## 1. Welcome

<https://council.science/current/news/researcher-assessment-survey/>

Thank you for supporting this survey, your contribution as a member is crucial to the success of our work.  
  
The **Global Young Academy (GYA)**,the**InterAcademy Partnership (IAP)** and the**International Science Council (ISC)** have joined forces to understand and shape the future of research evaluation. Building on our recent joint report, [*The Future of Research Evaluation: A Synthesis of Current Debates and Developments*](https://www.interacademies.org/publication/future-research-evaluation-synthesis-current-debates-and-developments) (also: [machine readable and world language versions](https://council.science/publications/the-future-of-research-evaluation-a-synthesis-of-current-debates-and-developments/)), we want to map engagement with research evaluation across our memberships, by exploring the criteria, policies and statements your organisation may have produced, and your activities and ambitions for reforming research evaluation.   
  
This survey should take **around 35 minutes** to complete depending on the length of your responses, and **you are able to save your progress and return later.**  
  
The deadline for submissions is at **12:00 PM (noon) UTC on Friday 15 December 2023**, please get in touch with the CultureBase team at [noemie@culturebase-consulting.co.uk](mailto:noemie@culturebase-consulting.co.uk?subject=GYA%20IAP%20ISC%20Research%20Assessment%20Survey) if you have any questions or need extra time to complete your submission.   
  
Please note that responses will not be confidential. We intend to draw on your input directly to form a report to be published in 2024, and we may also contact respondents to obtain further information on their answers. All responses should be provided with this in mind.  
  
We look forward to receiving your response, and having your support on this important project.

### **Before we start, please identify the organisation you are responding on behalf of: \***

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### **Is your organisation a member of, or affiliated with, any of the following groups? (Please check all that apply)**

* Global Young Academy (GYA)
* InterAcademy Partnership (IAP)
* International Science Council (ISC)

### **Which region and country does your organisation primarily represent? Region:**

* Africa
* Asia
* Europe
* Latin America and the Caribbean
* Northern America
* Oceania
* We are a global organisation

### **Country:**

### **Which discipline(s) does your organisation cover?**

* Engineering
* Humanities
* Medicine/Medical Sciences
* Natural Science
* Social science
* Other (please specify):

## 2. Researcher Assessment – Demographics

In this survey, we are interested in your organisation’s stance and practices around researcher assessment.  
  
By **researcher assessment**, we mean any forms of assessment or evaluation of researchers for promotion, career advancement, membership selection, prize selection, funding selection, and any other activities in which researchers’ profiles are assessed.

### **Is your organisation involved in assessing researchers for any of the following purposes?**

* Election or selection of new fellows or members
* Assessment of existing fellows or members
* Awards and Prize attribution
* Grant provision
* None of the above
* Other (please specify):

### **Please indicate who/what is being assessed within each of those activities**

|  | Individual researchers | Research institutions | Research groups | Other |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Election or selection of new fellows or members | Election or selection of new fellows or members Individual researchers | Election or selection of new fellows or members Research institutions | Election or selection of new fellows or members Research groups | Election or selection of new fellows or members Other |
| Assessment of existing fellows or members | Assessment of existing fellows or members Individual researchers | Assessment of existing fellows or members Research institutions | Assessment of existing fellows or members Research groups | Assessment of existing fellows or members Other |
| Awards and Prize attribution | Awards and Prize attribution Individual researchers | Awards and Prize attribution Research institutions | Awards and Prize attribution Research groups | Awards and Prize attribution Other |
| Grant provision | Grant provision Individual researchers | Grant provision Research institutions | Grant provision Research groups | Grant provision Other |

Other:

3. Researcher Assessment - Statements

Debate around the assessment of researchers has grown in prominence in recent years, with suggestions that change is needed to support better and more equitable science and healthier research environments. In this next section, **we would like to know more about the steps that your organisation is taking** to reshape researcher assessment.

In general, what impact do you think the current way that researchers are assessed within academia (for example for career advancement, promotion, and funding) have on the following:

|  | Strong negative impact | Mild negative impact | No impact | Mild positive impact | Strong positive impact | Don't Know |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Research quality | Research quality Strong negative impact | Research quality Mild negative impact | Research quality No impact | Research quality Mild positive impact | Research quality Strong positive impact | Research quality Don't Know |
| Research culture | Research culture Strong negative impact | Research culture Mild negative impact | Research culture No impact | Research culture Mild positive impact | Research culture Strong positive impact | Research culture Don't Know |
| Research productivity | Research productivity Strong negative impact | Research productivity Mild negative impact | Research productivity No impact | Research productivity Mild positive impact | Research productivity Strong positive impact | Research productivity Don't Know |
| Research creativity | Research creativity Strong negative impact | Research creativity Mild negative impact | Research creativity No impact | Research creativity Mild positive impact | Research creativity Strong positive impact | Research creativity Don't Know |
| Impact of research in society | Impact of research in society Strong negative impact | Impact of research in society Mild negative impact | Impact of research in society No impact | Impact of research in society Mild positive impact | Impact of research in society Strong positive impact | Impact of research in society Don't Know |

Would you like to add any comments?

Do any of the following statements apply to your organisation? (select all that apply)

* We are signatories of the Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA; https://sfdora.org)
* We are members of the Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment (CoARA; https://coara.eu)
* We are signatories of, or abide by, another statement or set of principles on researcher assessment (please provide details below)
* We participate in communities or discussion groups to discuss researcher assessment (please provide details below)

Please provide details of other statements, sets of principles, communities or discussion groups you participate in:

Does your organisation have a published statement or position paper on the responsible assessment of researchers? \*

* Yes, we have one or multiple statement(s).
* No/Not to the best of my knowledge.

## 4. Research Assessment - Statements

### **Is/are the statement(s) available? \***

* The statement(s) is/are available online.
* The statement(s) is/are not available online, but we are willing to share them.
* The statement(s) is/are not available online and cannot be shared.

## 5. Researcher Assessment - Statements

### **Please upload a copy of the statement(s) from your organisation directly to this survey or email to**[**noemie@culturebase-consulting.co.uk**](mailto:noemie@culturebase-consulting.co.uk?subject=GYA%2FIAP%2FISC%20Survey%20-%20Sharing%20a%20statement%20on%20research%20assessment%20from%20our%20organisation)

Choose File

Would you like to add any comment about the uploaded statements?

### **Was the creation of the statement(s) driven by any of the following (select all that apply):**

* Your organisation's leadership
* Your fellows / members
* Wider researcher community
* Government
* Funders
* Research institutions
* Donors financing your organisation
* Other (please specify):

### **What was the intended impact of the statement? (Select all that apply)**

* Change assessment practices within your organisation
* Set researcher assessment standards with members of your organisation
* Establish or update a position in the ongoing debate on researcher assessment
* Influence policies and practices beyond your organisation
* Other (please specify):

Comments:

## 6. Researcher Assessment - Practices

The following questions explore your organisation’s **practices when assessing researchers**, for example for fellowship or membership election/selection or any other assessment that looks at researchers’ profiles.  
  
We will address several topics, including metrics and criteria for assessment, CV formats, peer review processes, decision processes, and your overall approach to researcher assessment.

### **Has your organisation discussed or implemented significant changes to assessment processes in the past three years?**

* No, our assessment processes have remained largely the same.
* Yes, our organisation discussed changing assessment processes but changes have not yet been implemented.
* Yes, our organisation implemented changes to assessment processes.

If you answered yes, please briefly comment on the changes that have been discussed or implemented

### **When assessing researchers, for example for fellowship or membership election/selection or any other assessment that looks at researchers’ and innovators’ profiles, which elements are considered?**

### **\*Skip this question if your organisation does *not* assess researchers, experts, or individuals, for any of its activities**

|  | Not considered | Of little importance | Of moderate importance | Of high importance |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of published papers from the applicant | Number of published papers from the applicant Not considered | Number of published papers from the applicant Of little importance | Number of published papers from the applicant Of moderate importance | Number of published papers from the applicant Of high importance |
| Publication-level metrics from the papers (Citations, Altmetrics) | Publication-level metrics from the papers (Citations, Altmetrics) Not considered | Publication-level metrics from the papers (Citations, Altmetrics) Of little importance | Publication-level metrics from the papers (Citations, Altmetrics) Of moderate importance | Publication-level metrics from the papers (Citations, Altmetrics) Of high importance |
| Journal-level metrics or reputation of the journals where the applicant’s papers are published (e.g. Journal impact factor, SCimage Journal Ranks, other journal prestige ranking) | Journal-level metrics or reputation of the journals where the applicant’s papers are published (e.g. Journal impact factor, SCimage Journal Ranks, other journal prestige ranking) Not considered | Journal-level metrics or reputation of the journals where the applicant’s papers are published (e.g. Journal impact factor, SCimage Journal Ranks, other journal prestige ranking) Of little importance | Journal-level metrics or reputation of the journals where the applicant’s papers are published (e.g. Journal impact factor, SCimage Journal Ranks, other journal prestige ranking) Of moderate importance | Journal-level metrics or reputation of the journals where the applicant’s papers are published (e.g. Journal impact factor, SCimage Journal Ranks, other journal prestige ranking) Of high importance |
| Author-level metrics (H-index) | Author-level metrics (H-index) Not considered | Author-level metrics (H-index) Of little importance | Author-level metrics (H-index) Of moderate importance | Author-level metrics (H-index) Of high importance |
| Non-publication outputs (e.g. datasets, software) | Non-publication outputs (e.g. datasets, software) Not considered | Non-publication outputs (e.g. datasets, software) Of little importance | Non-publication outputs (e.g. datasets, software) Of moderate importance | Non-publication outputs (e.g. datasets, software) Of high importance |
| Contributions to grey literature (e.g. policy documents, news and media) | Contributions to grey literature (e.g. policy documents, news and media) Not considered | Contributions to grey literature (e.g. policy documents, news and media) Of little importance | Contributions to grey literature (e.g. policy documents, news and media) Of moderate importance | Contributions to grey literature (e.g. policy documents, news and media) Of high importance |
| Position and role within the applicant research organisation (e.g. head of department) | Position and role within the applicant research organisation (e.g. head of department) Not considered | Position and role within the applicant research organisation (e.g. head of department) Of little importance | Position and role within the applicant research organisation (e.g. head of department) Of moderate importance | Position and role within the applicant research organisation (e.g. head of department) Of high importance |
| Successful research funding obtained by applicant | Successful research funding obtained by applicant Not considered | Successful research funding obtained by applicant Of little importance | Successful research funding obtained by applicant Of moderate importance | Successful research funding obtained by applicant Of high importance |
| Awards and prizes received | Awards and prizes received Not considered | Awards and prizes received Of little importance | Awards and prizes received Of moderate importance | Awards and prizes received Of high importance |
| Open research practices (e.g. open access, open data, open methods) | Open research practices (e.g. open access, open data, open methods) Not considered | Open research practices (e.g. open access, open data, open methods) Of little importance | Open research practices (e.g. open access, open data, open methods) Of moderate importance | Open research practices (e.g. open access, open data, open methods) Of high importance |
| Teaching activities | Teaching activities Not considered | Teaching activities Of little importance | Teaching activities Of moderate importance | Teaching activities Of high importance |
| Mentoring responsibilities | Mentoring responsibilities Not considered | Mentoring responsibilities Of little importance | Mentoring responsibilities Of moderate importance | Mentoring responsibilities Of high importance |
| Services for the research community (e.g. peer-review, editorship of journals) | Services for the research community (e.g. peer-review, editorship of journals) Not considered | Services for the research community (e.g. peer-review, editorship of journals) Of little importance | Services for the research community (e.g. peer-review, editorship of journals) Of moderate importance | Services for the research community (e.g. peer-review, editorship of journals) Of high importance |
| Knowledge transfer and commercialization (e.g. patents, clinical trials, spin-offs) | Knowledge transfer and commercialization (e.g. patents, clinical trials, spin-offs) Not considered | Knowledge transfer and commercialization (e.g. patents, clinical trials, spin-offs) Of little importance | Knowledge transfer and commercialization (e.g. patents, clinical trials, spin-offs) Of moderate importance | Knowledge transfer and commercialization (e.g. patents, clinical trials, spin-offs) Of high importance |
| Participation in conferences | Participation in conferences Not considered | Participation in conferences Of little importance | Participation in conferences Of moderate importance | Participation in conferences Of high importance |
| Public engagement and outreach | Public engagement and outreach Not considered | Public engagement and outreach Of little importance | Public engagement and outreach Of moderate importance | Public engagement and outreach Of high importance |

Other element(s) or comments:

### **Are experts or prospective member/fellows informed of your assessment criteria before they agree to be considered for membership/fellowship?**

### **\*Skip this question if your organisation does *not* assess researchers, experts, or individuals, for any of its activities**

* No, the criteria for assessment are only shared with the review panels.
* Yes, the assessment criteria are shared with prospective members/fellows before the submission process.
* Yes, the assessment criteria are openly shared online.

If the assessment criteria are openly shared online, please share URL:

### **When assessing researchers, for example for membership or fellowship election/selection or any other assessment that looks at researchers’ profiles, are diversity characteristics of applicants considered?**

### **\*Skip this question if your organisation does *not* assess researchers, experts, or individuals, for any of its activities**

|  | Not considered | Considered, but with no impact on the decision | Considered with impact on the decision |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Gender Not considered | Gender Considered, but with no impact on the decision | Gender Considered with impact on the decision |
| Disability | Disability Not considered | Disability Considered, but with no impact on the decision | Disability Considered with impact on the decision |
| Age | Age Not considered | Age Considered, but with no impact on the decision | Age Considered with impact on the decision |
| Career stage | Career stage Not considered | Career stage Considered, but with no impact on the decision | Career stage Considered with impact on the decision |
| Race/Ethnicity | Race/Ethnicity Not considered | Race/Ethnicity Considered, but with no impact on the decision | Race/Ethnicity Considered with impact on the decision |
| Institutional/employer affiliation | Institutional/employer affiliation Not considered | Institutional/employer affiliation Considered, but with no impact on the decision | Institutional/employer affiliation Considered with impact on the decision |

Other or comment:

### **Did your organisation adapt, or consider adapting, its preferred CV format to improve assessment (e.g., narrative CV, capping the number of outputs submitted, etc.)?**

### **\*Skip this question if your organisation does *not* assess researchers, experts, or individuals, for any of its activities**

* No.
* Yes, we are considering this for the near future.
* Yes, we implemented changes.

If yes, please provide a few details on the changes being considered or implemented:

## 7. Researcher Assessment - Review Panels

The next questions look at **review panels**.  
  
By review panels, we mean the individuals who assess and evaluate submissions or potential membership/fellowship candidates.

### **In your organisation, what types of assessors are represented in the review panels (e.g., organisation leaders, organisation members, external members, members of the public, senior researchers, junior researchers, etc.)?**

### **Does your organisation actively promote diversity in review panels within any of the following categories?**

* Gender
* Career stage
* Race/Ethnicity
* Discipline
* Geography
* None of the above
* Other (please specify):

### **Do you provide training to individuals that serve on review and evaluation panels?**

* No.
* No, but panelists receive written guidance.
* Yes, panelists receive training.

If panelists receive guidance or training, please indicate the topics covered in the guidance/training and the format used:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## 8. Researcher Assessment - Experimentation

### **Has your organisation adopted any experimental methods or technologies in assessment, for example lotteries or the use of artificial intelligence for identifying assessment panel members, or for selecting members/fellows?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## 9. Researcher Assessment - Assessment of assessment

**How often does your organisation review its researcher assessment processes?**

* Ad hoc / when need arises
* Periodically every 4+ years
* Periodically every 2-3 years
* Periodically every year or less
* Other (please specify):

### **Who is involved in revising the researcher assessment processes in your organisation?**

* Leaders and senior members of our organisation
* External reviewers who are asked to appraise our assessment processes
* Individuals who have been or are likely to be assessed (e.g. researchers)
* Other (please specify):

## 10. Researcher Assessment - Other topic

### **University ranking exercises or lists are often discussed together with researcher assessment. Does your organisation have a stance on this topic?**

### **Another element often associated with researcher assessment is the precarity and career insecurity of early career researchers. Does your organisation have a stance on this topic?**

### **Looking ahead, what are the priorities for your organisation regarding the future of researcher assessment?**

|  | Low priority | Medium priority | High priority | Already accomplished | Don't Know |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Promoting further discussion of researcher assessment procedures | Promoting further discussion of researcher assessment procedures Low priority | Promoting further discussion of researcher assessment procedures Medium priority | Promoting further discussion of researcher assessment procedures High priority | Promoting further discussion of researcher assessment procedures Already accomplished | Promoting further discussion of researcher assessment procedures Don't Know |
| Changing internal procedures for researcher assessment | Changing internal procedures for researcher assessment Low priority | Changing internal procedures for researcher assessment Medium priority | Changing internal procedures for researcher assessment High priority | Changing internal procedures for researcher assessment Already accomplished | Changing internal procedures for researcher assessment Don't Know |
| Strengthening links with local partners (e.g. research institutions, funders) to coordinate change around researcher assessment | Strengthening links with local partners (e.g. research institutions, funders) to coordinate change around researcher assessment Low priority | Strengthening links with local partners (e.g. research institutions, funders) to coordinate change around researcher assessment Medium priority | Strengthening links with local partners (e.g. research institutions, funders) to coordinate change around researcher assessment High priority | Strengthening links with local partners (e.g. research institutions, funders) to coordinate change around researcher assessment Already accomplished | Strengthening links with local partners (e.g. research institutions, funders) to coordinate change around researcher assessment Don't Know |
| Strengthening links with international partners to coordinate change around researcher assessment | Strengthening links with international partners to coordinate change around researcher assessment Low priority | Strengthening links with international partners to coordinate change around researcher assessment Medium priority | Strengthening links with international partners to coordinate change around researcher assessment High priority | Strengthening links with international partners to coordinate change around researcher assessment Already accomplished | Strengthening links with international partners to coordinate change around researcher assessment Don't Know |
| Joining established international coalitions such as CoARA | Joining established international coalitions such as CoARA Low priority | Joining established international coalitions such as CoARA Medium priority | Joining established international coalitions such as CoARA High priority | Joining established international coalitions such as CoARA Already accomplished | Joining established international coalitions such as CoARA Don't Know |

Other:

## 11. Final remarks

### **Are there any further points you would like to raise with us?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### **In the coming months, we will invite a select number of IAP, GYA and ISC members to participate in online interviews and focus groups to discuss their approach to researcher assessment. Please indicate if you are willing to contribute to these further discussions.**

* I am willing to be contacted

Contact email:

END OF SURVEY