Driving Institutional Change for Research Assessment Reform

Breakout Sessions
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Applying systems thinking to research assessment reform

Research assessment reform involves multiple stakeholders, including funders, research institutes, libraries, publishers, and researchers. How can stakeholders work together to implement change in research assessment practices? What do different stakeholder groups need from each other to succeed?

Breakout session topics are inspired by the ideas presented in the participant commentaries. Participants will self-select into groups of no less than six and no more than eight people Wednesday morning.

Room	Breakout topics	Discussion leader(s)
D113	What is the right balance between top-down and bottom-up approaches for research assessment reform?	Diego Baptista (Wellcome) Connie Lee (University of Chicago)
D115	How might we use an institution's stated values as a starting point to improve research assessment policies and align them with practices?	Erin McKiernan (UNAM)
D116	Building trust in policies and practices—how do researchers know that research institutions and funders really mean what they say?	Dave Carr (Wellcome) Prachee Avasthi (University of Kansas Medical Center)
D124	How can scholarly societies lead from the outside to influence research assessment reform?	Erika Shugart (ASCB) Brooks Hanson (AGU)
D125	What can departments and institutions do to improve the triage phase of assessment for faculty searches?	Lee Ligon (RIT) Sandy Schmid (UT Southwestern Medical Center)
South Lounge	Where do university rankings fit into research assessment reform?	Stephen Curry (Imperial College)
North Lounge	How can departments, institutions, and funders evaluate contributions to team science?	Sue Biggins (Fred Hutch) Miriam Kip (BIH QUEST Center For Transforming Biomedical Research)
C123	How might we improve equity and inclusion in academia (e.g. by examining how models of scarcity and exclusivity influence our current research assessment practices and concepts of rigor)?	Needhi Bhalla (UC Santa Cruz) Olivia Rissland (Colorado)
N140	What do preprints need to be more useful in evaluation?	Jessica Polka (ASAPBio)

Driving Institutional Change for Research Assessment Reform
Breakout Sessions
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Discussion leader instructions:

- Point out the session will be held under **Chatham House Rule**, which states, "When a meeting, or part thereof, is held under the **Chatham House Rule**, participants are free to use the information received, but neither the identity nor the affiliation of the speaker(s), nor that of any other participant, may be revealed." This means that any information shared in breakout sessions may NOT be attributed to the speaker.
- Designate a note-taker, whose responsibilities will include:
  - Record who participated in the breakout group (name, affiliation)
  - Take notes and record the discussion
  - Briefly summarize (<5min) the breakout session discussion to the all participants immediately after the session.
  - Send notes to Anna Hatch, DORA Community Manager (ahatch@ascb.org) by Friday, October 25.
- Remind participants that everyone should contribute. We would like you to help create an atmosphere where everyone feels welcome to speak openly and honestly. For example, if one person or a small group of people is dominating the conversation, ask other participants what they think to bring new ideas into the conversation.
- Ask participants to briefly introduce themselves: name, affiliation, and position.
- Introduce your specific breakout topic to the group. There are four general steps to the discussion. Aim to spend 20-25 minute per step.
- **Step 1**. Mapping and understanding the system
  - Who are the relevant stakeholders? Use table attached for note-taking.
  - For each stakeholder that is identified by the breakout group, record their espoused purpose as well as any "hidden" priorities they might have. For example, scholarly publishers espoused purpose is to disseminate research, but a "hidden" priority for them would be the need to make a profit.
- **Step 2**. Understanding the current reality
  - Where are we now? Outline the current state-of-play related to your topic. Don't forget to highlight emerging good practices, if any. Also note what policies, practices, and attitudes prevent change keeping in mind the different stakeholders.
- **Step 3**. Creating a shared vision
  - What do you want the future to look like? Identify key outcomes the group would like to see.
- **Step 4**. Bridging the gap between where we are now and where we want to go
  - Ideate strategies to help achieve a shared vision. What action(s) would each stakeholder group need to take? In what ways, would stakeholder groups need to coordinate their efforts?

Driving Institutional Change for Research Assessment Reform

Breakout Sessions

Wednesday, October 23, 2019

Step 1. Mapping and understanding the system.

Stakeholder	Purpose	Hidden priority