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Questions and issues

1. Peer review models in different contexts (overview table)
2. Criticism, Biases, and Obstacles
3. Criteria and Dimensions
4. Granularity, Scope and Costs
5. Selection of Peers and Process Management
6. Country Visit UK
7. Template
Peer review models in use
(all countries respond)

Peer review models

1) Pure peer review
2) Mixed model with peer review and metrics (for different purposes)
3) Informed peer review (mostly informed by metrics and numbers)
4) Extended peer review (including non-scientific peers)

Different Purposes / Contexts

1) PRFS
2) in national evaluation / assessment exercises (field evaluations, disciplinary evaluations) without any links to funding
3) at University/regional level
## Overview Table

### Peer review models in use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>PR in PRFS</th>
<th>PR other national uses</th>
<th>PR other levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Field evaluations neither systematically nor regularly</td>
<td>Quality Assurance at University level mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(often informed PR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>informed PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>mixed model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column 1 (green) will be filled - based on the information already collected, please check

Columns 2 and 3 - to be filled by the participants
2. Criticism, Biases, and Obstacles

1. Conservative
2. Insufficient with interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, translational, and problem-solving research
3. Conflict of interest and potential biases
4. Time consuming and expensive
3. Criteria and Dimensions

1. Research quality
   1. Interdisciplinary, transdisciplinary, translational research, problem-solving research, non-English outputs
   2. Importance of numbers, metrics and statistics


3. Use of self-assessments

4. Scores

5. Final outcome
   1. Stars, Scores, Rankings, Numbers
   2. Recommendations
   3. Prospective elements
4. Granularity, Scope and Costs
   
   1) Areas /institutions under consideration
      1) Selected
      2) All
   2) Unit of Assessment (researcher, group / faculty, university)
   3) Scope and architecture of Panels (crucial according costs and acceptance)
      1) Number and Hierarchy
      2) On-site-visits or remote panel evaluation
      3) Combinations in multi-step approaches
Selection of Peers and Process Management

5. Selection of Peers and Process Management

1) Avoiding Conflict of interest and potential biases
   1) Small countries, small research communities
   2) Different “schools of thought”

2) Appropriate presentation of all relevant aspects
   1) Gender
   2) Geographic distribution (national, international or mixed)
   3) Users or industry

3) Social interaction and process management
   1) Disagreement, dominance of few panelists, division of work
   2) Preparation and organization
6. Country Visit UK

April 28: UK presentation REF at HEFCE

1) David Sweeney - Director - Research, Education & Knowledge Exchange

2) Steven Hill - Head of Research Policy

3) Kim Hackett - REF Manager

Finetuning of emphasis and availability will follow (Erik, Dorothea and the HEFCE people)

Proposal of agenda - Room for input from participating countries
7. Template

1. Overview: Peer review models in use - see Slide 4
2. Participants can share their experiences and interests
   1. Criticism, Biases, and Obstacles
      1. Experiences ......
      2. Interest ......
3. Participants may suggest topics, emphasis etc for the discussion on Peer review in PRFS in London on April 28.