SUMMARY OF THE WORKSHOPS

RECOGNITION & REWARDS FESTIVAL – 13TH APRIL 2023

During the Recognition & Rewards Festival there are two workshop rounds. In this recap you can read about the content and conclusions of the different workshops. The reports show a wide range of working methods and demonstrate good, substantive sessions. We will thank the different colleagues for making some notes.

ROUND 1

1.1 A co-creative session: from individual to collective recognition and rewards (G)
Iris Lechner, Joeri Tijdink and Jeroen de Ridder (VU)

The participants in this workshop are set in a class-format: groups of four of five tables with Lego, colored paper, scissors, glitter etc. We knew what was going to be expected from us. Iris asked us the question: 'What do you consider to be a good university?'. We answered the expected ones: Harvard, Oxford etc. When we were asked what makes a university a good university, we were a lot quieter.

The core theme of this workshop: Can we imagine the university of the future? Iris and her team researched the perspectives that makes a good university around six 6 'Epistemic Responsibilities':

- To cultivate the diversity of disciplinary fields.
- To address the big questions of life.
- To stimulate the development of intellectual virtues.
- To foster research integrity.
- To cultivate and safeguard academic freedom.
- To serve and engage with society at large.

We were asked to put sticky notes on two large sheets of paper. One that said, 'Imagine you're 25 years in the future, how are universities Recognized & Rewarded?'. The other one said, 'What does R&R look like in this university?'

Just a few of the remarks on the sticky notes:

- People in universities will be recognized and rewarded for their (less individualistic) contribution to their team, department, strategy, overarching aims.
- Success is determined not only by the university itself but also by affiliated partners.
- Quality is not assessed by rankings.
- No hierarchical problems (i.e., social safety).
- Teaching is tailored to individuals and performed by A.I.

We were then asked to pick one of the Epistemic Responsibilities and make a 3Dmodel for the university of the future. The Lego and all the other things provided could be used.

The funny thing was that all groups worked together on their model and there were clear similarities. These aspects could be clearly seen:

- Multidisciplinarity / community / building bridges.
- Influences from inside and outside.
- Universities want to be 'center' of knowledge and expertise.

- Open / adaptive.
- Positivity / together we're strong.

Overall: We seem to have a completely different picture of what makes a university a good university than the examples mentioned at the beginning of this workshop.

1.2 Assessment of teacher quality in the University Teaching Practice from Different Perspectives (G)

Roeland van der Rijst & Max Kusters (ICLON, Leiden University)

Leiden University develops scenarios to recreate teaching situations, which is useful for reproduction and comparing teachers. In the workshops, the participants practice with some of these scenarios. The research project is *Understanding what it takes: Teacher Agency in University.*

The scenarios were focussed more on the educational context and less so on the performance of the teacher. How can these scenarios be used to assess teacher quality? They are quite focussed on solutions and less on the individual performance of the teacher. They do trigger a sense of reflection in the teacher, and the teacher's awareness of problems related to teaching. As such, it relates to teacher agency and less so on teacher quality.

A big take away is the shift from teacher quality to teacher agency, and how that can relate to teacher recognition. It is an important tool in the formative assessment of teaching. The next question is how to embed that into institutional policy.

1.3 Enabling Diversity - addressing silent assessment (I)

Jacqueline Kool, Liorah Hoek, Alice Schippers, Carolina Suransky (University of Humanistic Studies)

This workshop uncovered the silent assessment that systematically excludes people with a disability (and others) from the academic field. This workshop also helped us to explore what each of us can do to create an inclusive academic environment.

We played a **game** based on the 'spoon theory' and divided 'spoons' over different tasks for one day. We got to experience how frustrating it is to make these choices. Especially when an unexpected urgent matter comes in. This helped us to understand the main challenges that disabled people face when they (try to) enter the academic field. To remind us of that there was an empty table for all the people who weren't able to attend.

We talked about the **spoon theory**, that metaphorically describes the amount of physical and/or mental energy that a person has available for daily activities. Not every activity weighs equally for everyone: each illness is different, and each person is different. More important: people never really know how many 'spoons' they will get on a specific day. This varies depending on in- and external factors and may feel like a 'constant gamble' and can lead to severe physical exhaustion and mental problems that cost even more 'spoons'. Further, we talked about **crip time**, that denotes the extra time a person might need to perform any task and to listen to their 'bodymind'.

Recognition & Rewards is about people 'who are already in'. People with a disability, however, very often don't even get in. When they manage to do so, they most likely made sacrifices. The burden is on them, what can we do to make them feel (more) welcome and belonging?

These **solutions** were mentioned:

- Recognizing that it's hard to ask for help.
- Being specific when offering help.
- Trusting them when they say an activity is too much, don't press them.
- Educating yourself on their condition.
- Think of solutions in which people can work together (co teaching).
- Include multiple voices.
- Pay attention to context and relationships.
- Think about what kind of differences you want include (skin color, gender, sexual orientation, etc.).
- Focus on condition or impairment (selfcare management), the workplace and resources.
- Different methodes of using ICT in teaching by re-using (parts of) courses, making courses as a team, etc.

1.4 From words to deeds: concrete actions to reward and assess societal impact (A)

Annelinde Vandenbroucke, Sharon Unsworth, Jeanette Mostert and Ymke Bresser (Radboudumc)

There is no report available form this workshop.

1.5 How does leadership become everyone's (I)

Rolien Walinga & Maaike Verbree (VU)

The Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam has developed the leadership programme 'The Art of Engagement' as a handle on good leadership and teamwork. It is about the underlying values of leadership. Its creators call shared responsibility around leadership essential for a socially safe and healthy group dynamic within the academic culture. Divided into four groups, attendees were assigned ten minutes to have a conversation about one of the following accents to leadership:

- contribute to the bigger picture.
- listen and encourage growth.
- be transparent and clear.
- be bold and decisive.

It depends on character to what approach you can relate the best on what moment, but it's all included. And it's also recommended to be open about your personal quest in this context.

Most of us are aiming to link Recognition & Rewards to a culture change. There is already a lot that starts to move, but there also remain professors who stay on their own path in old-fashioned ways. How do we engage them? For example, by setting explicit criteria for desired leadership and make those criteria leading in nominations and evaluations. Participants noted that we all look to the theme leadership with a different scope. It's important to point that out. You also have to be aware of that when you pass your vision on to younger generation. It is desirable to be clear on criteria: what is excellent teaching, what is excellent research? But: transparency is a big challenge. How do you bridge nationality-related cultural differences within a team?
Discuss *how* instead of *what* when you try to start a process of change. What is the scope of academics who do not manage a fixed defined team? A real team consists of eight to ten people, you can question whether a department is properly set up if it is set up differently.'

What are the main take aways of this session?

- They call their method 'The Art of Engagement' because it's a process of search and practice, not something that fits and works right away.
- 'If you encounter obstacles within your team: voice constructive criticism'.
- Leadership is personal and context driven. It is essential to relate your own scope to individual characters as well as to the bigger picture.

1.6 Interdisciplinary collaborations: business as unusual? (A)
Anke de Vrieze and Sylvia Brugman (Wageningen University & Research)

How do you tell an alien what 'Recognition & Reward' means? The workshop participants all needed different words for that. They run form 'then we recognize everyone's talent' to 'you do something you do well, and I'll give you a candy for it'.

With this introduction, it became clear at once what makes interdisciplinary work so complicated, even for scientists who basically have a drive for interdisciplinary work. But that, one might briefly say, can be remedied with training in 'learning to understand each other'. Unfortunately, other obstacles to working more interdisciplinary are more difficult to tackle. How do you get scientists to do this in traditionally discipline-oriented universities? How do you know if interdisciplinary work suits you?
You have to be able and willing to look beyond your own discipline, be at the service of the team, share knowledge in an accessible way, these are just some of the aspects that are important. Going beyond the boundaries of your disciplinary work means going out of your comfort zone, and that can mean that not everything goes smoothly. If we really move towards more interdisciplinary work, then we have to accept that when something goes wrong it is not a failure, but part of the experiment. At the moment we avoid that, afraid as we are for our CV.

If we really want to work interdisciplinary, we will not only have to do research assessments, but more broader assessments. Assessments as well on education and research and impact but also on the general and more specific skills that are needed.

When a team finally works on an interdisciplinary assignment, it is often still under pressure due to short-term funding. Interdisciplinary work takes more time than monodisciplinary work to achieve results. The common language must be found, and collaboration must also be learned. Continuing to work together then goes into one's own time. That is not really recognition and reward!

Question that remained at the end was: is it a solution not to assess at all and just let everyone go at their strengths, or go to self-managing teams that take responsibility themselves to come up with results? These are two very different questions but worth exploring further in terms of desirability, pros and cons and feasibility.

1.7 Moving debate about new forms of research assessment (A)
Rinze Benedictus & Sander van der Laan (UMC Utrecht)

Approximately fifteen participants of this workshop with different expertise (research, policy, funder), organisations (including the international stakeholders) were engaged in a lively debate. In reaction on a posed statement, the participants were asked position themselves on a line Agree-Disagree. Four statements on developments within R&R have been discussed.

First statement on significance of Recognition & Rewards developments was just for practice. The most diversify meanings were on the topic of need of disciplinary Recognition & Rewards working groups (instead of national or institutional). The debate led to a conclusion that it depends on the level of abstraction: vision and direction is needed to be developed on international level, the framework formulation should be done nationally, and the implementation can be institutionalized, where needed, also per discipline. But due to interdisciplinarity of the most of research activities and mobility of the researchers, the discussion and alignment within these levels needs attention.

The most striking discussion was based on the statement: 'Universities should use the Evidence-based CV in hiring and promotion.' Striking, because none of the participants went for DISAGREE. However, this did not make the discussion easy or shallow. Number of challenges and yet unsolved problems have been recognized, and some good practices exchanged. The main message was, that current academic CV does not reflect on the way of doing the research/tasks, is limited to listing them. The discussion did not avoid the topic of metrics and 'counting' problems, perception of objectivity vs subjectivity.

The last statement on 'Recognition & Rewards should be led by Early Career Researchers' raised diverging opinions on the role and engagement of junior, but also senior staff. The group have reached the conclusion stating that all levels are needed to successfully implement Recognition & Rewards; the young ones due to their future perspective and ownership, and the senior staff because they are now in leading positions to start the cultural change. Furthermore, support staff is needed for implementing the changes in procedures and systems such as Graduate schools.

1.8 Recognising supporting roles (I)
Jeroen Bosman & Jeroen Sondervan (Utrecht University), Shauna Ní Fhlaithearta (Wageningen University & Research)

Jeroen Bosman and Jeroen Sondervan told the participants about the Open Science program of Utrecht University. One of the goals of this program is bridging the gap between academic and non-academic staff. At Utrecht University they developed the Triple model and asked themselves how they can apply this on the support staff:

- hybrid teams with academic and support staff.
- hybrid functions.
- remove distinction from systems, procedures etc.
- hybrid careers.

Then Shauna Ní Fhlaithearta told us about the organisation of data stewardship at Wageningen University.

After both presentations we created a survey for everyone at the festival about the recognition of the support staff. We had to come up with (closed) questions for this survey. There were a few tables:

A. Supporting role identities.
B. Hybridity/ team science nature of roles.
C. Career experience/ development.
D. Current Challenges/ barriers and practical issues experienced.
E. Including supporting roles in the Recognition & Rewards movement.

One of the topics we discussed was that it should be easy to have different roles in an organisation, for example a combination of an academic role and a support role. Also, the career development

should be easier, from an academic career to a support career and vice versa. To make this possible there are some things in the system that needs to change. For example, it should be easier in the UFO-system to have a hybrid role. Both the supervisor and HR play an important role in these changes. They have to start the conversation with their employees about these subjects and support the possibility of a hybrid career.

1.9 Recognizing the diversity of Open Science Practices across different research communities (I)

Maaike Duine (Open Science Officer, Open-Access-Büro Berlin, University Library, Free University Berlin)

Maaike presented the project 'Open Science Dashboard', that she works on on behalf of the Open Access Büro Berlin, located at the Freie Universität Berlin. The project ends in September, but the organizers are looking for a follow up. Monitoring is needed for Open Science practices across different disciplines to measure progress. The objective of the project is to develop dashboard with different types of indicators for different disciplines, so it becomes easier to broaden the perspective on research outputs. The development of a dashboard has not been without challenges (finding project partners, lack of awareness, defining research fields of scientific disciplines, lack of data available, quality of available data, time constraints, developing qualitative indicators).

In groups, the participants discussed some national and international examples of Open Science dashboards, from the European Open Science monitor to the French Open Science monitor. In the end, participants shared their first impressions on the different monitors and found that there are many challenges to thoroughly monitoring Open Science practices. It is hopeful to see that Open Science is increasingly becoming the norm, but we should be wary to only measure outputs and find ways to incorporate more qualitative elements. Ultimately, the dashboard should just be a tool to support Open Science policy, not a goal in and of itself.

What are the main take aways of this session?
We need to think about the openness of an entire scientific project. Each project is different, and scientist should be rewarded for openness in every part of the project.

1.10 The Alternative C.V: What should it look like? (G)

Chris Hartgerink and Daan Rutten (Liberate Science GmbH)

The session was about "designing" a CV in a very visual way. We were asked to start with a brainstorm in post-it notes and write down anything that we could think of that could be interesting to know (from a recruitment standpoint) or to share (from a candidate perspective). That resulted in a wide range of topics that could be included in a CV. Interesting was that we all experienced that starting to think from this fresh/blank perspective was refreshing and made us all rethink the standards we generally adhere to. We than were asked to visualize the alternative CV based on the topics we came up with. The time was too short to come up with a final design, but the speakers will send us a wrap up afterwards.

What are the main take aways of this session?
We concluded that this way of creating a CV can be beneficial in that in create space for new ways of looking at CV's and their purpose. However, one should take into account that this way of working

fits some people but not all. One can argue that creativity becomes a competence measured instead of the content of the CV.

1.11 Implementing R&R: A Dilemma for Early Career Academics (G)

Annemijn Algra and Max van Haastrecht on behalf of several early career networks (YoungSiT, PNN, PhDoc, LAP).

Minister Dijkgraaf was present during this workshop. The Recognition & Rewards movement creates dilemmas for Early Career Academics (ECA's), and the participants did recognize this: should ECA's for instance enter into the discussion with their supervisor, that they want to show they are dissertation-worthy in a 'different' way than the traditional way, or just do what everyone else has always done during this transition period? Is it wise to already submit a narrative when applying for a research grant, or just cite their number of publications? Why is there not more focus on beginning faculty in many universities' R&R programs (and in this workshop as well)? The discussion was lively, and participants could well sense that for ECA's, these questions feel like one to which there is no 'right' or 'wrong' answer.

What are the main take aways of this session?
So far in many R&R project groups at universities there are few ECAs, even though Recognition & Rewards is also about them. They are our future senior academics! Therefore, the main take away is: include them in the project and steering groups. Don't talk about them but include them. In return they bring energy and good ideas.

ROUND 2

2.1 Recognizing open science in research assessments: Issues, challenges, and opportunities (A)
Alex Rushford, Sarah de Rijcke and Hans de Jonge

There are loads of initiatives engaged in transforming the traditional scientific system. Multiple statements, agreements, concordats, best practice principles and so on – these really seem to be growing exponentially. This development leads to a growing awareness among initiators that open science systems must be accompanied by a different approach to assessment. 'How to' has many perspectives. From 'What is meant by openness and which practices to reward?' to 'Skills, infrastructure, administrative routines need building'. The workshop focussed on *data sharing practices* as a dimension of the open science umbrella.

Two vignettes with dilemmas about interests around open science provided material for a conversation which showed that:

- a holistic view is essential during the implementation process, so that even people with reservations experience space for their voices.
- not openness but sets of data should be assessed.
- transparent data management can be a prerequisite for a research project.
- definitions of quality and fairness must be open and clear.
- ask academics within the PhD track to reflect on their approach to data: both qualitative and quantitative.
- the context of the data must be clear: understanding the researcher's stories and intentions leads to an appropriate perspective on quality.
- each discipline has its own specifications regarding openness, we need to give each other the space and trust to develop those specifications.

2.2 Academic Career Track at TU Delft (G)
Meike Blokland and Evan van de Leur (TU Delft)

There is no report available form this workshop.

2.3 Are narrative CVs proving effective in achieving desired outcomes of recognition and reward initiatives? (G)
Noémie Aubert Bonn, James Morris, Sean Sapcariu, Karen Stroobants

The workshop started with short presentations from the speakers, highlighting the international perspectives on the narrative CV, and also zooming in on the perspectives from CoARA, FNR and Science Europe. We then had an open discussion guided by a few questions that were posted by the speakers. One of those questions was how our institutions implemented narrative CV's and what the goal or idea behind the reason for implementation was. Discussing these motives from different perspectives was really useful for figuring out both where are differences and similarities lie, and which differences and similarities we found with regards to the challenges that the implementation brought along. Furthermore it was really productive to hear different experiences with the narrative formats, whether it was from policy officers, researchers that had worked with the format or the people responsible for implementing them. Overall it was a very useful workshop and great way to share ideas and experiences.

What are the main take aways of this session?
That the narrative CV is the right way forward but that we need to keep conversations with researchers and institutions going to ensure we keep moving in the right direction.

2.4 Devising career tracks and criteria: the process as part of the change (I)
Martyna Janowicz and Iris Goedhart (Tilburg University)

During this session, Martyna Janowicz and Iris Goedhart gave an insight in how they try to create a larger diversity of possible career tracks at the Tilburg School of Economics and Management (TiSEM). Martyna and Iris explained to the group how they have to manage internal stakeholders in order to be able to create career opportunities based on education, instead of only based on research. They showed how they identified possible 'bears in the way' they have to overcome in order to reach this goal and explained how they tried to overcome these bears. After their presentation, they asked the group to think about and discuss other bears that can stand in the way of devising career tracks. In small groups, we discussed different possible bears we could think of. We finished with a group discussion again.

What are the main take aways of this session?
The way in which you decide to manage your stakeholders determines the outcome of the process. If you organise this in a right way, stakeholders will be more open for changing their views and you are more likely to be successful.

2.5 Impact-by-design: Drafting, assessing and rewarding performance and learning through impact thinking (G)
Jeroen Jansen, Joost Teube, Wiebke Eberhardt and Fran Meissner (University of Twente)

There is no report available form this workshop.

2.6 No R&R without accountability, leadership and inclusion (G)
Lotje Siffels, Tim Winkel and Younes Saramifar (0.7)

Report to follow.

2.7 Recognition & Rewards for science communication – in practice (G)
Frank Kupper (Athena Institute VU)

This workshop was built around the performances of two actors. They were asked to play out scenarios given to them by Frank and the participants. The participants even got to participate in the play. Central theme: What do scientists need to be able to communicate meaningfully?

The first role play was around a scientist who feels that communication is not part of his core responsibilities. Because he also feels that communication is important, this is one of the things he does in the evenings and at weekends. He feels pressure from society that wants to know what the return on investment is of the research that he does. He wants to take responsibility, but he also has other responsibilities outside science (work-life balance).

The scientist wants to be better at communicating but does not feel supported by the university. No tools, no real help from communication department, not enough time, no appreciation, communication is not expected and considered to be a hobby or free time. Even worse: If you're good at communication, you're taken less seriously as a scientist.

In a next scene a scientist talks with a manager about priorities and time. The scientist is successful in communicating on TV and writing articles for a broad newspaper like NRC. She needs time to prepare for her next 'performance'.

The scientist feels outreach is part of her responsibilities, the manager feels only writing scientific articles is really important. All other things are nice but not what is expected from her. The manager says 'my hands are tied' referring to rules and decisions made by others.

The scientist makes it the manager's responsibility to give her the mandate to spend her time the way she wants to spend it. In the role play the responsibility is escalated higher and higher up in the hierarchy up until the rector (the real rector played the role of his life). This was not an ideal situation. A department as a whole should be able to decide what they think is important in science (including social impact = science communication) and act accordingly. There has to be a plan including a financial paragraph. Choices have to be made and priorities have to be set in harmony.

The manager can then reshuffle people, tasks, responsibilities etc. to improve the recognize & reward of the role of science communication in the total package of responsibilities of science and the scientist.

2.8 Recognizing and rewarding scientists: Time for bias-free assessments (G)

Thomas Hoogeboom (Radboudumc), Nellie Konijnendijk (KNAW) and Soraya Refos (KNAW)

Goal of the session was: try to reimagine the current scientific system using a thought experiment. The veil of ignorance: a thought experiment to overcome your own biases. How to maximise the quality of life for those in the worst positions?

The current system is flawed and has many aversive effects and isn't fair. Current appraisal of scientists is flawed due to, among other things: bias in metrics (i.e., men and women's rates of self-citation differ with 70% → citations lead to new citations), different in funding rate across various ethnic groups, invitations to conferences, student evaluations (students rate male instructors higher)) and stereotyping. Everybody has stereotyping biases imprinted.

The thought experiment: imagine that you are allowed to rethink how we recognize the quality of a scientist. But you do not know who you are when you are being assessed (female/non-binary/male/transgender/cis, brown/black/white, young/old/, etc).

Aspects related to culture, the work environment etc. are possibly the only thing to which a general criterion can (should?) be applied to all individuals as we all have similar ambitions when it comes to establishing the desired culture.

What are the main take aways of this session?

- It should be quality that counts.
- We often argue that a trajectory is the same for everyone. By doing so, we are ignorant of the various circumstances that people are in.

- Certain behaviours are (only) negatively interpreted for certain groups.
- Stereotypes are especially present in people's instincts. This validates the use of quantitative measures.
- There is no single perfect metric. We (the universities and academics) have so many tasks and responsibilities that a metric always needs to be seen in context → personalized metrics.
- Avoid metrics that are biased but keep quantitative measures. People need to know what they need to do!
- Let the person being evaluated propose their own metrics.
- Don't mix performance and potential evaluations.
- Not everyone needs the same goals/criteria.
- Don't keep performance criteria too vague or too hard to reach.
- Don't use student evaluations as a way to measure teaching performance. For alternatives, see the article of Kreitzer & Sweet-Cushman, 2021.
- Formulate team goals with the team. Communicate performance criteria with the team.
- Start with clear, specific, measurable performance criteria directly related to job requirements that were agreed on together.
- When returning from leave, adjust the requirements immediately (you will not be able to make your previous requirements in less time).
- Train reviewers to be aware of their own biases.

2.9 Reimaging assessment: how to balance between the individual and the team (G)
Hanneke Hulst (Leiden University) and Hilde Verbeek (Maastricht University)

Teamwork has become more and more important over the years. This applies not only to research but to all scientific work: teaching, research and impact are often done in teams. When you want to define what a 'team' is, you need to realize that there are formal and informal teams, hierarchical and matrix, temporary and permanent, and thus that there is a very large variety. There is no need to get lost in a definition of 'team'. What makes a number of people a team is a common goal, cooperation and complementarity and above all: trust in each other's knowledge and skills. It is important to realize that individual (career) goals can be disruptive in a team, which is why it is wise to state at the beginning: what does each of the members bring to this team? When synergy and energy are thus created, it is pleasant to work in that team and the team members can achieve beautiful results together.

What are the main take aways of this session?
Trying to assess teamwork can clash with current tools that are mostly individually focused. If you say teamwork is important, but you only judge the individual performance, that's an inconsistent message. There are many examples outside Academia where teams are already being assessed, and where the contribution to the team effort is crucial for one's individual career steps. So, let's bring the "outside in".

2.10 Research Quality Assessment in an era of change: is it possible to develop and operationalize a framework that embraces the current debate and needs of the community? (I)
Klodiana Daphne Tona (Donders Institute Radboudumc)

Tona presents the research quality assessment framework, and the approach to develop the framework.

During this workshop participants stepped into the shoes of an assessor, and from this position (jointly) discussed a framework [under construction] to assess research quality. The framework itself responds to the need to operationalize the reform of research assessment. It is a result of earlier co-creation processes in which a diverse group of academics have been involved.

Within the framework four dimensions which are relevant for assessing research quality are presented, each a 'leg' within an X-frame. The two 'legs' at the base of the X represent the dimensions "Rigor" and "Culture" – pillars of any research. The two upper 'legs' representing "Relevance" and "Originality" will receive more or less importance during an assessment, depending on the context of the assessment.

Before going into break-out groups all participants were asked to indicate – via mentimeter – what they thought constituted 'rigor', 'culture', 'relevance' and 'originality'. The answers were relatively uniform and showed that there is a joint understanding what these terms mean within the context of doing research. This included the relatively new dimension 'culture' (i.e., collaboration/teamwork; social safety; learning environment). Only the word 'societal impact' - which was mentioned within the relevance dimension - raised discussion: not all research would immediately have societal impact. Would all research need to be measured on this?

Within the break-out groups the participants discussed the four dimensions, including sub-elements. Were any missing? What would further be needed to conduct an assessment using this framework? And what would additionally be needed to conduct a transparent assessment?

Some of the results are:

- No additional dimensions were identified. It was suggested that the dimension 'climate' should be at the basis of everything.
- The term impact is confusing – it gives the impression that every researcher immediately has to have impact. This supported the use of 'relevance' rather than 'impact' as one of the dimensions.
- Some sub-dimensions raised discussion - should ethics be assessed as part of 'rigor' or as part of 'culture', or as part of both dimensions?
- An important requirement for a good and transparent assessment: time.

2.11 Writing and assessing impact narratives (I)

Giovanna Lima, Lisa Burghardt, Erika Hajdu and Bart Wesstein (Erasmus University Rotterdam)

There is no report available form this workshop.