

ACUMEN

academic careers understood through measurement and norms

Deliverable Title	D7.4 Midterm External Review
Dissemination Level	PU
Work Package	WP7 - ACUMEN Management
Version	1.0
Release Date	31 January 2012
Author(s)	organization: Clifford Tatum and Paul Wouters report: Hinze, Rafols, and Sivertsen
Project Website	http://research-acumen.eu/

European Commission
7th Framework Programme
SP4 - Capacities
Science in Society 2010
Grant Agreement: 266632



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION



Academic Careers Understood through Measurement and Norms (ACUMEN)

1st review, January 2012

Reviewers

Sybille Hinze, Institut für Forschungsinformation und Qualitätssicherung (iFQ), Berlin

Gunnar Sivertsen, NIFU, Oslo

Ismael Rafols, SPRU, University of Sussex, Brighton

Context of review

On 11th and 12th of January 2012, we (the reviewers) attended a project meeting held in Tallinn. The meeting aimed to update and coordinate the teams participating in the project on the progress made within the first year of work. During the project meeting, we had the opportunity to observe group presentations and discussion, and to ask questions and comment on the project development.

Report and recommendations

The project is still at an early stage. Many materials are still in a draft form. Thus, from our point of view, a detailed evaluation of the outcomes does not seem appropriate. Instead, we will focus on what was presented and discussed during the project meeting and give an impression of our overall perception of the work in progress. We furthermore would like to draw attention to some issues that were either not sufficiently clear to us, and that may benefit from further awareness.

Before the meeting we received the description of work as well as a list of deliverables and milestones. According to the overall schedule deliverables due at the time of the project review were related to WP1, the literature review as well as the survey both relating to the identifying and assessing evaluation methods. The following report takes note of what was presented during the two day project meeting.

The project meeting in Tallinn was well organized, well attended and all teams provided comprehensive presentations on the progress they have made so far and their future research agenda. The project appears to be very well managed and the project coordinator (CWTS Leiden) conveys a clear sense of leadership. The project timetable appears to be roughly in line with the outlined schedule and planned deliverables. There seems to be only minor delays in some of the WPs which are in accordance with the usual inertia during the first year of a three year project. All participants were made aware of these delays and potential consequences for following WPs were openly discussed and addressed.

Some administrative problems related to contractual instability in one of the host organizations (TH Wildau) were mentioned, but these did not impact the pursue of the work. Contributions and deliveries were provided as expected. ACUMEN management took notice of the difficulties and showed resolution in addressing them. Hence, there is no concern that these organizational difficulties may hinder the overall project.

Presentations were given by all WPs. As to be expected based on the overall schedule for the project, the progress made so far differs across the WPs. Substantial progress was made in various WPs. Some WPs already produced specific outcomes (e.g. in WP 1 the results of an online survey, WP2, study on the web presence of academics, or WP3, literature review on altmetrics). Other WP showed a clear planning of the research activities (e.g. in WP1, peer review, the careful design of interviews on career evaluation).

In all individual WPs we find that their contextualization and purpose within the project, as well as their contribution to reaching the overall objective of the project and their (inter)relation with other WPs, needs to be made more explicit. The relations between the WPs are clearly stated in the proposal and need to be followed through also when presenting first results. From our point of view, this could be easily accomplished through team interaction.

In particular we had the impression that the project would benefit from a more explicit sharing across the teams of the conceptual framework and theoretical underpinnings of the proposal. In the meeting we observed some ambiguities in the focus.

Evaluations of individual researchers take place in different contexts with different requirements, criteria and possible outcomes, e.g. as career evaluation (within an academic unit) or in project selection (in a funding organization). The project may need an analysis of these different contexts, as well as a more definite outline of selection criteria, e.g. why certain contexts were taken into account or why certain disciplines or countries were selected for more detailed analysis.

An analysis of the modes of communication and valorization of research may also be needed (research communication may be internal vs. external to science, and informal vs. formal).

The shared data strategy of the project results in a focus on four disciplines in some of the WPs: Astronomy & Astrophysics, Public Health, Environmental Engineering, Philosophy (incl. History and Philosophy of Science). In the operationalization of the disciplines in specific data sets, one needs to ensure that the disciplines are adequately represented, especially with regard to the humanities and social sciences.

Evaluation of individual performance is a highly relevant but also controversially discussed issue and thus, we would encourage the project to explicitly discuss the ethical issues involved in the evaluation of individuals and the potential use and abuse of certain indicators and information sources. The project has a communication strategy that will become important in this respect, already before the project is finalized. Communication with other experts would be advisable (e.g. the scientometrics and the research information systems communities), as well as with wider stakeholders, such as learned societies and research councils.

All in all, we are confident that the project is in good progress and should receive continued support.

Paul Wouters <p.f.wouters@cwts.leidenuniv.nl>

21 November 2011 17:50

To: Gunnar Sivertsen , Cc: Tatum III, C.C. <c.c.tatum@cwts.leidenuniv.nl>

ACUMEN

Dear Professor Sivertsen, dear Gunnar,

I am writing to inquire about your interest and availability to serve as external reviewer for Academic Careers Understood through Measurements and Norms (ACUMEN). ACUMEN is a 3-year, European FP7 research collaboration with nine institutional partners throughout Europe (see: <http://research-acumen.eu/>). The review committee will be comprised of 2-3 reviewers that are peers, but not part of the project.

As we approach the end of the first year, we are organizing this review to coincide with our next project review and coordination meeting. This meeting will be held on 11 January, in Tallinn, Estonia. Tallinn is the location of the Archimedes Foundation, one of the ACUMEN partners. We have scheduled a review of key deliverables and milestones, as well as early research results. As such, this event would provide a condensed overview of the project, process, and participants.


Please let us know if you are in principle interested and available to serve as external reviewer for the ACUMEN project. Depending on your proximity to Tallinn, Estonia, participation may require travel on 10 January to facilitate attendance during the full agenda on 11 January. Travel and accommodations will be organized by ACUMEN and cost will be covered by the ACUMEN budget.

Please reply to Clifford Tatum, ACUMEN Project Manager, with your availability and/or any questions you may have. <c.c.tatum@cwts.leidenuniv.nl>

Best regards,
Paul Wouters
Professor of Scientometrics
Director Centre for Science and Technology Studies
Leiden University

Visiting address:
Willem Einthoven Building
Wassenaarseweg 62A
2333 AL Leiden
Mail address: P.O. Box 905
2300 AX Leiden
T: +31 71 5273909 (secr.)
F: +31 71 5273911
E: p.f.wouters@cwts.leidenuniv.nl

CWTS home page: www.cwts.nl
Blog about Citation Cultures: <http://citationculture.wordpress.com/>
Research Dreams: www.researchdreams.nl

Clifford Tatum <c.c.tatum@cwts.leidenuniv.nl> 
 To: Gunnar Sivertsen , Cc: Paul Wouters
 ACUMEN Review: materials and travel information

28 November 2011 16:01

Dear Professor Sivertsen,

In this email you will find materials about the ACUMEN project, an overview of the meeting program in Tallinn, Estonia, and a request for information needed to prepare your travel and accommodation.

ACUMEN Project Information:

The following materials about the ACUMEN project are provided as background information for review prior to the meeting in Tallinn.

1. rationale and description of work
2. list of deliverables and milestones
3. integrated schedule and dependency chart

On a related topic, I am still working out an appropriate review protocol for this stage of the project. Details to follow at a later date.

Program Outline:

11 January, 09:30 - 17:00: The first day we will begin with an overview of the data strategy (milestone 1). Work package leaders will then present progress on deliverables and preliminary research results for each of the work packages. The final session of the day will be a review of the portfolio components (milestone 2).

12 January, 10:00 - 15:00: The second day we will organize an open symposium with participation from local researchers interested in research assessment (broadly defined) or related work. This event serves as an opportunity for networking and is part of the ongoing ACUMEN dissemination plan. As such, we would welcome short presentations from the review committee members.

Travel and Accommodations:

The meetings will be held at the Park Inn by Radisson Central Tallinn Hotel, which is also where we will stay. The Leiden University travel office will organize (and pay for) your return travel and hotel reservations. To facilitate this I need some information (see below).

The program in Tallinn is organized so you can arrive on 10 January, the day before the meeting and return home 12 January, after the symposium. Please provide the following:

- your city and preferred airport or train station
- preferred time of departure flight on 10 January
- preferred time of return flight on 12 January
- also, please send a scan or copy of your passport (name page only)

Please let me know if you have any questions about the above information.

Best regards,

Clifford

--
 Clifford Tatum
 Project Manager, ACUMEN
 Centre for Science and Technology Studies
 Leiden University, the Netherlands
c.c.tatum@cwts.leidenuniv.nl
<http://research-acumen.eu/>
 +31 6 3960 5311



[1-ACUMEN....pdf \(844 KB\)](#)



[2-ACUMEN....pdf \(327 KB\)](#)

ACUMEN - Integrated Plan (Updated - 03 October 2011)

Milestones

	Due	Milestone	Lead Beneficiary	Comments	Content (specific tasks)
MS1	jun '11	Data Strategy	University of Wolverhampton - UK (4)	consistency and quality of ACUMEN dataset	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6
MS2	feb '12	Portfolio Components	eHumanities Group - Amsterdam (9)	Identify candidates for ACUMEN Portfolio	WP1, WP4
MS3	feb '13	Individual metrics	RSLIS - Denmark (8)	new indicators tested on ACUMEN dataset	WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5
MS4	oct '13	Portfolio Course	Bar-Ilan University - Israel (2)	test teaching portfolio	WP6
MS5	feb '14	ACUMEN Portfolio	Leiden University - Leiden (1)	the proof of the pudding	WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6

Integrated Schedule

	Meetings	f2f	vid	vid	f2f	vid	vid	vid	f2f	vid	vid	vid	vid	f2f																						
Events					rv 1				rv 2					ws	dm																					
Milestones			ms1			ms2				ms3				ms4	ms5																					
project month	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36

month by name		mar	apr	may	jun	jul	aug	sep	oct	nov	dec	'12	feb	mar	apr	may	jun	jul	aug	sep	oct	nov	dec	'13	feb	mar	apr	may	jun	jul	aug	sep	oct	nov	dec	'14	feb				
D7.1	Dissemination report																																								
	develop/implement																																								
D7.2	ACUMEN website																																								
	develop/implement																																								
D1.3	New evaluation Methods				ms1								ms2																											ms5	
T 1.1	Literature review																																								
T 1.2	Survey																																								
D7.4	Mid-term External Review																																								
	organize review event																																								
D2.5	Portfolio Model				ms1																				ms3															ms5	
T 2.1	Web presence																																								
T 2.2	Web bibliography																																								
T 2.3	Web indicators																																								
D3.6	Web 2.0 Guidelines				ms1																				ms3															ms5	
T 3.1	literature reviews																																								
T 3.2	analysis of Web discussions																																								
T 3.3	content analysis																																								
T 3.4	methods for data collection																																								
D7.7	External Review																																								
	organize review event																																								
D5.8	Novel bibliometric indicators				ms1																				ms3																ms5
T 5.1	Literature review																																								
T 5.2	novel bibliometric indicators																																								
T 5.3	Selection of two samples																																								
T 5.4	Analysis of the consequences																																								
D7.10	graduate school demo																																								
T 7.4	organize grad school event																																								
D6.9	Expert workshop proceedings				ms1								ms2																												ms5
	workshop event planning																																								
D1.11	Evaluation impact				ms1								ms2																												ms5
T 1.3	eval and academic labour																																								
T 1.4	develop Criteria																																								
D2.12	Sample Web indicators				ms1																				ms3																ms5
T 2.4	Highly cited scientists																																								
T 2.5	Measurement and analysis																																								
D4.13	Gender effects of new evaluation indicators				ms1																				ms3																ms5
T 4.1	literature reviews																																								
T 4.2	survey design																																								
T 4.3	Integration of data from WPs																																								
T 4.4	Statistical analysis																																								
T 4.5	performance indicators																																								
T 4.6	guidelines and criteria																																								
D6.14	Portfolio guidelines				ms1								ms2																											ms4	ms5
T 6.1	coordinate sample strategies in the WPs																																								
T 6.2	integrate data and analyses from WPs																																								
T 6.3	coordinate exchange of conclusions, integrate																																								
T 6.4	test guidelines (multi-disciplinary workshop)																																								

Legend	
[light blue box]	coordination meetings
[blue box]	events
[red box]	milestones
[purple box]	deliverable duration
[green box]	deliverable due date
[light purple box]	task activity
[grey box]	vid video conference
[dark purple box]	rv Program Review
[light green box]	ws workshop (multi-disciplinary test)
[light grey box]	dm demo (grad school event)