



Quality Assurance Group

WP4 REVIEW OF DELIVERABLE:

C4 - Evaluation methodology for monitoring the usage of open science platforms and the performance and impact of research at Serbian universities

DELIVERABLE DETAILS

Title of the deliverable:	The Leiden Manifesto for research metrics
Author(s) responsible for the deliverable:	Snežana Smederevac and Dejan Pajić
WP leader:	University of Novi Sad
QAG reviewer(s):	Snezana Smederevac, Petros Stefaneas, Marina Lenisa, Caspar Addyman, Thed van Leeuwen
Short description of the deliverable:	
<p>Research evaluation based on quantitative data has become a common practice in many European countries, including Serbia. In order to make an objective assessment, science policy institutions should ensure that applied methodology is relevant and transparent and that data used in evaluation procedures are comprehensive, objective and accurate. Furthermore, quantitative evaluation should be used primarily to support expert assessment in order to achieve a balanced judgment. These are just a few of ten principles presented in the Leiden Manifesto for research metrics compiled by Diana Hicks, Paul Wouters, Ludo Waltman, Sarah de Rijcke and Ismael Rafols.</p> <p>Members of the BE-OPEN team have translated Leiden Manifesto in Serbian language in order to set the background for discussion on common misconceptions about research metrics and quantitative evaluation of scientific output in Serbia. Leiden Manifesto represents a suitable starting point in developing indicators of performance and impact of research at Serbian universities within the Project's Work Package 4.</p>	

QUALITY ASSURANCE DETAILS

Assurance point:	Issues to be addressed:	Assessment:	Comments:	Recommendations:
1. Compliance with the objectives of BE-OPEN	Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?	Deliverable complies with objective of the project	N/A	N/A
2. Compliance with the specific objectives of the work package	Does the deliverable comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?	Deliverable complies with WP objective specified in the WP description	N/A	N/A
3. Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity	Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?	Deliverable corresponds with the activity description as specified in the Application Form	N/A	N/A
4. Compliance with the deliverables format	Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format?	Deliverable is presented using the Project's deliverable format	N/A	N/A
5. Adequacy of complementary information	Examples of complementary info: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> External sources used Bibliography List of contacts Methodology used (i.e. for surveys) 	Deliverable Adequacy of complementary information complies with minimum information required	N/A	N/A
External sources and Bibliography used:				

- Wouters, P. in *Beyond Bibliometrics: Harnessing Multidimensional Indicators of Scholarly Impact* (eds Cronin, B. & Sugimoto, C.) 47–66 (MIT Press, 2014).
- Shao, J. & Shen, H. *Learned Publ.* 24, 95–97 (2011).
- Seglen, P. O. *Br. Med. J.* 314, 498–502 (1997).
- Garfield, E. J. *Am. Med. Assoc.* 295, 90–93 (2006).
- López Piñero, C. & Hicks, D. *Res. Eval.* 24, 78–89 (2015).
- van Raan, A. F. J., van Leeuwen, T. N., Visser, M. S., van Eck, N. J. & Waltman, L. J. *Informetrics* 4, 431–435 (2010).
- Waltman, L. et al. *J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci. Technol.* 63, 2419–2432 (2012).
- Hirsch, J. E. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* 102, 16569–16572 (2005).
- Bar-Ilan, J. *Scientometrics* 74, 257–271 (2008).
- Butler, L. *Res. Policy* 32, 143–155 (2003).
- Hicks, D., Wouters, P., Waltman, L., De Rijcke, S., & Rafols, I. (2015). The Leiden Manifesto for research metrics. *Nature*, 520(7548), 429. doi:10.1038/520429a

6. Adequacy of written language	Level of written Serbian	C2	N/A	N/A
Quality assurance:				
Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement		Overall assessment is that deliverable is completely in line with adequate quality expectations for the Report on the existing open science legislative and incentives		
Date of Quality Assurance performed by QAG reviewers:		01.04.2020.		
Deadline for submission of amended version of the Deliverable:		N/A		

BE-OPEN TEAM

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.