name	label	choice1	choice2	choice3	choice4	choice5	choice6	choice7	choice8
note_Info1	# Survey on the usage of indicators and metrics in research assessment The goal of the survey is to review the metrics and indicators used in member institutions of the "[Responsible Metrics and Indicators](https://github.com/rachelHey/metricsWG)" Working Group (RMI WG) of CoARA. **The aim is to investigate the status quo of how metrics and indicators are used in research assessment.** This will be a ground for preparing an integrative framework of indicator-based and qualitative research assessment. If you have any questions or concerns do not hesitate to [contact us](https://github.com/rachelHey/metricsWG). We are very grateful for your time and collaboration. The survey is open until 2024-06-16. **Confidentiality and open data**: We will release anonymous open data. We make sure that neither individuals nor institutions can be identified. If we quote or paraphrase open text answers in a report, we will ask each author for approval. Most questions concern practices at your institution, but some also ask for your personal opinion. Please read our [consent form](https://www.psy.lmu.de/pm/consent/rmi-study.html) and assert with the check box below that you have read it and agree to it. You can get a copy of the data you entered. Instructions will be provided in the email we send to all participants. In order to keep this survey short, we created a [separate document](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1qXRs_kb76G8fPfbFqRJ91FwnElZKYyXaHLpRMFFRsGI/edit?usp=sharing) where we give more background information on the aims and the terminology. *The Steering Committee of the RMI WG* Davide Crepaldi (Italian Reproducibility Network) dcrepaldi@sissa.it Rachel Heyard (Swiss Reproducibility Network) rachel.heyard@uzh.ch Katarzyna Nawrot (Poznan University of Economics and Business) katarzyna.nawrot@ue.poznan.pl (Co-Chair of the RMI WG) Felix Schönbrodt (German Psychological Society) felix.schoenbrodt@psy.lmu.de (Co-Chair of the RMI WG)								
note_Info2	<details> <summary> What are "metrics" and "indicators"? (click for more) </summary> In this survey, the terms "indicators" and "metrics" are used interchangeably and are meant in a broad way - any quantifiable variable that is supposed to be a (often noisy) measure of an evaluative dimension (such as quality, rigor, productivity, performance). Indicators can be on any scale level, including dichotomous (e.g., present/ not present), counts (e.g., number of publications), rating scales (e.g., not at all - somewhat - a lot), or complex numerical values, which are themselves aggregates of more basic information (e.g., the Altmetric Score). Basically, an indicator is anything that you could put as a number into a spreadsheet table. In the survey, we will only use the term "indicator". </details> 								
note_Info3	<details> <summary> We only consider <i>research</i> activities. (click for more) </summary> We only consider indicators for the evaluation of research activities (i.e., we do not consider indicators for other academic activities, such as teaching, administration, or leadership performance). </details>								

name	label	choice1	choice2	choice3	choice4	choice5	choice6	choice7	choice8
consent_check	I have read the [consent form](https://www.psy.lmu.de/pm/consent/rmi-study.html) and agree to it.								
submit_welcome	Continue to next page ...								
note_GeneralInformation	### General information								
Institution_Name	Name of the institution								
Website	Website of the institution								
Email	Your email address. We need this to send you the invitation to the next part of the survey.								
Position	Position of the person answering the questionnaire								
CoARA_member	Is your institution a CoARA member?	Yes	No						
CoARA_month	Please specify approximately from when (year/month).								
CoARA_interest	Is your institution planning to undertake efforts to join CoARA in the future?	Yes, within the next year	Yes, within 2–3 years	Not planned, but cannot be ruled out	Not interested	I don't know			
Institution_Type	What is the type of the institution you are representing?	University	School of Higher Education	Scientometric organization	Evaluation organization	Funding organization	Academic society	Grassroot Network / Reproducibility Network	Other
University_Type	Please specify the type:	General University	Art University	Economic University	Life Science University	Medical University	Technical University		
School_of_Higher_Education_Type	Please specify the type:	Technical	Other School of Higher Education						
Institution_Other	Please specify:								
Discipline	(optional:) Does your institution represent a specific scientific discipline or group of disciplines? If yes, which?								
OwnershipStructure	Ownership structure of your institution:	Public/non-commercial institution	Commercial institution	Other					
OwnershipStructure_Other	Please specify:								
Institution_Size	If you have the numbers quickly at hand: Size of your institution in approximate number of active researchers (Professors & Postdocs; not counting PhD students).	1-9	10-49	50-99	100-249	250-499	500 and more	Does not apply	I don't know
institution_Students	Size of your institution in approximate number of students.	1-99	100-499	500-1000	1000-9999	10000-19999	20000 and more	We have no students / does not apply	I don't know
Location	In which country is your institution (primarily) based?	Specific country	International institution						
Location_Country	Please specify:								

name	label	choice1	choice2	choice3	choice4	choice5	choice6	choice7	choice8
MI_Use	Are indicators used in your institution? (Select all that apply)	In a formalized/standardized way	In an informal way (e.g., committee members are counting publications, although this is not an "official" indicator)						
Evaluation_Units	What are the **units** of evaluation?								
Evaluation_Units_Outputs	Specific research *outputs* (e.g., papers, data sets, projects)	Yes	No						
Evaluation_Purpose_Outputs	What is the purpose of evaluation? (multiple choice)	Academic graduation (e.g., PhD, habilitation)	Academic hiring	Job promotion to a higher payment or prestige level	Performance-oriented payments and rewards	Awards	Funding decisions (both third-party and internal funding; project-based and/or permanent positions)		
Evaluation_Purpose_Outputs_Other	Other purposes of evaluation (optional):								
Evaluation_Units_Persons	Individual *researchers* (i.e., persons)	Yes	No						
Evaluation_Purpose_Outputs_2	What is the purpose of evaluation? (multiple choice)	Academic graduation (e.g., PhD, habilitation)	Academic hiring	Job promotion to a higher payment or prestige level	Performance-oriented payments and rewards	Awards	Funding decisions (both third-party and internal funding; project-based and/or permanent positions)		
Evaluation_Purpose_Outputs_Other_2	Other purposes of evaluation (optional):								
Evaluation_Units_Teams	Larger *groups* of researchers (i.e., teams)	Yes	No						
Evaluation_Purpose_Outputs_3	What is the purpose of evaluation? (multiple choice)	Academic graduation (e.g., PhD, habilitation)	Academic hiring	Job promotion to a higher payment or prestige level	Performance-oriented payments and rewards	Awards	Funding decisions (both third-party and internal funding; project-based and/or permanent positions)		

name	label	choice1	choice2	choice3	choice4	choice5	choice6	choice7	choice8
Evaluation_Purpose_Outputs_Other_3	Other purposes of evaluation (optional):								
Evaluation_Units_Institutions	Entire *institutions* or large subunits (departments, universities)	Yes	No						
Evaluation_Purpose_Outputs_4	What is the purpose of evaluation? (multiple choice)	Academic graduation (e.g., PhD, habilitation)	Academic hiring	Job promotion to a higher payment or prestige level	Performance-oriented payments and rewards	Awards	Funding decisions (both third-party and internal funding; project-based and/or permanent positions)	General performance evaluation of the institution	
Evaluation_Purpose_Outputs_Other_4	Other purposes of evaluation (optional):								
MI_Impact	In your opinion, how high is the impact of indicators on decisions and/or rankings within your assessment exercise?	High	Medium	Low	Insignificant				
MI_Impact_AnswerBase	↳ What is your answer based on?	official documents	participation in meetings and committees	your own experience as a subject of assessment	small talk with colleagues	other			
MI_Impact_AnswerBase_Other	Please specify:								
submit_Questions	Continue to next page ...								
note_moreindicators	**Important note**: You will soon receive an email from "rmi@researchcloud.org". This email contains a link with which you can always go back to this survey and add more indicators. Please check check your SPAM folder.								
submit_spam_notification	Continue to next page ...								
note_MI	## Indicators You now can submit multiple indicators which are used in research assessment at your institution. **Aim for at least three indicators - but you can submit as many as you want.** *You can also submit (more) indicators later. We sent you an email with a link.* Instructions: * Note: "Indicator" and "metric" are used interchangeable. * We only consider indicators for the evaluation of *research* activities. (i.e., we do not consider indicators for other academic activities, such as teaching, administration, or leadership performance). * We are explicitly interested both in official and 'unofficial' indicators that are used in your institution, and also in indicators that are only used "locally" at your institution. If in your experience some committees regular								
MI_Own	Do you want to submit indicators now? (If "no", please submit them later, see email)	Yes	No						
submit_MI_Number	Continue to next page ...								