



VQR 2011-2014

evaluation of non-bibliometric products

andrea bocco, DIST



Fields of knowledge

Non-bibliometric evaluation for:

08A – architecture

10 – literature, history of art

11A – history, philosophy, pedagogy

12 – law

13 – economics and statistics

14 – sociology and political science

One GEV for each Field of knowledge; each GEV is composed by two referees for each scientific discipline plus a Coordinator



Products accepted

- **Scientific monographs** (includes Collections of research essays, etc.)
- **Scientific Articles**, Review essays, and similar pieces
- **Contributions to volumes**, such as Chapters, Essays, Scientific articles in peer-reviewed **conference proceedings**, Edited volumes, Catalogues, Dictionary and Encyclopaedia entries, Translations
- **Other scientific products**: Compositions, Drawings, Architectural projects, Exhibitions, Maps, Data banks, Software, Prototypes...
- **Patents**



Products accepted

- Handbooks and teaching supports
- Reviews of a single work
- Short encyclopaedia and dictionary entries
- Short case notes
- Short catalogue entries

are **not** accepted



Evaluation methodologies

1. peer-review with external reviewers (generally two, possibly one Italian and one stranger)

2. direct evaluation performed by GEV

3. bibliometric analysis (if applicable)

informed peer review consists of merging 1. and 3.
assignment to quality levels is not automatic



Peer reviewers

Selection of external reviewers based on

- competence, not on representation of scientific associations or academies
- language skills
- role
- provenance

Lists of scholars and authoritative specialists have been formed for each field of knowledge

Reviewers have been asked to evaluate up to 30 pieces, and to act conforming to the principle of loyal institutional cooperation governed by criteria of fairness, objectivity and impartiality



Peer review process

Evaluation of scientific products was based on **a specific evaluation form** and on the **guidelines** prepared by each GEV.

Three **criteria**: originality, methodological rigor, actual or potential impact.

Free text field containing a compulsory, short opinion to substantiate the scores assigned for each criterion.

The total score determined a first, tentative attribution of each product to one of the five quality levels: Excellent; High; Fair; Acceptable; Limited.

Such attribution has been evaluated critically first, and separately, by both GEV referees, then by the GEV coordinator. In the case of overly discordant assessments or litigation between peer reviewers, either the judgment of a third expert or the establishment of a Consensus Group were called in.

Substantial, not bureaucratic character of evaluation



A discussion of results (08A)

Accentuation of **internationalisation**, pursued by modifying research production and circulation practices (greater presence of works signed by several authors, marking alliances and orientations).

Accentuation of **disciplinarity**.

'**Professionalisation**' of research: extension of good practical sense in dealing with problems and methodology. (Report of the 1st VQR: problem of "adopting more stringent and selective production methods").

Rapid **growth of articles** to the detriment of other types of products, result of well recognisable exogenous pushes.

Affirmation of **productivism**: short research times, and reduction of time-consuming research; privileged traditional objects, minimisation of innovation, impoverishment of frontier areas; recurrence of themes, authors and circulation channels; evaluation-oriented research.

The **correspondence** between score of the article and class of the magazine is not at all obvious.