Session #4	15.05.2024, 10:00-11:00 CEST
Early learnings and questions from assessing open science at Utrecht University	***Anestis Amanatidis***
	Utrecht University

1. Updates from the community:

- RWTH in Aachen is working on an OS roadmap

2. Presentation + Collaborative notes:

What do you consider evaluations that also value research processes?

Evaluations that take into account research proposals and research programmes goals
Evaluations that are done mid-term rather than after the project/programme
Evaluations that take into account the composition of participation in the research

How can we think about capturing values, interactions and strategies for evaluation? What do you want/need from these sessions?

- From a Dutch perspective: Open Science is one of the themes in the SEP protocol. For departments/units that already wrote their self-evaluation, does this have consequences for their research and/or assessment with regards to Open Science later? Can we learn from that?

3. Links & Resources:

Session #3	20.03.2024, 10:00-11:00 CET
How can research assessment in computer science consider open science?	*Laurent Romary*
	INRIA France

1. Updates from the community <mark>*(add your updates, news etc. here. We will have a round of updates during the beginning of the session)*</mark>

- *https://github.blog/changelog/2024-03-13-authenticate-orcid-id/ GitHub is partnering with ORCID. You can now authenticate your ORCID account with your GitHub account, and display your ORCID iD on your public GitHub profile. [I don't know if this means the ORCID iD is added to the metadata]*

- *Project / Organisation, Name, Update description*

- *Project / Organisation, Name, Update description*

- *…*

Presentation + Collaborative notes:
- Conferences and workshops seem to be playing an important role in CS
    - Difficult to track: changing names, intervals etc for events..
- Question posed: What is the role of OS in fostering a more inclusive research assessment process that prioritises quality over quantity?

What kind of 'artefacts' would you like to be included in research assessment processes?
- Cross-referencing mechanisms between publications, data and software
- Better coverage of conferences
- Changing policy landscape (e.g. CoARA) and specific requirements for these developments
- Publication-orientation / software-orientation "profiles" to capture diversity of the rather heterogeneous 'informatics community'
- How could we set up these ideas into something concrete, especially for EU level?

How to monitor research: How to systematically monitor / capture mentions of software in publications. Abigail: reckons the heterogeneity, wondering how to do justice to the particular needs of the kinds of communities etc. that exist in her department.

Links & Resources:

- In the OpenAIRE Graph you can Link by using this page: https://explore.openaire.eu/participate/claim and here a guide: https://www.openaire.eu/claim-publication

Session #2	17.01.2024
How can research assessment in the social sciences and humanities consider open science?	***Fotis Mystakopoulos*** ***Carol Delmazo***
	OPERAS

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

Session #1 - 18.10.2023 with Ludo Waltman (CWTS):

AHA SLIDES: https://ahaslides.com/RAXOS

You are all invited to join to GraspOS Training series:

Objective: Introduce you to the tool and service that are used in GraspOS

Training Session 1: BIP! Scholar: going beyond researcher profiles

      Date: November 2, 2023

      Time: 14.00-15.00 CET

      Location: Virtual event via Zoom supported by OpenAIRE

      Registration link: https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_SoII3tAcQUGYfLTM8GSgZg

---

- Open Sciences are a sort of link that connects different fields and researches due to their unique nature. The idea of accessibility, transparency and capacity-building are being noted by the people involved in science, and by the structures and infrastructures around them (Davide, CNR-IrCRES)

- From Kaveh Bazargan (rivervalley.io) – we need to move away from the "paper" being the primary source of communication.

    - So faster, more granular exchange of ideas. My idea here.

    - My talk on Open Science to NISO.

- And here…It's very important to stand multiple indicators, both qualitative, and also quantitative (i'm a little bit concerned about an exclusively qualitative assessment), grounded on the diversity of scientific practices…

- Assessment must respect the "natural/human" rhythm of maturation for science production (I'm talking from the Humanities and Social Sciences point of view, but not only in this areas) - this issue should stress what Ludo Waltman said about evaluating only when is needed and when is pertinent

- On diversity of practices and even some concerns about Open Science and Ethics (personal and sensitive data), maybe it would be good to have an institution from Health Sciences on GRAPos Pilots (sorry if you already have it and I haven't noted)

- Maybe a superfluous question, but what is understood under"Open Science" in this community: open access, open data, open peer review, OER, preregistration, FAIR data, citizen science/participatory science,... ? All of it?

    - From Anestis: I am sure that in one way or another, all of these notions come to the fore in the everyday lives of the people who are here. Personally, the idea of open science *as* disclosure is a rather narrow way of understanding it. So indeed, involving participants ('society') and make sure that the knowledge production (process) is productive to *bettering* l relations between actors around an issue is important.

- Double link between Research Assessment and OS (how RA can reward OS practices and how Infrastructures for RA need to be open) - in GraspOS we try to accomplish both through the development of an Open and Federated Research Assessment Infrastructure

- Open Science Assessment Framework (OSAF) should enable the translation from principles to actual practice

    - Acknowledges the CoARA core commitments: diversity of contributions should be recognised (instead of only journal articles) depending on the context of research; assessment should be qualitative supported by quantitative indicators

- Idea with OSAF is to build on what has been done, not to create another framework.

- OSAF method - stakeholders at the centre. Using the SCOPE framework, the evaluation then starts by asking what these stakeholders value, and further what contextual factors are important to keep in mind in the (e)valuation.

- GraspOS 9 Pilots: will realise what we are working on in practical settings at 3 levels: Countries / RPOs / Disciplines.

What do you see as the main obstacles to realising open science aware responsible research assessment?

- I can think a main obstacle lies in the same obstacle we observe for Open Science: there is still a sort of antagonism toward open access and open sciences of documents, data, flows and whatever else. At the same time, the idea that is possible, thanks to OA, to be seen and evaluated as much as evaluating and see yourself, can be seen as an issue by the evaluators which

hold the power to decide the destiny of an infrastructure or a programme (Davide, CNR-IrCRES)

- Balancing generic aspects to very specific aspects. Different domains need different work.

- Promoting responsible research assessment practices without adding to the already-existing work surrounding assessment is important. Assessment work is difficult, complex and a lot of work. Referring to SCOPE to indeed "evaluate only where necessary" in the sense that the energy and effort of the assessments should be in balance with the value of the assessment itself.

- Focus on individual researchers instead of team science/contributions, including contributions from non-scientific/non-researcher staff that are now mostly excluded (see for example Bennett et al. 2023). This is a barrier to the specialisation needed to make research outputs available, and the focus on competition instead of collaboration goes against the open science ethos. (!)

- Investment in the journal article as the primary object of assessment is still very entrenched - funders, institutions and publishers - and I think the majority of researchers - are all very committed to the methods and systems and processes that are built around publications. Individual research activities and institutional research planning are still focused on the publication as the primary research output.

- In practical terms, there is a lack of established systems and processes and standards for collating reliable information and metrics about OR practices and outputs - this is an area that GraspOS can clearly help with

- Balancing generic aspects with specific aspects. FAIR assessment is not the same for all domains,. How can we make it domain specific while keeping the generic aspect?

- The term 'RRA' is ill-perceived, feeling that reform is linked to having more workload - how to reform the way assessment is done without adding anything more to the workload of those doing the assessment?

- I'm working in a university administration (external funding for research projects) and find it difficult to explain to people in the administration outside our OS/RRA community why research assessment needs to change, e.g., stop overusing rankings and publication indicators. Also, from the same point of view, there are many movements and agendas to keep track of, OS and RRA being two of them. But others are gender and green research. Many of these movements could

support each other but sometimes they do not overlap. Merging too many agendas may also be counterproductive. (Marianne Gauffriau)

How do you hope GraspOS will help you overcome these obstacles ?

Questions to Ludo's presentation:

- How does this relate to OpenAlex?

- Do you connect with the CoARA WG on Responsible Metrics?

Links

- Here is the report on the FAIR assessment method we developed in the ExPaNDS project for FAIR self-evaluations at Photon and Neutron Research Infrastructures. At these facilities, the automated workflows and processes are vital to the data that are produced, so we needed an evaluation method that incorporated this aspect. Also, as we have visiting users, we can only realistically hope to produce data that is 'FAIR when it leaves the facility'. What researchers do with it later at their home institutions is beyond our control. Here is the report: https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.7246801

- Here's our EOSC Co-Creation project reports: Making FAIReR assessments possible. Final report of EOSC Co-Creation projects: "European overview of career merit systems" and "Vision for research data in research careers" https://zenodo.org/records/4701375

- CoaRA WG OI4RRA https://coara.eu/app/uploads/2023/10/WG-Overview_Towards-Open-Infrastructures-for-Responsible-Research-Assessment.pdf

- SCOPE FRAMEWORK for responsible research(er) evaluation: https://inorms.net/scope-framework-for-research-evaluation/