

Training on Quality Assurance in PhD



*Scientometrics: how to measure the impact of
scientific work*

Palermo, March 18-20 2013

V. Capursi & V. Muggeo - Dip. Scienze Statistiche e
Matematiche, Università di Palermo

Plan of the talk

1. Introduction
2. Measuring research production in Italy: first experiences 2001-2003
3. Measuring research production in Italy: first experiences 2004-2010

1. Introduction

- Why measuring research? Why evaluation?
 - for funding allocation
 - for career progression (within University)
 - not fully involving PhD programs

- What is evaluation?

Research evaluation is a process based on the critical analysis of data and information, which leads to a judgment of merit

- The objectivity of the process assumes:

previously defined criteria and methodologies

evaluators, who are outside the Structures that are being evaluated and who are not involved with the product to be evaluated

Measuring research production in Italy: previous experiences

- Foreword: all these evaluations are national-based

Measuring research production in Italy: previous experiences

- Foreword: all these evaluations are national-based
- Previous attempts by the CNVSU (Comitato Nazionale Valutazione Sistema Universitario): assessment of research products in terms of quantity but not quality. Aimed at ranking of universities (based on funded national projects (PRIN))

Measuring research production in Italy: previous experiences

- Foreword: all these evaluations are national-based
- Previous attempts by the CNVSU (Comitato Nazionale Valutazione Sistema Universitario): assessment of research products in terms of quantity but not quality. Aimed at ranking of universities (based on funded national projects (PRIN))
- First (true) experience: CIVR 2003 (Comitato Indirizzo di Valutazione della Ricerca, Italian)
 - window evaluation: 2001-2003.
 - for funding allocation

- a lot of concerns and debate (criteria confused and not shared by academic community)

- a lot of concerns and debate (criteria confused and not shared by academic community)

- Second experience: ANVUR (National Agency for the Evaluation of Universities and Research Institutes) → VQR (Evaluation of Research Quality)
 - to evaluate Departments (for funding allocation)
 - window evaluation: 2004-2010 (results not yet available..)
 - different tools between scientific areas and humanities

- a lot of concerns and debate (criteria confused and not shared by academic community)

- Second experience: ANVUR (National Agency for the Evaluation of Universities and Research Institutes) → VQR (Evaluation of Research Quality)
 - to evaluate Departments (for funding allocation)
 - window evaluation: 2004-2010 (results not yet available..)
 - different tools between scientific areas and humanities

- For the first time in Italy ANVUR has fixed rules to regulate
 - Members of Committees (for career progression)
 - Candidates (for career progression)

- Again several concerns/discussions on criteria used for career progression

Some details on the first experience (CIVR 2001-03)

- 102 participants structures (universities and other research structures) in 14 scientific areas
- Each structure was asked to submit products (17329 research products) proportionally to the number of researchers on duty.
- 151 panelists hiring 6661 experts were involved in the process which classified the products into excellent, good, acceptable, limited.
- Final results used to allocate funds.

Some Details on the second experience: (ANVUR 2004-10)

- Department evaluation (VQR (for funding allocation)

bibliometric and non-bibliometric areas..

- Research production evaluation (for career progression both candidate and member of committee)

bibliometric and non-bibliometric areas..

medians.. have been changed by ANVUR after the announcement..

ANVUR does not provide the (anonymous) data that have been used to compute medians (no accountability)

Important differences among groups..

ANVUR does not provide the (anonymous) data that have been used to compute medians (no accountability)

Important differences among groups..

Take home message:

ANVUR does not provide the (anonymous) data that have been used to compute medians (no accountability)

Important differences among groups..

Take home message:

Research evaluation is important and ambitious but it is not simple..

Some criticisms

1. A big mess
2. Bibliometric areas have evaluation tool much more known, accepted and consolidated (h-index, IF, and friends..)
3. mad journals (which journals in group A..)
4. medians ... but later the minister Profumo : 'medians are useless'
5. On the website of ROARS (Return on academic research)
6. The same criteria used in **DIFFERENT WAY** by the committees of the different disciplines.