

Please note that both the EoI and Full Proposal will be submitted via an online form with text fields, without the option to upload a file. Access to the EoI form will be provided from 06-04-2023 onwards by the CoARA secretariat to your Point of Contact. Same procedure for the Full Proposal form at a later date.

Annex I – Call for Working Groups

Please note: Fields marked with an asterisk (1-13) need to be completed at the Call for Expression of Interest stage. The remaining fields will need to be completed for full proposals.

Only for full proposals: Title of the submitted Expression(s) of Interest related to this proposal	
1. Working Group title *:	Open Science and centralized and administrative <u>evaluation of research</u> : an odd couple?
2. Issues to be addressed*: 50 words max.	Could a centralized and administrative assessment of research, which evaluates its "products" in a zero-sum game, be made compatible with Open Science? Can openness and cooperation be more than lip service when the evaluation agency is appointed by the government and encourages competition rather than cooperation?
3. Main keyword*:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changing culture
4. Second keyword (optional):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open Science
5. Contact details of the lead scientific proposer (can be different from the organisation's designated Point of Contact)	Name, department, and e-mail
6. I confirm that my organisation is a member of CoARA and that I have the authority to submit the proposal on behalf of my organisation and on behalf of the organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes

mentioned in point 7 below*:	
7. List of at least 3 (Eols)/5 (full proposals) member organisations proposing the Working Group*:	AISA – Associazione italiana per la promozione della scienza aperta; Università di Milano-Bicocca (Department of Human Sciences for Education "R. Massa") – University of Trento
8. Short description of the mission and objectives of the group, and of how it fits with the overall CoARA vision*: <i>200 words max.</i>	<p>Some national research assessment models are administrative, centralized, and heavily dependent on bibliometrics computed from proprietary databases (such as Scopus and Clarivate Analytics) in the STM fields and sometimes also in the SSH. Moreover, in such models, the research assessment agency is conceived as a referee in a zero-sum game, forcing universities and research organizations into an endless competition, since the "winners" are financed with the money taken from the "losers".. In such a situation, how can Open Science become part of the research process, if the very evaluation game they are forced to play makes cooperation useless, if not harmful?</p> <p>We therefore need to rethink both the legitimacy and the powers of national assessment agencies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. how should an evaluation agency evolve to encourage researchers to cooperate openly, rather than behaving like employees struggling to publish as many papers as possible and to game a system imposed on them without their consent? 2. which laws and regulations on administrative evaluation would need to be changed to implement the COARA agreement? 3. how to build a public, sustainable research infrastructure to make research independent of private, proprietary powers?
9. Agreement core commitment(s) the implementation of which is supported by the group*:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Base research assessment primarily on qualitative evaluation for which peer-review is central, supported by responsible use of quantitative indicators</i> 2. <i>Avoid the use of rankings of research organisations in research assessment</i>
10. Agreement supporting commitment(s) the	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. <i>Review and develop research assessment criteria, tools</i>

<p>implementation of which is supported by the group (optional):</p>	<p><i>and processes</i></p> <p>3.1. <i>With the direct involvement of research organisations and researchers at all career stages, review and develop criteria for assessing research units and research performing organisations, while promoting interoperability</i></p> <p>3.2. <i>With the direct involvement of researchers at all career stages, review and develop criteria, tools and processes for the assessment of research projects, research teams and researchers that are adapted to their context of application</i></p>
<p>11. Type of group*:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Interest community</i>
<p>12. Expected impact notably expected adoption and implementation scenarios*: <i>300 words max</i></p>	<p>1. identifying which administrative research assessment agencies and which purposes of the administrative research assessment exercises are inconsistent with the openness and collaboration required by the practice of open science.</p> <p>2. Identifying which laws and regulations should be changed to integrate open science into the research process.</p> <p>3. Suggesting how a research assessment agency should encourage researchers to cooperate openly rather than train them to behave like employees struggling to produce as many papers as possible and (possibly) to game a system that is imposed on them without their consent.</p> <p>4. Addressing the issue of the private influence exerted on researchers by data analysis giants such as Google, Elsevier or Clarivate Analytics and designing a public and pluralistic infrastructure (in the spirit of Plan I, for example).</p> <p>5. Identifying and sharing good practices</p>
<p>13. Added value of the Working Group over and above what is currently being done within the community*: <i>300 words max</i></p>	<p>How should research assessment be reformed to recognize the diversity of research activities and to overcome the inflation of papers and the conformism encouraged by the “publish or perish” model? Such a topic has been extensively developed by COARA.</p> <p>On the other hand, very little has been said on the scientific legitimacy and purpose of the administrative and centralized</p>

	<p>research assessment agencies that are so common in some EU countries. It may therefore be worth asking whether, in such countries, recommending a shift from bibliometrics to peer review and from closed to open science may be sufficient to reform their research assessment systems.</p> <p>1. How can peer review be truly among “peers” if the peers are under the control of a central authority appointed by the government?</p> <p>2. How can open science be open, pluralistic and cooperative if the game of administrative evaluation of research is designed as a zero-sum game (<i>mors tua, vita mea</i>)?</p>
14. Work plan and outputs / deliverables, that can be accomplished within the timeline proposed (max. 2 years): <i>600 words max</i>	
15. Proposed membership structure, involving organisations of different types and sizes, and from different geographical areas, and include a wide range of experience levels: <i>300 words max</i>	
16. Envisaged co-chairs leading the Working Group, representing different types of organisations and countries/regions:	
17. Mechanisms to ensure that a broader range of CoARA member organisations, including from outside Europe, contribute to and benefit from the Working Group work: <i>250 words max</i>	
18. Envisaged support needed from the Secretariat and resources expected to be provided in-kind by Working	

Group members:

100 words max

*Please note: this will be
provided for information only
and will not be evaluated by
the CoARA Steering Board.*