In 2020, Science Europe published a set of recommendations aimed at ensuring that the assessment processes that research organisations implement for funding allocation and career progression are effective, efficient, fair, and transparent.

The recommendations were formulated based on the results of an extensive survey of the research assessment practices of Science Europe Member Organisations, and further developed through a broad consultation process with both Science Europe members and the wider research community.

Science Europe members already implement many practices and policies that provide good examples of how our recommendations can be applied. This slideset showcases a set of good practice examples from Science Europe Member Organisations.

The good practices are listed according to the seven recommendation topics defined in Science Europe’s recent publication:

- **Transparency**
- **Evaluating Robustness**
- **Bias, Discrimination & Unfair Treatment**
- **Cost, Efficiency & Applicants’ Effort**
- **Broadening the Pool of Reviewers**
- **Qualitative Assessments**
- **Novel Approaches**

[www.scieur.org/assessment](http://www.scieur.org/assessment)
FWO has implemented a two-week rebuttal phase in its project funding schemes, during which applicants can respond to comments of reviewers. This gives them the chance to clear up any misunderstandings or counter unfounded assessments.

Read more on the FWO example: https://scieur.org/ra-fwo
Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: https://scieur.org/assessment
INFN publishes webpages and reports dedicated to the transparency of all their internal processes, including those followed for research evaluation.

Read more on the INFN example: https://scieur.org/ra-infn
Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: https://scieur.org/assessment
DFF ensures the transparency of its research assessment processes by implementing strict conflict-of-interest regulations, applicant right-to-reply processes, and open (non-anonymous) reviewing.

Read more on the DFF example: [https://scieur.org/ra-dff](https://scieur.org/ra-dff)

Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: [https://scieur.org/assessment](https://scieur.org/assessment)
HRB periodically publishes detailed evaluation reports that include both output, outcome, and impact assessments.

Read more on the HRB example: [https://scieur.org/ra-hrb](https://scieur.org/ra-hrb)

Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: [https://scieur.org/assessment](https://scieur.org/assessment)
FNP periodically evaluates its funding programmes in 3 ways: via self-monitoring, internal evaluation, and external evaluation. The evaluation reports are made publicly available.

Read more on the FNP example: https://scieur.org/ra-fnp1
Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: https://scieur.org/assessment
FNR commissioned an external evaluation of its selection processes based on surveys of applicants, reviewers, panel members, and staff. This highlighted strong accomplishment and provided some recommendations for continued success.

Read more on the FNR example: [https://scieur.org/ra-fnr](https://scieur.org/ra-fnr)
Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: [https://scieur.org/assessment](https://scieur.org/assessment)
FWF regularly commissions independent, external checks of bias in its assessment and decision-making processes. It publishes the findings of these studies on ex ante peer review and the outcomes of FWF projects.

Read more on the FWF example: https://scieur.org/ra-fwf1
Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: https://scieur.org/assessment
CSIC launched the ‘Women and Science Commission’ to study the possible causes that make it difficult for women to enter and pursue a research career. It proposes actions to help CSIC achieve equality between women and men.

Read more on the CSIC reports at http://scieur.org/ra-csic
Read all recommendations on Research Assessment Processes at http://scieur.org/assessment
GOOD PRACTICE EXAMPLE
FROM SCIENCE EUROPE MEMBER ORGANISATIONS

BIAS, DISCRIMINATION & UNFAIR TREATMENT

NCN applicants are entitled by law to appeal in case of any perceived bias or discrimination. Scientific co-ordinators oversee the process and can request re-reviewing or expel reviewers/panel members if necessary.

Read more on the NCN example: https://scieur.org/ra-ncn
Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: https://scieur.org/assessment
Forte incorporates ‘gender and diversity perspectives in the content of the research’ into its assessment practices as one of four sub-criteria of ‘scientific quality’.

Read more on the Forte example: [https://scieur.org/ra-forte](https://scieur.org/ra-forte)

Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: [https://scieur.org/assessment](https://scieur.org/assessment)
UKRI are developing and piloting a new service called the ‘UKRI Funding Service’. Based on a new digital platform, it aims to make funding applications simpler and more efficient for all involved.

Read more on the UKRI example: https://scieur.org/ra-ukri
Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: https://scieur.org/assessment

@UKRI_News   @ScienceEurope
FNP have developed an interactive webpage with clear guidance and checklists on its application and evaluation processes and requirements. It also provides information on specific evaluation criteria and the type of evaluating body.

Read more on the FNP example: [https://scieur.org/ra-fnp2](https://scieur.org/ra-fnp2)

Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: [https://scieur.org/assessment](https://scieur.org/assessment)
DFG have implemented a user-friendly webpage that displays all funding schemes offered, listed by different focuses. This allows applicants to efficiently review the funding opportunities open to them.

Read more on the DFG example: https://scieur.org/ra-dfg
Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: https://scieur.org/assessment
SFI have developed a ‘Reviewer Code of Conduct’ to maintain and ensure high-quality peer review. The use of international independent reviewers is an integral part of SFI’s decision-making process.

Read more on the SFI example: https://scieur.org/ra-sfi
Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: https://scieur.org/assessment
RCN uses a mixture of international and national experts, and bases the composition of reviewers and panels on the objectives of a scheme. Lists of reviewers for each scheme are published for a limited period of time.

Read more on the **RCN** example: [https://scieur.org/ra-rcn](https://scieur.org/ra-rcn)

Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: [https://scieur.org/assessment](https://scieur.org/assessment)
AKA provides clear information on the expertise of panel members and reviewers used, with an emphasis on recruiting international reviewers. National reviewers are used where societal relevance is an important consideration.

Read more on the AKA example: [https://scieur.org/ra-aka](https://scieur.org/ra-aka)
Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: [https://scieur.org/assessment](https://scieur.org/assessment)
HRZZ builds international partnerships to expand its reviewer pool. This allows them to broaden the criteria used to select reviewers, alleviate the effects of reviewer fatigue, and maintain quality.

Read more on the HRZZ example: [https://scieur.org/ra-hrzz](https://scieur.org/ra-hrzz)

Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: [https://scieur.org/assessment](https://scieur.org/assessment)
The SNSF are testing a new standardised structure for CVs (‘SciCV’) for applicants in biology and medicine. Among other innovations, applicants can present their contributions in a narrative style, which helps to make academic activities, beyond publications, more visible and valued.

Read more on the SNSF example: https://scieur.org/ra-snsf
Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: https://scieur.org/assessment
NWO has introduced a uniform narrative CV format in its Talent Programmes Veni, Vidi, and Vici to improve quality of assessments. It rests on the premise that research needs a diversity of talents and there is not one ideal type of researcher. The use of journal based metrics is banned.

Read more on the NWO example: https://scieur.org/ra-nwo
Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: https://scieur.org/assessment
FWF recently piloted a hybrid double-blind assessment/random-allocation system as a new way of effectively and efficiently conducting assessments for funding allocation. This was part of their ‘1000 Ideas’ programme.

Read more on the **FWF** example: [https://scieur.org/ra-fwf2](https://scieur.org/ra-fwf2)

Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: [https://scieur.org/assessment](https://scieur.org/assessment)
RCN have implemented a Sandpit funding scheme called Idélab, where assessments are made during highly interactive and multidisciplinary workshops. This model promotes multidisciplinary perspectives and supports innovative ideas and projects.

For more information on Sandpit funding schemes visit: https://scieur.org/ra-sand
Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: https://scieur.org/assessment
UKRI (EPSRC) are currently running a remote ‘Sandpit’ where assessments for funding allocation are made in a virtual workshop format. This approach aims to promote collaborative thinking and supports innovative solutions to research challenges.

Read more on the UKRI EPSRC example: https://scieur.org/ra-epsrc
Discover all our recommendations on Research Assessment Processes: https://scieur.org/assessment
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