Culture @UofG
What are we doing? How are we doing?

Tanita Casci Head of Research Policy
Re-imagining Research Culture, 2 September 2019
@tanitacasci #researchculture
Research culture: What do we mean?

“A positive research culture is one in which colleagues are recognised and valued for their varied contributions to a research activity, in which colleagues support each other to succeed, and in which there is an incentive to produce work that meets the highest standards of academic rigour.”
Promoting how research is done

1. Supporting what we value
2. Rewarding what we value
3. Celebrating what we value
4. Measuring how we are doing
1. **Supporting what we value**

**Credit where credit’s due**
- Specialist career tracks
- Recording authorship contribution

**Openness as a route to quality**
- Sharing research as widely as possible, as early as possible
- Publications, data, code, materials, educational resources

**Measuring what matters**
- Responsible use of metrics
- Staff survey on research culture
CRedit (Contributor Roles Taxonomy) is a high-level taxonomy, including 14 roles, that can be used to represent the roles typically played by contributors to scientific scholarly output. The roles describe each contributor's specific contribution to the scholarly output.
Author contributions in Enlighten

Edit item: Case study: the University of Glasgow’s digital preservation journey 2017-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>Given Name / Initials</th>
<th>GUID</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spence</td>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>as571n</td>
<td>investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spence</td>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>as571n</td>
<td>Writing - original draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCutcheon</td>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>vmc2y</td>
<td>Project administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCutcheon</td>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>vmc2y</td>
<td>Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCutcheon</td>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>vmc2y</td>
<td>Funding acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCutcheon</td>
<td>Valerie</td>
<td>vmc2y</td>
<td>Writing - review and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahon</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>mm401g</td>
<td>Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahon</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>mm401g</td>
<td>Writing - review and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Responsible Metrics” Statement

- Since October 2017
- Institutional approach to assessing research quality

Key features:
- Applies to outputs, supervision, income
- Qualitative and quantitative indicators
- Commits to using normalised metrics
- Transparent about sources of data
- Reviewed regularly

Statement on the Use of Quantitative Indicators in the Assessment of Research Quality

At the University of Glasgow we apply fair and transparent mechanisms for monitoring and reporting research performance. These principles underpin the institutional 2015–2020 key performance indicators (KPIs) for the quality of our research. As we explain below, these principles are also applied in our processes for recruiting staff and assessing their research performance.

The University uses both qualitative and quantitative indicators to assess individual and institutional performance. We acknowledge the limitations of using either approach alone: qualitative indicators can be perceived as being subjective, whereas quantitative indicators can be viewed as being unsophisticated; conversely, qualitative indicators allow the application of expert disciplinary judgement, whereas quantitative indicators allow the application of assessment methodologies that are transparent and consistent.

Both approaches are important, and indeed both are used successfully in the assessment processes used by the UK Research Excellence Framework (REF). The University additionally recognises the ever-increasing role of quantitative indicators in the external measurements of our reputation, as measured by various league tables and funding agencies.

Below we list the principles by which the University uses quantitative indicators, and then describe how we apply them specifically in assessing research outputs (e.g., journal articles, book chapters, monographs), income, postgraduate research (PGR) supervision, and in recruitment, performance management and promotion.
5. Selected Outputs

In the tables below, please list the applicant’s **four most significant publications** or other outputs. Alternatively, please list research impact of equivalent quality.

Under ‘Output details’, please provide, where relevant: the title, title of journal / book (and publisher), year of publication, page ranges, DOI and full author list.

Under ‘Importance & Contribution’ please **highlight the influence that each output has made to advancing the field**, supported by indicators of quality as appropriate to your discipline (maximum 100 words each). Appropriate indicators include, for example, reference to (UK) REF panel criteria or benchmarked and subject-normalised citation metrics, but **not journal impact factor**.

In the case of jointly authored outputs, **please state your contribution to the work**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output details</th>
<th>Importance &amp; Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output details</th>
<th>Importance &amp; Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output details</th>
<th>Importance &amp; Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output details</th>
<th>Importance &amp; Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document your commitment to open research, as appropriate to your discipline (open data, open access, open code, open educational resources and practices that support replication).
2. **Rewarding** what we value

Academic promotion criteria

Requirement to evidence:

- **Collegiality**: Outputs, funding, supervision, impact, teaching, leadership, esteem

- **Excellence**: Reward not only **what** is done but **how** it is done

Also:
Parity of credit for **impact** and **outputs**
Good research thrives in an environment in which colleagues support each other to succeed.

Awards announced June 2019
RESEARCH CULTURE

At the University of Glasgow we are creating an environment that produces research of the highest quality. Good research happens within a community that supports, incentivises and rewards a positive research culture. A positive culture is one in which colleagues are recognised and valued for their contribution, in which they support each other to succeed, and in which researchers are motivated to produce work of the highest standards of academic rigour.

A positive culture cannot be achieved in a single step. Our approach is to focus on a series of actions to further key values, such as research integrity, open research, recognition for varied contributions to research, fair approaches to evaluation and collegiality. These values are now embedded in our promotions and individual performance criteria.

Our aim is to recognise not just what research is done but also how it is done.

• Plan initiatives to promote a positive research culture
• Conduct internal monitoring of progress, e.g. through surveys
• Inform external reporting on culture and good practice
• Manage communications
An annual assurance statement for culture?

- Public statement that we go beyond box-ticking
- Share ideas with the sector
- Keep us focussed and committed
- Make us attractive to external recruits
- Transparency to staff
4. Measuring how we are doing

Research Culture Survey 2019

- >1,200 Responses
- >1,500 Text comments
- Research-only, Research & Teaching, Technical Staff

![Pie chart for job family distribution]

- Research only: 62.7%
- Research and Teaching: 29.4%
- Technical and Specialist: 6.1%
- Not specified: 1.7%

![Pie chart for gender distribution]

- Female: 39.4%
- Male: 47.5%
- Not specified: 1.1%
- Prefer not to say: 11.7%
Q9: Reflecting on the past 5 years, do you think research culture has improved at the University?
Q4: Does your current research project or study have a data management plan?

- Just over 50% of participants agree that they had a data management plan.
- Around 30% indicate that they did not.
- The remaining 20% either don’t know, think they do or did not specify.
Q2: To what extent do you agree that your School / Institute supports a culture of…

2.1. Open research (e.g. open data, pre-print publishing, making research materials or designs publicly available, or other ways of increasing transparency) 68.7%
2.2. Open access publication 72.4%
2.3. Research integrity (e.g. good authorship practice, robust study design) 74.7%
2.4. Discussion of personal and professional development 57.1%
2.5. Valuing quality of publication (or output) over quantity 61.0%
2.6. Collegiality (in which colleagues support each other to succeed in research) 58.5%
2.7. Collaboration across groups or disciplines 56.0%
Q3: To what extent do you agree with the following statements...

- >75% of participants agree or strongly agree that they understand what constitutes research impact and good authorship practice in their discipline (Q3.3 & Q3.4)

- <50% of participants agree or strongly agree that they feel able to spend time undertaking Continuing Professional Development activities relevant to their career aspirations (Q3.6)
Q5: I understand where I can go for information or support on the following topics.

Q6: Which of the following areas would you like to know more about?
Free-text comments (>1,500!): Key observations

**What we want**

1. More TIME, less bureaucracy
2. Value OUTPUTS as much as funding
3. Opportunities for COLLABORATION
4. Greater job SECURITY, open dialogue
5. Committed & up-to-date LEADERSHIP

**What we value**

Pre-submission peer-review of papers and grants, work-in-progress sessions, writing retreats, formal or informal

Opportunities to connect in supportive, inclusive and casual environment
Thank you!
Tanita.Casci@glasgow.ac.uk
@tanitacasci #researchculture