



Evaluation of FEEM Research Programs and Researchers

January 2017

Evaluation of FEEM

Research Programs and Researchers

1 Core Methodology

In the previous years, FEEM CCSD researchers have been evaluated according to their productivity, in a specific and short time window, in terms of the quantity and quality of their publications - specifically *peer-review articles*, *working papers* and *project reports*. From 2016 onwards, FEEM Research Programs and researchers will be evaluated - in a specific time window- according to their performances (output quantity & quality) in three main macro areas: *Research Outcomes*, *Policy Support & Social Impact* and *Fundraising*. Each pillar contains several groups and/or subgroups of FEEM outcomes (see sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 for details) forming the elementary inputs in the evaluation process. Given this scope, the correct approach is to count the quantity of outputs produced (in the time window considered) by each FEEM Research Program and researcher whilst considering at the same time their quality. For this reason, the evaluation process is based on the *scoring rule*¹: each FEEM Research Program and researcher is ranked according to the sum of all its and their *scores* in the specific time window considered.

Important. A *value added* approach is used in the research outcome pillar; that is, if an outcome has been produced in several and different ways during the considered time window (for example Media, WP and Peer reviewed), only the outcome with the highest score will be considered (Peer reviewed).

1.1 Scores

Program's Coordinators have been asked to assign a score to each elementary indicator used in the evaluation process, using as numéraire the score artificially assigned to a publication in a *Top Journal* (10 points). **As a consequence the ratio between the scores of two different indicators represents their relative importance.** For example if an outcome A is considered half as important as a Top Journal, its score is half the score of a Top Journal (the score of A is hence 5 points).

Bonus. the research outcomes and fundraising activities that involve FEEM cross area will receive a bonus of 20% respect the original score.

1.2 FEEM Research Programs and Researcher Ranking

FEEM researcher. Prior to summation, each output score is rescaled taking into account the number of FEEM co-authors/co-workers; co-authors/co-workers not affiliated to FEEM are not take into account.

Maternity Leave. The score of a researcher in maternity leave will be increased proportionally to the amount of time she could not work in the time window considered.

¹ Marchant T. (2009), Score-based bibliometric rankings of authors, Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology.

FEEM Research Program. The final score of a program will be given by the sum of all outcomes' scores belonging to that program; as a consequence an outcome belongs to a programme according to its relevance and not, hence, to the affiliation of a FEEM author.

In order to allocate part of *FEEM Base Research Fund* among programmes, each programme will receive a fixed quota and a variable one proportional to the score obtained with the following rule: (0.5 weight) according to the score obtained evaluating the performance of a program in absolute term (independently of the number of researchers) and (0.5 weight) according to the score obtained evaluating the performance of a program the program in standardized term (by the number of researchers belonging to it, taking into account the share of time a researcher works for that program).

2 Elementary Indicators and Their Scores

As said, FEEM Research Programs and researchers will be evaluated according to their performances in three main pillars (*Research Outcomes, Policy Support & Social Impact* and *Fundraising*). Each pillar is formed by several groups and/or subgroups of outcomes; a score for each of them has been assigned and shown in the following tables.

All the information come from FEEM Activity Report (FAR). We will not consider only PhD Thesis (because their value lies in the articles that will then be published), Other (because a score cannot be assigned) and Events and Training Activities.

2.1 Research outcomes and related scores

Group	Sub-group	Score
<i>Book with ISBN</i>	English	7
(only authored books: edited books are not considered)	Italian	5
<i>Printed International Magazines and Newspapers</i>	None	2
<i>Chapter or paper in Book with ISBN</i>	English	1.5
	Italian	1.5
<i>Policy journals</i>	None	1.5
<i>Peer-Review Journals</i>	Infinite set	(see note) ²

² The score of a peer-reviewed publication will be based on the quality of the journal where it has been published. Keeping fixed the scores assigned by FEEM Senior researchers in the FAR past editions (i.e. $Score_{Top J.} = 10$, $Score_{Lowest qual. J.} = 1.54$), the score of a publication in the j -th peer reviewed journal, denoted by S_j , will be based on a linear re-parametrization of its journal's Scimago Journal bibliometric indicator (SJR_j) ([link: http://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php](http://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php)) according to the following formula:

$$S_j = \begin{cases} 10 & \text{for } SJR_j > 12.485 = SJR_{Econometrica} \\ \varphi \cdot SJR_j + \delta & \text{for } \min(SJR) = 0.1 \leq SJR_j \leq 12.485 \\ 1.54 & \text{for } SJR_j = n.a. \end{cases}$$

where $j \in T = \{\text{All peer reviewed Journals}\}$, $\varphi \approx 0.683$ and $\delta \approx 1.4716$

<i>Conference Paper</i>	None	1
<i>Working Paper</i>	None	1
<i>Project Report</i>	None	1
<i>ICCG Reflection</i>	None	0.2
<i>RE3</i>	None	0.2
<i>Media, Press, Blog, Magazines</i>	None	0.2
<i>ICCG ICP</i>	None	0.1
<i>Brief</i>	None	0.1

2.2 Policy Support and Social Impact

Group	Sub-group	Proposed Score
<i>Activities as Trainer or Supervisor</i>	None	1
<i>Policy Impact Activities (participation at policy process)</i>	International	3
	National	2
<i>Advisory Activities</i>	International	3
	National	2
<i>Stakeholder Engagement</i>	None	1
<i>Awards and Recognitions</i>	International	5
	National	2

2.3 Fundraising³

Group	Sub-group	Proposed Score
<i>Financed Project as Coordinator</i>	$\geq \text{€}500k$	10
	$\text{€}300k \leq x < \text{€}500k$	8
	$x < \text{€}300k$	5
	$\geq \text{€}300k$	5
<i>Financed Project as Partner</i>	$\text{€}100k \leq x < \text{€}300k$	3
	$x < \text{€}100k$	1
	in reserve list	3
<i>Non Financed Project as Coordinator</i>	> EU threshold	2
	in reserve list	1
<i>Non Financed Project as Partner</i>	> EU threshold	0.5
	in reserve list	0.5
<i>Non Financed Project: all remaining cases</i>	None	0.1

³ All monetary values refer to the budget actually assigned to FEEM, not to the project budget.

This document was approved on January 12th, 2017.