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How did Imperial come to sign DORA?

Impact factors declared unfit for duty
Posted on May 16, 2013 by Stephen

Regulars at this blog will be familiar with the dim view that I have of impact factors, in particular their mis-appropriation for the evaluation of individual researchers and their work. I have argued for their elimination, in part because they act as a brake on the roll-out of open access publishing but mostly because of the corrosive effect they have on science and scientists.
How did Imperial come to sign DORA?

Imperial College professor Stefan Grimm ‘was given grant income target’

Emails with manager reveal details of review placed on academic found dead in September

December 3, 2014

By Chris Parz

Twitter: @ChrisParz

A researcher at Imperial College London who was found dead in September had been told he was “struggling to fulfil the metrics” of a professorial post at the

March to Stefan Grimm, who died in 2015.

... the details of his process, which includes an “attributable share” of £200,000 per year in research funding and being one programme grant as principal investigator in the following 12

Application and Consistency of Approach in the Use of Performance Metrics

A report by the Associate Provost [Institutional Affairs]

December 2015

1 Introduction

1.1 In their review of performance management policies at the College, which was presented at Provost’s Board in February 2015, the Director of HR and the (then) Senior Consul noted that:

“... a number of concerns were raised ... about the application and consistency of approach in the use of performance metrics in academia and in the College.”

As a result, the Provost asked the Associate Provost [Institutional Affairs] to convene a small team to undertake a review of the application of performance metrics for academic staff at Imperial College, the recommendations to be submitted for consideration by Provost’s Board. It was subsequently agreed by the Provost to restrict this review to academic staff (Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, Readers and Professors) and to consider other academic researchers (PDRAs, Research Fellows and perhaps others), who are of major importance to the College but who nevertheless have their own (and different) concerns, at a later date.

https://www.imperial.ac.uk/research-and-innovation/about-imperial-research/research-evaluation/
Imperial signed DORA in 2017: then what?

- College signed DORA in Jan 2017
- DORA implementation working group convened
- Report approved in Dec 2017
  - Changed language in adverts, job descriptions, and guidance on hiring, promotion & funding procedures
  - Communication: workshop

“We recognise that establishing a transparent, evidence-based processes of staff evaluation as part of a culture that aims to be fully inclusive will take time.

Signing the declaration is intended to empower staff to challenge any instances of practice that deviate from the goal of ensuring that research assessment practices are as rigorous as possible.”
Imperial signed DORA in 2017: then what?

https://youtu.be/IpKyN-cXHL4

One-day workshop: Mapping the Future of Research Assessment at Imperial (Sept 2019)
Our research culture

Message from the Vice-Provost (Research and Enterprise)

Our strategy is a call to action to everyone at Imperial – staff and students – who believes that the dignity and individuality of every other person here should be respected and cherished.

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Strategy

Executive summary
Why the initiatives at Imperial are important
Current work in College
Area of the Strategy

Download an overview of our strategy, inclusive excellence
2012/2013

Working Together Task Group

The Working Together Task Group (WTG) was established in January 2007 with a specific focus on listening to our community and delivering concrete proposals that will help to tackle the concerns raised by staff and students.

The task group is led by the Provost, Professor Ian Walmsley, and includes 12 members from all areas of the College, the student body and staff. It appointed two sub-committees to conduct initial investigations, which are reported to the task group.

The task group is supported by an external independent advisor, Dr. Jane Boulter, who has extensive experience of supporting positive change in complex institutions, including universities and the NHS. The task group is working to develop new initiatives that will help to meet the challenges we face.

Membership
- N.K. et al., Director of Research, Imperial College
- O.K. et al., Director of Life Sciences, Imperial College
- H.K. et al., Director of Health Sciences, Imperial College
- J.K. et al., Director of Engineering and Physical Sciences, Imperial College

League tables

Imperial College London is rated as one of the world’s best universities.

This page includes a selection of overviews from the latest worldwide university rankings. These results reflect the performance of departments within the College. Imperial College London is one of the world's leading universities, consistently ranked in the top ten universities globally.
We need to re-imagine how we do research

Why we need to reimagine how we do research

Jeremy Farrar
Director
Wellcome

The emphasis on excellence in the research system is stifling diverse thinking and positive behaviours. As a community we can rethink our approach to research culture to achieve excellence in all we do.

The relentless drive for research excellence has created a culture in modern science that cares exclusively about what is achieved and not about how it is achieved.

People tell me about instances of destructive hyper-competition, toxic power dynamics and poor leadership behaviour – leading to a corresponding deterioration in researchers’ wellbeing. We need to cultivate, reward, and encourage the best while challenging what is wrong.

We know that Wellcome has helped to create this focus on excellence. Our aim has rightly been to support research with the potential to benefit society. But I believe that we now also have an important role to play in changing and improving the prevailing research culture. A culture in which, however unintentionally, it can be hard to be kind.

https://wellcome.ac.uk/news/why-we-need-reimagine-how-we-do-research

10 September 2019
The intersections between DORA, open scholarship, and equity

August 18, 2020

Introduction

The San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), published in May 2013, does not mention the term 'open scholarship.' And yet DORA and open scholarship are becoming increasingly entwined. DORA's ambition is to improve research evaluation practices but the practicalities of implementation make it impossible to separate the evaluation of research from questions about who and what research is for, who gets to be involved, and how it should best be carried out, all of which have to take account of the power dynamics that shape the scholarly landscape. Equally, progress towards open scholarship, which aims to make the products and processes of academic work as...
The bigger picture: understanding the real-world constraints on change

External and internal drivers, each reasonable by its own terms, conspire to create a toxic brew

Individual actors (funders, universities, researchers) are constrained by competitive forces
DORA: the declaration

One general recommendation:

**Do not** use journal-based metrics, such as Journal Impact Factors, as a *surrogate measure* of the quality of individual research articles, to assess an individual scientist’s contributions, or in hiring, promotion, or funding decisions.

17 **positive** recommendations for different stakeholders:

- funders
- institutions
- publishers
- data providers
- researchers

For institutions:

4. **Be explicit about the criteria** used to reach hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions, clearly highlighting, especially for early-stage investigators, that the *scientific content of a paper is much more important than publication metrics* or the identity of the journal in which it was published.

5. For the purposes of research assessment, **consider the value and impact of all research outputs** (including datasets and software) in addition to research publications, and **consider a broad range of impact measures** including qualitative indicators of research impact, such as influence on policy and practice.

[https://sfdora.org/read/](https://sfdora.org/read/)
DORA: the organisation

- **sfdora.org**
- Launched in 2013
- >17,600 individuals and >2,200 organisations have signed
- From 2017: significant new financial support
  - 1.2 members of staff (plus an intern)
  - International steering group & a global advisory board (all volunteers)

---

**Member Organizations**

**Visionary**
- HHMI Howard Hughes Medical Institute
- SNSF Swiss National Science Foundation

**Sustainer**
- ASCB American Society for Cell Biology
- CANCER RESEARCH UK
- Company of Biologists
- eLife

**Supporter**
- EMBO European Molecular Biology Organization
- HHMI Howard Hughes Medical Institute
- Luxembourg Medical Research Fund
- PLOS Public Library of Science

---

19,612 individuals and institutions have signed our declaration.
DORA: Steering Committee, Advisory Board and Staff

Steering Committee

- David Carr, Welcome
- Stephen Curry, Chair, Imperial College London
- Michael Hill, Swiss National Science Foundation
- Matt Kaiser, Cancer Research UK
- Stuart King, eLife
- Catrinna MacCallum, Hindawi
- Eric McKeeman, National Autonomous University of Mexico
- Dan Morgan, PLOS
- Clare Moulton, The Company of Biologist
- Bend Pulverer, EMBO
- Marc Schiltz, Luxembourg National Research Fund
- Erika Shugart, American Society for Cell Biology
- Bede Stern, Howard Hughes Medical Institute

Advisory Board

- Giney Barbour, Chair, Queensland University of Technology, Australia
- José Pío Beltrán, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC), in Valencia, Spain
- Needhi Bhalla, University of California, Santa Cruz, United States
- Leslie Chan, University of Toronto Scarborough, Canada
- Kelly Cobey, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Canada
- Christian Gonzalez-Billaut, Universidad de Chile, Chile
- Yukiko Gotoh, The University of Tokyo, Japan
- Kristina Hormia-Poutanen, National Library of Finland, Finland
- Rebecca Lawrence, F1000, United Kingdom
- Xiaoxuan Li, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China
- Satyajit Mayer, National Centre for Biological Science (TIFR), India
- Valerie Mizrahi, University of Capetown, South Africa
- Ahmed Ogunlaja, Open Access Nigeria, Nigeria
- Laura Rovelli, El Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales (CLACSO), Argentina
- Judith Sutz, Universidad de la República, Uruguay
- Rhoda Vianyenze, Makerere University School of Public Health, Uganda

Staff

- Anna Hatch, Program Director
- Hailey Hazlett, Policy Intern
- Helen Sitar, Community Coordinator
DORA: our roadmap for action

- Recruit more signatories
- Extend the global and disciplinary impact of DORA
- Develop and promote best practice in research assessment

Framework for action:
- understand the obstacles to changes in the way research is assessed
- experiment with different approaches
- create a shared vision when revising policies and practices
- communicate that vision on campus and beyond

More info & resources at: https://sfdora.org/
DORA: building and promoting new tools and processes for evaluation

[Diagram and text discussing research assessment ideas and tools]

https://sfдора.org/resources/
**DORA: we collaborate on tools and policies**

**Royal Society - Resumé for Researchers**

Opening up conversations about researcher evaluation

Resumé for Researchers has been created to support the evaluation of individuals’ varied contributions to research. Find out more about the background to the tool in our blog.

**Module 1 – How have you contributed to the generation of knowledge?**

This module can be used to explain how you have contributed to the generation of new ideas and hypotheses and which key skills you have used to develop ideas and test hypotheses. It can be used to highlight how you have communicated on your ideas and research results, both written and verbally, the funding you have won and any awards that you have received. It can include a small selection of outputs, with a description of why they are of particular relevance and why they are considered in the context of knowledge generation. Outputs can include open data sets, software, publications, commercial, entrepreneurial or industrial products, clinical practice developments, educational products, policy publications, evidence synthesis pieces and conference publications that you have generated. Where outputs have a DOI please only include this.

**Module 2 - How have you contributed to the development of individuals?**

**Module 3 - How have you contributed to the wider research community?**

**Module 4 - How have you contributed to broader society?**

https://royalsociety.org/topics-policy/projects/research-culture/tools-for-support/resume-for-researchers/

---

**Welcome Trust – implementing DORA principles**

**Guidance for research organisations on how to implement the principles of the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment**

The draft guidance below provides information for Wellcome-funded organisations on how to implement the core principles of the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA).

We want to hear your comments and feedback on this guidance, before we publish an updated and final version in spring 2020. Fill in our short survey by 17:00 GMT, 24 February 2020.

On this page
- The DORA principles
- What we expect
- Three areas to consider
- Background

https://wellcome.ac.uk/how-we-work/open-research/guidance-research-organisations-how-implement-dora-principles
DORA: sharing good practice
DORA: case studies

Reimagining academic assessment: stories of innovation and change

Case studies of universities and national consortia highlight key elements of institutional change to improve academic career assessment.
“the purpose of RRA is to improve research, in cultures, in practices and in products.”

RRA is “an umbrella term for approaches to assessment which incentivise, reflect and reward the plural characteristics of high-quality research, in support of diverse and inclusive research cultures.”

“Opening up the range of contributions that are recognised as valuable will also be an important step towards detoxifying the hyper-competitive culture which, by fixating on stunted measures and proxies for success, is eroding the sustainability of research systems, degrading researcher wellbeing, and maintaining barriers that exclude women and other under-represented groups.”
Thank you

s.curry@imperial.ac.uk
@Stephen_Curry