

Chosen statement	Diversity of outputs
Stakeholder group	Policy makers
Idea title (optional)	
Short description	In assessment, consider a broad range of outputs - tasks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Type - contributions</li> <li>• Channel</li> <li>• Languages</li> </ul> Outputs as evidence of outcomes
Allies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open research information</li> <li>• Infrastructure providers (ind. Platforms, databases, etc)</li> <li>• Researchers</li> </ul>
Vision for implementing the idea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define “broad range”</li> <li>• Define proportions between types of outputs</li> <li>• Model for weighting evaluation criteria (evaluators)</li> <li>• Model for self-evaluation (researchers)</li> </ul>
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of alignment (researchers are mobile)</li> <li>• (concerns researchers as well as reviewers)</li> <li>• Researchers feel they have to do everything rather than choose what to emphasise according to evaluation process</li> </ul>

Chosen statement	18: Challenge the use of inappropriate indicators in research assessment
Stakeholder group	Libraries
Idea title (optional)	There is a life beyond IF
Short description	
Allies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- researchers/research community</li> <li>- national funders</li> <li>- human resources direction</li> </ul>

	Really depending on local context
Vision for implementing the idea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reward diamond OA journals</li> <li>- open a discussion via panel session (organization) = make people talk, find connection</li> <li>- show data sources are not reliable</li> <li>- ranking with Open Alex instead of WoS</li> <li>- present the policy (CoARA)</li> </ul> Alert, explain → disclaimer on rankings
Risks & challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- research assessment (sometimes) depends a lot of national guidance &amp; national funders → opportunity?! you know who to talk</li> <li>- what's unsaid, you can't act on it = main difficulty</li> </ul>

Chosen statement	DORA 15
Stakeholder group	Researchers
Idea title (optional)	Debates about the new assessment system
Short description	Series of debates about the new system of evaluation of the applicants
Allies	Ambassadors - progressive professors (senior maybe)
Vision for implementing the idea	No big funding required because of ethical issues debated →
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no changes</li> <li>- no participants</li> </ul>

Chosen statement	
Stakeholder group	RPO
Idea title (optional)	Research assessment should be based on scientifically rigorous, valid methods, meaning open, transparent and reproducible, with a specific emphasis to reduce biases
Short description	People take shortcuts and use "objectifying" quantitative measure to reach results quickly. This could even happen if they look

	at the scientific content instead of commercial metrics (JIF). Thus emphasis on methodology.
Allies	Data driven faculties, experts in methodology at own institution → ECRs “thinking out of the box”
Vision for implementing the idea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prepare tenure and promotion decisions better to reduce time pressure and avoid people taking shortcuts</li> <li>- reflection on the goal of assessment, e.g. clear criteria for “excellence”</li> <li>- install a student’s program, e.g. research oriented teaching, on the methodology of research assessment</li> </ul>
Risks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- could turn into an inward-looking heuristics → compare/align with other RPOs</li> <li>- you’ll run into time problems → create clear processes, use collaborative digital tools (like open notebooks or DMP tools)</li> </ul>

Chosen statement	DORA 6: Greatly reduce emphasis on the publication IF...
Stakeholder group	Publisher
Idea title (optional)	
Short description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● equitable assessment of publications</li> <li>● make metrics marginal</li> <li>● [unclear] alternative metrics like Open Alex</li> </ul>
Allies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- researchers</li> <li>- research infrastructures</li> <li>- libraries</li> </ul>
Vision for implementing the idea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- be transparent in our communication (website...)</li> <li>- [unclear] researchers in [unclear]...</li> <li>- create a badge “IF Free”</li> </ul>
Risks	researchers who don’t want to abandon the

	IF → we won't publish them!
--	-----------------------------

Chosen statement	Expert-based evaluation, high quality research is valued regardless of the pub. language or pub. channel
Stakeholder group	Research infrastructures
Idea title (optional)	Diversity of open publishing
Short description	Research infrastructures support and take measures towards and make sure that language of the publication and review is the same, to support equality and democracy in SSH. And support diversity of publication channel.
Allies	Members of [unclear], research councils, researchers, national funding agencies
Vision for implementing the idea	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- policy making on the level of the consortia</li> <li>- service alternative for publication channels</li> <li>- events for [unclear] and good practice</li> </ul>
Risks	strong resistance from commercial interests (publishers)