Research and researcher assessment is a systems challenge, suggesting that institutions that prioritize developing infrastructures to support their efforts may be better positioned to achieve their goals than those focused only on individual solutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STANDARDS FOR SCHOLARSHIP</th>
<th>FROM FOUNDATION...</th>
<th>Core definitions and shared clarity of purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROCESS MECHANICS AND POLICIES</td>
<td>TO EXPANSION...</td>
<td>Increased traction and capability development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTABILITY</td>
<td>TO SCALING</td>
<td>Accelerated uptake and continuous improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULTURE WITHIN INSTITUTIONS</td>
<td>ADOPTION OF NEW PRACTICES</td>
<td>Faculty have the ability to customize success measures to reflect their research interests and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATIVE AND ITERATIVE FEEDBACK</td>
<td>INTEGRATION INTO EXISTING SYSTEMS</td>
<td>Assessment mechanisms can be flexibly applied and adapted to accommodate diverse disciplines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STANDARDS FOR SCHOLARSHIP**

How are new definitions of “quality scholarship” formulated and applied?

**PROCESS MECHANICS AND POLICIES**

How are new practices incorporated into review structures, processes, and institutional policies?

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

How are individuals and institutions held liable for executing on new assessment practices?

**CULTURE WITHIN INSTITUTIONS**

How are assessment practices perceived and adopted both within and outside of formal evaluation activities?

**EVALUATIVE AND ITERATIVE FEEDBACK**

How are intervention outcomes and progress toward institutional values captured and continually improved upon?
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Institutions just starting to think about research and scholarship assessment reforms may not yet be ready to begin testing new practices, and instead be primarily focused on articulating and building a case for why new assessment practices will be beneficial and aligning on values to support them. They might also start by identifying and diagnosing the nature of biases that exist in their assessment systems, which can help institutions get more specific about what issues need to be addressed more systematically in new structures and processes.

Research increasingly suggests that diverse groups create solutions and policies that are less biased. Actively engaging a diverse set of participant individuals to ensure breadth of representation can help ensure that efforts are inclusive from the outset, as well as contributing to more broadly applicable and relevant assessment mechanisms.

Conducting work related to assessment reform with high levels of transparency can also help to encourage an increased sense of credibility in the final results.

Ensuring that new assessment principles and practices are internalized and actively used requires addressing issues of capacity. This can mean setting aside sufficient time and support to learn new mechanisms or processes, but also recognizing that more holistic and qualitative inputs may initially require more processing time than metrics like JIF. Supporting uptake may benefit from top-down advocacy and structures to encourage adherence and reduce reactance, as well as articulating and adopting a well-rounded set of leading and lagging indicators to more quickly identify what is working or not.

While internalizing new principles and practices at an individual level is important, mid- or late-stage reform institutions can increase adoption by intentionally building in apparatuses to systematically monitor and scale new models.

Integrating values and desirable actions into processes and structures can increase the likelihood that new reforms are applied consistently, and can also reduce the pressure on individuals to teach or convince others given that preferred behaviors are essentially “baked in” to institutional norms and activities.

Institutions at later stages of research and scholarship assessment reform will benefit from recognizing that it is an ongoing process of monitoring and reflexivity rather than a one-and-done accomplishment. This requires proactively identifying issues as conditions change. It also means adopting an anticipatory mindset for improvement to recognize how success can also lead to unintended consequences, such as systems that achieve higher equity of applicants and hires but which fail to provide support post-hire mentoring or access to opportunities.