

Concluding remarks

Bernard Rentier

Why do we assess ?

- Resources are scarce (money, time)
- Researchers are accountable
- Growing distrust and frustration

How do we assess ?

- Today mostly on quick proxies (Journal Impact Factors,...), not enough on content and advancement of knowledge
- Impact of research is a good indicator but it should be clear which impact, on what and how to measure it
- Quantitative assessment generates competition, not sharing

Why should we change ?

- Landscape is changing (towards O.S.)
- Open Science is based on exchange and sharing
- Assessment should take these principles into account.

Why should we change ?

- Reduce quantitative criteria, increase weight of qualitative criteria (quantitative metrics induces overpublication)
- Current practices of assessment reduce researchers' diversity

Are there alternatives ?

- DORA
- Several theoretical paths
- Concrete initiatives (Ghent University, panels)

Sharing experience

- In universities
- Role for libraries, in synergy with researchers, monitoring impact (macro & micro)

Public authorities, funders, OA publishers, researchers: same combat

- Awareness of OS benefits and collateral damage
- Consensus on where we are, not quite on how to get where...
- Compliance of funders to O.S. principles is increasing but not quite enforced
- « Everybody is well-intentioned »

Take-home message

There is no way to implement Open Science harmoniously without a large, significant and determined consensus on new ways to evaluate research and researchers.