





# Responsible Research Assessment and DORA


Anna Hatch, PhD  
Program Director

 [sfdora.org](https://sfdora.org)  
 [@DORAssessment](https://twitter.com/DORAssessment)

# Why is research assessment reform difficult to solve?



# Motivation for the SPACE rubric

<b>RETHINKING RESEARCH ASSESSMENT</b> <b>SPACE TO EVOLVE ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT</b> <small>A RUBRIC FOR ANALYZING INSTITUTIONAL PROGRESS INDICATORS AND CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESS</small> 			
Research and researcher assessment is a systems challenge, suggesting that institutions that prioritize developing infrastructures to support their efforts may be better positioned to achieve their goals than those focused only on individual solutions.			
	<b>FROM FOUNDATION...</b> <small>Core definitions and shared clarity of purpose</small>	<b>TO EXPANSION...</b> <small>Increased traction and capacity development</small>	<b>TO SCALING</b> <small>Accelerated uptake and continuous improvement</small>
<b>STANDARDS FOR SCHOLARSHIP</b> <small>How are new definitions of "quality scholarship" formulated and applied?</small>	<b>ALIGNMENT ON VALUES AND GOALS</b> <small>THE PROBLEM STATE</small> Standards are explicitly designed and articulated to align with institutional mission and vision, such as increasing equity and support for traditionally underrepresented, marginalized groups New standards for scholarship consider the balance across research, teaching, and service contributions (e.g., training, mentoring and good citizenship) Specific definitions and standards of "quality" with regard to scholarship are articulated and shared across disciplines and management/organizational centers	<b>DIVERSIFICATION OF STANDARDS</b> <small>THE PROBLEM STATE</small> Scholarship is assessed using diverse indicators (e.g., societal impact, width of assessment in a full host of work: scholarly articles, and those not subject to a peer review contribution) Indicators of quality recognize non-individualized activities and accomplishments (i.e., team science) New indicators of "scholarship" are designed across the full range of institutional disciplines	<b>ADOPTION OF NEW PRACTICES</b> <small>THE PROBLEM STATE</small> Faculty have the ability to maintain success measures to reflect their research interests and goals New standards, definitions, and criteria for reflecting the quality and impact of scholarship are integrated into the language and processes of new assessment practices
<b>PROCESS MECHANICS AND POLICIES</b> <small>How are new practices incorporated into existing structures, processes, and institutional policies?</small>	<b>REINFORCING EXISTING JUDGMENTS</b> <small>THE PROBLEM STATE</small> Meaningful and appropriately rigorous qualitative structures for academic assessment, such as narrative CVs, are given due weight Structures and processes are applied consistently across assessment activities, taking into consideration alternate paths and starting points Use of new assessment mechanisms extend beyond traditional evaluation contexts into ensuring equitable opportunities, mentoring, and retention to increase research and research diversity	<b>CAPACITY TO SUPPORT NEW ACTIVITIES</b> <small>THE PROBLEM STATE</small> Training in the goals and procedures of assessment processes and practices are accessible and continually maintained Institutions design processes take into account the resource capacity of committee members to effectively adopt new assessment practices, such as additional hours on time Institutions have designated senior faculty or others to ensure faculty capacity for new assessment practices and principles	<b>INTEGRATION INTO EXISTING SYSTEMS</b> <small>THE PROBLEM STATE</small> Assessment mechanics can be flexibly applied and adapted to accommodate diverse disciplines Mechanisms to support practices are codified and written into institutional policies New processes and policies are seamlessly integrated successfully adopted
<b>ACCOUNTABILITY</b> <small>How are individuals and institutions held liable for maintaining or new assessment practices?</small>	<b>TRANSPARENCY AND CLARITY OF GOALS</b> <small>THE PROBLEM STATE</small> The goals, principles, and practices of academic assessment and means, processes, and metrics (PPT) activities are transparent and clearly articulated, and agreed upon by all participants Institutions have clearly defined expectations for adherence to academic assessment practices Examples of "what good looks like" are collected and shared to more concretely illustrate sought outcomes and behaviors	<b>OWNERSHIP THROUGH COMMITMENT</b> <small>THE PROBLEM STATE</small> Research scholars self-select adherence to academic assessment principles and practices Senior leaders and committee members have a clearly defined equitable assessment practice during both formal and informal career development contexts Institutions model ways to lead accountability, such as ensuring that system-level incentives align with and support agreed-upon principles and practices	<b>PRODUCTIVITY TO ENGAGEMENT</b> <small>THE PROBLEM STATE</small> Individuals actively contribute to the development and review of new practices and principles Departmental principals, leaders and senior outreach activities to include new or reinvigorated applications Faculty serve as "ambassadors" for new academic assessment practices, such as when serving as external committee members
<b>CULTURE WITHIN INSTITUTIONS</b> <small>How are assessment practices perceived and adopted both within and outside of formal evaluation activities?</small>	<b>INCLUSION AND ACCESS</b> <small>THE PROBLEM STATE</small> More diverse types of individuals are included in both defining and participating in career assessment processes such as individuals only career researchers on PPT committees Representation of traditional/legitimate seats or research equity goals for both new hires and research retention Career growth and mentoring systems are intentionally designed to provide ongoing support for underrepresented lines	<b>AMBIGUITY OF INSTITUTIONAL LOGOS</b> <small>THE PROBLEM STATE</small> Adoption of new assessment mechanisms is supported and advocated for by departmental and institutional leaders only All individuals actively contribute to building more equitable practices—not just marginalized ones New research assessment norms are increasingly adopted as default by faculty, administrators, and applicants	<b>OWNERSHIP THROUGH REFLECTION</b> <small>THE PROBLEM STATE</small> Positive feedback on intentional group efforts to reflect on assessment practices and slow down activities or avoid pressure is incorporated into both formal and informal assessment practices All participants in assessment activities feel processes achieve a balance of effectiveness and efficiency
<b>EVALUATIVE AND ITERATIVE FEEDBACK</b> <small>How are interventions and programs toward institutional values captured and institutionally improved upon?</small>	<b>ARTICULATION OF DIVERSE INDICATORS</b> <small>THE PROBLEM STATE</small> Goals and success criteria for traditional academic assessment interventions are well-defined and shared Use of leading indicators (e.g., increased diversity of regions for open positions, requirements, hiring indicators (e.g., increased diversity of lines) when pursuing interventions) Goals and success criteria are systematically reviewed whenever institutional strategy is updated	<b>SYSTEMATIZATION TO GAIN CONSISTENCY</b> <small>THE PROBLEM STATE</small> Quantitative and qualitative data from interventions are captured in a standardized way Mechanisms that capture both quantitative and qualitative feedback are explicitly designed and embedded into assessment processes from the outset Best practices and examples of "measurement" and/or gathering feedback are codified and shared across disciplines within the institution	<b>IMPROVEMENT USING FEEDBACK LOOPS</b> <small>THE PROBLEM STATE</small> Interventions that don't achieve desired outcomes are considered learning opportunities, not failures Outcomes and data are collected and measured to ensure high standards of evaluation quality and identify unintended consequences in other efforts Feedback and other indicators are shared and assessed in aggregate to identify and emerge patterns or opportunities for course correction

✓ Help institutions analyze the outcomes of interventions to improve academic career assessment

✓ Support the development of new practices and catalyze change

Rubric link: [bit.ly/3nj8gO1](https://bit.ly/3nj8gO1)





Universitat  
Oberta  
de Catalunya

**UOC signs the  
San Francisco  
Declaration (DORA)  
Action Plan**

## UOC signs the San Francisco Declaration (DORA) Action Plan

**Document prepared by  
the work group DORA and  
approved by the Research  
and Innovation Commission  
on December 18, 2018**

DORA working group

Daniel Aranda (ECIC), Nadja Gmelch (AGIC), Josep Grau (GPE), Eric Mesalles (OSRT), Clara Riera (BIBRA), Israel Rodríguez (IN3)

Universitat Oberta  
de Catalunya[illegible]

# Process mechanics & policies: deliberative judgments



**UOC**  
Universitat  
Oberta  
de Catalunya

## Postdoctoral recruitment

Journal-based metrics → narrative discussion of “achievements”

<b>RETHINKING RESEARCH ASSESSMENT</b> <b>SPACE TO EVOLVE ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT</b> <small>A RADING FOR ANALYSING INSTITUTIONAL PROGRESS INDICATORS AND CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESS</small> 			
Research and researcher assessment is a systems challenge, suggesting that institutions that prioritize developing infrastructures to support their efforts may be better positioned to achieve their goals than those focused only on individual solutions.			
<b>FROM FOUNDATION...</b> <i>Core definitions and shared clarity of purpose</i>	<b>TO EXPANSION...</b> <i>Increased traction and capability development</i>	<b>TO SCALING</b> <i>Accelerated uptake and continuous improvement</i>	
<b>STANDARDS FOR SCHOLARSHIP</b> How are new indicators of “quality scholarship” formulated and applied?	<b>ALIGNMENT OF INDICATORS</b> How do we ensure that standards are explicitly designed and articulated to align with institutional vision and values, with a necessary emphasis on supporting traditionally underrepresented, non-traditional groups? How do we ensure that indicators are designed to be forward aware, research, teaching, and service contributions including learning, mentoring and good citizenship? Specific indicators and standards of “quality” with regard to scholarship are articulated and shared across disciplines and non-academic committees	<b>INTEGRATION OF INDICATORS</b> How do we ensure that indicators are explicitly designed and articulated to align with institutional vision and values, with a necessary emphasis on supporting traditionally underrepresented, non-traditional groups? How do we ensure that indicators are designed to be forward aware, research, teaching, and service contributions including learning, mentoring and good citizenship? Specific indicators and standards of “quality” with regard to scholarship are articulated and shared across disciplines and non-academic committees	<b>ADOPTION OF NEW PRACTICES</b> How do we ensure that indicators are explicitly designed and articulated to align with institutional vision and values, with a necessary emphasis on supporting traditionally underrepresented, non-traditional groups? How do we ensure that indicators are designed to be forward aware, research, teaching, and service contributions including learning, mentoring and good citizenship? Specific indicators and standards of “quality” with regard to scholarship are articulated and shared across disciplines and non-academic committees
<b>PROCESS MECHANICS AND POLICIES</b> How are new practices integrated into review processes, governance, and institutional policies?	<b>MECHANISMS FOR ASSESSMENT</b> Meaningful and appropriately rigorous qualitative discussion for academic assessment, such as narrative CVs, are given due weight. Structures and processes are applied consistently across assessment activities, taking into consideration alternate paths and timing points. Use of new assessment mechanisms extend beyond traditional evaluative contexts into ensuring equitable opportunities, mentoring, and support to increase research and research diversity	<b>TECHNICAL SUPPORT</b> Training on the goals and procedures of assessment processes and practices are available and continuously maintained. Institutions design processes that increase the resource capacity of committees members to effectively adopt new assessment practices, such as additional bodies on time. Institutions have designated senior leadership or officers to ensure faculty quality for new assessment practices and principles	<b>ADAPTATION OF NEW PRACTICES</b> Assessment mechanisms can be flexibly applied and adapted to accommodate diverse disciplines. Mechanisms to support practices are codified and within time institutional policies. New processes and practices are seamlessly integrated and widely adopted
<b>CULTURE WITHIN INSTITUTIONS</b> How are assessment practices perceived and adopted both within and outside of formal evaluation activities?	<b>ASSESSMENT PRACTICES</b> The goals, principles, and practices of academic assessment and review, governance, and shared (DORA) activities are transparent and clearly articulated, and agreed upon by all participants. Institutions have clearly defined opportunities for a platform to academic assessment practices. Examples of “what good looks like” are collected and shared to ensure consistency throughout institutions and behaviors	<b>ADAPTATION OF NEW PRACTICES</b> Research activities that maintain adherence to academic assessment principles and practices. Research and review activities are clearly articulated and applied to assessment practices, during both formal and informal career development contexts. Institutions must ensure that assessment, such as ensuring that assessment practices align with and support agreed-upon principles and practices	<b>ADAPTATION OF NEW PRACTICES</b> Individuals actively contribute to the development and review of new practices and principles. Experiences previously broken and codified academic activities to include new or re-evaluated activities. Faculty serve as “champions” for new academic assessment practices, such as when serving as external committee members
<b>EVALUATIVE AND ITERATIVE FEEDBACK</b> How are information systems and progress toward institutional goals captured and continuously improved upon?	<b>ARTICULATION OF INDICATORS</b> How do we ensure that indicators are explicitly designed and articulated to align with institutional vision and values, with a necessary emphasis on supporting traditionally underrepresented, non-traditional groups? How do we ensure that indicators are designed to be forward aware, research, teaching, and service contributions including learning, mentoring and good citizenship? Specific indicators and standards of “quality” with regard to scholarship are articulated and shared across disciplines and non-academic committees	<b>SYSTEMATIZATION TO CASE CONSISTENCY</b> How do we ensure that indicators are explicitly designed and articulated to align with institutional vision and values, with a necessary emphasis on supporting traditionally underrepresented, non-traditional groups? How do we ensure that indicators are designed to be forward aware, research, teaching, and service contributions including learning, mentoring and good citizenship? Specific indicators and standards of “quality” with regard to scholarship are articulated and shared across disciplines and non-academic committees	<b>IMPROVEMENT OF FEEDBACK SYSTEMS</b> How do we ensure that indicators are explicitly designed and articulated to align with institutional vision and values, with a necessary emphasis on supporting traditionally underrepresented, non-traditional groups? How do we ensure that indicators are designed to be forward aware, research, teaching, and service contributions including learning, mentoring and good citizenship? Specific indicators and standards of “quality” with regard to scholarship are articulated and shared across disciplines and non-academic committees

<https://sfdora.org/case-study/open-university-of-catalonia/>

[https://www.uoc.edu/portal/\\_resources/CA/documents/coneixement-obert/dossier-dora\\_en.pdf](https://www.uoc.edu/portal/_resources/CA/documents/coneixement-obert/dossier-dora_en.pdf)

# Process mechanics & policies: capacity to support new activities



**UOC**  
Universitat  
Oberta  
de Catalunya

## University engagement and training

DORA task force critical for advocacy and training in new evaluation procedures

<b>RETHINKING RESEARCH ASSESSMENT</b> <b>SPACE TO EVOLVE ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT</b> <small>A FRAME FOR ANALYSING INSTITUTIONAL PROGRESS INDICATORS AND CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESS</small> 			
Research and researcher assessment is a systems challenge, suggesting that institutions that prioritize developing infrastructures to support their efforts may be better positioned to achieve their goals than those focused only on individual solutions.			
<b>FROM FOUNDATION...</b> <i>Core definitions and shared clarity of purpose</i>	<b>TO EXPANSION...</b> <i>Increased traction and capability development</i>	<b>TO SCALING</b> <i>Accelerated uptake and continuous improvement</i>	
<b>STANDARDS FOR SCHOLARSHIP</b> How are new indicators of "quality scholarship" formulated and applied?	<b>ALIGNMENT OF INDICATORS</b> How do we ensure that standards are explicitly designed and articulated to align with institutional vision and values, such as increasing equity and support for traditionally underrepresented, non-traditional groups? How do standards for indicators consider the balance across research, teaching, and service contributions including training, mentoring and good citizenship? Specific indicators and standards of "quality" with regard to scholarship are cultivated and shared across disciplines and non-academic communities	<b>INTEGRATION OF CONTEXT</b> How do we ensure that scholarship is assessed using these indicators (e.g., societal impact, with a commitment to a full breadth of work in academic practice and beyond) in a way that recognizes the value of non-traditional activities and accomplishments like team science? How do indicators of "scholarship" are designed across the full range of institutional disciplines?	<b>ADOPTION OF NEW PRACTICES</b> How do we ensure that the ability to measure success remains to reflect their research interests and growth? How do we ensure that new standards, definitions, and criteria reflecting the full range of work and impact of scholarship are integrated into the language and processes of our assessment practices?
<b>PROCESS MECHANICS AND POLICIES</b> How are new practices integrated into review operations, governance, and institutional policies?	<b>MEANINGFUL AND APPROPRIATE RESPONSE QUALITIES</b> How do we ensure that meaningful and appropriate response qualities (e.g., societal impact, with a commitment to a full breadth of work in academic practice and beyond) are given due weight? Structures and processes are applied consistently across assessment activities, taking into consideration alternate paths and timing points. Use of new assessment mechanisms extend beyond traditional evaluation contexts into ensuring equitable opportunities, mentoring, and support to increase research and research diversity	<b>TRAINING ON THE GOALS AND PRODUCTION OF ASSESSMENT PRACTICES AND POLICIES</b> How do we ensure that training on the goals and production of assessment practices and policies are available and continuously maintained? Institutions design processes that increase the resource capacity of committee members to effectively adopt new assessment practices, such as additional training on time. Institutions have designated senior leadership or have to ensure faculty capacity for new assessment practices and principles	<b>ADAPTING TO NEW PRACTICES</b> How do we ensure that assessment mechanisms can be flexibly applied and adapted to accommodate diverse disciplines? Mechanisms to support practices are codified and within institutional policies. New processes and practices are seamlessly integrated and widely adopted
<b>CULTURE WITHIN INSTITUTIONS</b> How are assessment practices perceived and adopted both within and outside of formal evaluation activities?	<b>ASSESSMENT PRACTICES</b> How do we ensure that the goals, principles, and production of academic assessment and review, governance, and review (RTR) activities are transparent and clearly articulated, and agreed upon by all participants? Institutions have clearly defined opportunities for a platform to academic assessment practices. Examples of "what good practice" are cultivated and shared to increase transparency, trustworthiness, and behaviors	<b>IMPACT OF INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE</b> How do we ensure that the goals, principles, and production of academic assessment and review, governance, and review (RTR) activities are transparent and clearly articulated, and agreed upon by all participants? Institutions have clearly defined opportunities for a platform to academic assessment practices. Examples of "what good practice" are cultivated and shared to increase transparency, trustworthiness, and behaviors	<b>ADAPTING TO NEW PRACTICES</b> How do we ensure that assessment mechanisms can be flexibly applied and adapted to accommodate diverse disciplines? Mechanisms to support practices are codified and within institutional policies. New processes and practices are seamlessly integrated and widely adopted
<b>EVALUATIVE AND ITERATIVE FEEDBACK</b> How are information systems and progress toward institutional review captured and continuously improved upon?	<b>ARTICULATION OF INTERDISCIPLINARY</b> How do we ensure that the goals, principles, and production of academic assessment and review, governance, and review (RTR) activities are transparent and clearly articulated, and agreed upon by all participants? Institutions have clearly defined opportunities for a platform to academic assessment practices. Examples of "what good practice" are cultivated and shared to increase transparency, trustworthiness, and behaviors	<b>SYSTEMATIZATION TO CASE CONSISTENCY</b> How do we ensure that the goals, principles, and production of academic assessment and review, governance, and review (RTR) activities are transparent and clearly articulated, and agreed upon by all participants? Institutions have clearly defined opportunities for a platform to academic assessment practices. Examples of "what good practice" are cultivated and shared to increase transparency, trustworthiness, and behaviors	<b>IMPROVEMENT LONG-TERM FEEDBACK LOOPS</b> How do we ensure that the goals, principles, and production of academic assessment and review, governance, and review (RTR) activities are transparent and clearly articulated, and agreed upon by all participants? Institutions have clearly defined opportunities for a platform to academic assessment practices. Examples of "what good practice" are cultivated and shared to increase transparency, trustworthiness, and behaviors

<https://sfdora.org/case-study/open-university-of-catalonia/>

[https://www.uoc.edu/portal/\\_resources/CA/documents/coneixement-obert/dossier-dora\\_en.pdf](https://www.uoc.edu/portal/_resources/CA/documents/coneixement-obert/dossier-dora_en.pdf)



# Thank you!

More information: [sfdora.org](https://sfdora.org)