valued in research assessment vis a vis other 'scales'?
- Global movement with local, diverse enactment

What is the role of OS in fostering a more inclusive research assessment process that prioritises quality over quantity?

- The current heavy reliance on two enormous companies to manage scholarly information (RELX/Elsevier and Clarivate in the context of Web of Science and Scopus) is a huge driver of the problem - forcing people to publish in certain (mostly English speaking and Western-focused US and Northern Europe) journals. This is limiting bibliodiversity and multilingualism. These bibliometric databases sell their information to University rankings as well compounding the problem. So we need to break this stranglehold and the answer is **open infrastructure** and ensuring that open infrastructure is being used for all aspects of scholarly information management including assessment. So my direct answer to this question is - Open Scholarship addresses the inclusive assessment process in that Open Infrastructure is part of Open Scholarship. [I would say that of course, I work for DOAB and the OAPEN Library! - Danny Kingsley here]

What kind of research output would you like to be included in research assessment processes? What are the kinds of 'undervalued' practices that are not being taken into account?

- Research processes that reconfigure relations between actors in beneficial ways are usually hard to 'make worthy' in research assessments. How can *processes* rather than *objects* be made to matter? Especially in the SSH, relations to actors are often how 'fields' come to be and shapes research practices.
- Methodology can be considered another research output that, according to Bianca Gualandi (University of Bologna, Italy), can be a lens to assess 'rigour', a concern of Jonathan Morris. The point is that if we can describe methodologies and talk about it

not only under the prism of reproducibility, but also in relation to research assessment. [Although I (Bianca) agree with Giovanna Lima that looking at research "outputs" rather than "processes" is limiting, it might be necessary to pragmatically think about how to turn a process (e.g. my methodology) into an output (e.g. the description of my methodology) for RRA purposes]. [Giovanna Lima: I agree - research protocols are one type of output I encourage colleagues to produce. This is particularly relevant for Digital Humanities.]

- Michelle Duryea was also here in the first session. Feels as though the focus is a question of 'digitisation': the development of tools, services, indicators.. In AUS context, they collect non-traditional research outputs that relate to research reports, etc.. what came up was establishing a metadata standard for non traditional outputs. What is missing here is a 'research statement': @Michelle, can you add the components of the statement?

- As suggested by Tiina Käkelä (University of Helsinki) a list of research output is less than ideal because it quickly becomes obsolete. However, without being prescriptive, it might be a useful starting point. I (Bianca Gualandi, University of Bologna, Italy) add here my 5 cents mentioning a small study (https://doi.org/10.1108/JD-07-2022-0146) we did at the University of Bologna, in the Department of Classical Philology and Italian Studies, that produced the following list of 13 research outputs (in order of how frequently they were mentioned by researchers in interviews): [Publications]; Other primary sources (e.g. manuscripts and artworks); Digital representation of cultural objects (e.g. facsimiles and photos); Catalogues; databases and other search tools; Events (e.g. conferences and exhibitions); Websites; Software; Documentation; Digital infrastructures (e.g. mobile apps and web platforms); Personal data; Corpora; Standards; Born-digital artefacts (e.g. tags, associations and texts). Also extremely useful is the recent ALLEA report *Recognising Digital Scholarly Outputs in the Humanities* (https://doi.org/10.26356/OUTPUTS-DH).

- Outputs and practices

- Because of the potentially 'etheral' nature of some non-traditional outputs such as 'experiences' or 'aural performances' sometimes the mechanism of capture of these can be an issue. There was concern in 2009 in Australia when the first research assessment exercise was introduced, particularly with music scholars. Some of them had made recordings of performances for their own purposes, not knowing this might be then used for assessment. This meant there was a selection of performances to put forward based on the quality of the *recording* not the *performance*. So the mechanism of capture can be a factor when we talk about non-traditional outputs [Danny Kingsley - OAPEN & DOAB]

- Giovanna Lima (Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands): in favour of a long list of non-traditional outputs that would be selected by the researchers themselves, like Jonathan shared - Bianca's list above is a good first start, and the list can be updated continuously. Not only the types of outputs should be diverse, but also the roles researchers have (e.g., Artist; Clinical Trial Advisor; Compiler; Composer; Creator; Curator; Developer; Director; Editor; Editorial Board member; Performance Postdoctoral Supervisor; Producer; Project manager; Thesis Supervisor; Translator). Both ORCID and the CREDIT taxonomy are important stakeholders to be engaged in this process of broadening the recognition and rewarding of open science.

- Jonathan Morris (University of Hertfordshire, UK) - just to flesh out my points here. From the perspective of sitting on a research assessment panel such as REF2021 (last UK exercise), we went out of our way to indicate in the submission guidance our receptiveness to receiving 'non-traditional' outputs for assessment. None the less we received a lower proportion of such outputs than at the previous exercise. I think that this is because researchers and especially their institutions were worried about the difficulty of assessing the scientific rigour where it was not immediately obvious (conventional scholarly apparatus) in the final output. In

other words they self-regulated in a risk averse manner that may have excluded the work that best represented their research.

What are qualitative options for research assessment?

- What about including those doing the evaluation in the process?
- Giovanna Lima (Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands): is focusing on research outputs the right approach? If knowledge production is to be opened up to diverse publics, the focus on outputs becomes challenged, as such opening up implicates a focus on research processes. How to make them durable in research assessments?

Links and resources:

- GraspOS: developing tools and services to support research assessments of/through open science: *https://graspos.eu/*
- The SCOPE framework: *https://inorms.net/scope-framework-for-research-evaluation/*
- OPERAS Research Infrastructure: *https://operas-eu.org/*
- OPERAS' service METRICS: *https://operas-eu.org/services/metrics-service/*
- OPERAS' service Go TRIPLE; https://operas-eu.org/services/discovery-service-triple/
- OPERAS' service PRISM: https://operas-eu.org/services/prism/
- Maryl, M., Błaszczyńska, M., Bonincontro, I., Immenhauser, B., Maróthy, S., Wandl-Vogt, E., van Zundert, J. J., & ALLEA Working Group E-Humanities. (2023). Recognising Digital Scholarly Outputs in the Humanities – ALLEA Report. ALLEA. https://doi.org/10.26356/OUTPUTS-DH