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Driving Institutional Change for Research Assessment Reform

How can we improve how scientists and scientific work are evaluated, recognized, and rewarded?

How can we diminish the corrosive influence of journal names and metrics in research assessment?
Peer review meeting in 2018

Publish the content of peer reviews
Current challenges with assessment

- **Corrupting incentives:** scientists are evaluated based on where they publish, not what they publish.
- **Lack of transparency and accountability:** results of peer evaluation are not made available to inform assessment by institutions or funders.
- **Lack of credit:** scientists do not receive discoverable credit for their contributions (for example, as collaborators, creators of datasets & software, or as peer reviewers).
Future of scientific communication and assessment

- Autonomy and recognition for researchers
  - Authors share; Credit is assigned based on individual contributions

- Open Science
  - Open Access; Unique identifiers for all outputs

- Transparent evaluations of scientific work
  - Contribute to institutional assessments
People, not projects

- to enable creative scientists to follow their curiosity
- to promote discovery science for long-term impacts on scientific progress

HHMI Investigators work at host institutions across the US.
HHMI expects its Investigators to achieve some combination of the following:

- Pursue rigorous & deep biological studies
- Lead research fields into new areas of inquiry
- Develop innovative tools and methods
- Forge links between basic biology and human health
- Demonstrate promise of future contributions
- Actively serve and train at host institutions and in community
# The HHMI review process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewers</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>In-person meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respected leaders</td>
<td>Research report</td>
<td>Presentation on accomplishments &amp; future plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-serving and ad hoc experts</td>
<td>Five most significant papers (incl. preprints)</td>
<td>Q &amp; A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors, not deciders</td>
<td>Mentorship &amp; community activity</td>
<td>Deliberations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal evaluation of reviewers</td>
<td></td>
<td>HHMI leadership makes decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A selection of 5 most significant papers

- Short impact statements for each paper
A selection of 5 most significant papers

- Short impact statements for each paper.
- Must be publicly shared as a preprint if not yet published in a journal.
What counts in HHMI assessment

What counts
- Expert advisors
- 5 critical articles
- Past accomplishments

What doesn’t
- Number of papers
- Publication venue
- Research $ 

“Deletion test”
Learning from the HHMI process

Consider elements of HHMI’s process for promotion and tenure review, for example the focus on a few research articles.

We share our review process here:

hhmi.org/programs/biomedical-research/investigator-program/review
Thank You.