



Questionnaire for a survey on forms of evaluation of research proposals oriented to the search for solutions to development problems: characteristics, processes and evaluation criteria

Latin American Forum for Scientific Evaluation (FOLEC) of the Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO) and the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Canada.

This questionnaire is inspired by the evaluation experience of the Sectorial Commission for Scientific Research (CSIC) of the University of the Republic, Uruguay. It has been designed by the researcher Natalia Gras, Associate Professor of the Academic Unit of the CSIC of the University of the Republic, Uruguay, within the framework of the CLACSO-IDRC 109465-001 Project, based in the CLACSO research area, directed by Pablo Vommaro. It benefits from the participation of FOLEC-CLACSO (as an observer) in the research evaluation work group of the Global Research Council and in the DORA Advisory Council and from the collaboration of the work team made up of Laura Rovelli, Dominique Babini and Ana Luna González.

"Development problems" will be used to refer broadly to the problems of social and economic development of the countries (problems in the area of production of goods and services, public policy, health, social exclusion, poverty, environmental, energy, etc.)

Welcome

Information for participants and consent.

The deadline for answering this questionnaire is **September 13th, 2021**, and it takes an average of 20 to 25 minutes to complete it.

You can download a PDF version of the questionnaire for guidance here. But only responses received by completing the online questionnaire will be processed.

What is this questionnaire about?

We intend, through this questionnaire, to gather information on the forms of evaluation of research proposals oriented to the search for solutions to development problems, their characteristics, processes and evaluation criteria by specialists and/or authorities of scientific and/or higher education organizations in countries of the **Global South, particularly in developing economies of South Asia like Bangladesh, India and Sri Lanka.**

In this way, we aim to highlight and analyze relevant and quality ways of evaluating research proposals for funding to better adapt to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals

(SDGs), global "grand challenges" and local critical situations, as well as to facilitate funding schemes that promote more inclusive research systems.

Our results will be open access and internationally disseminated to major funders of science, innovation and higher education.

Initiatives participating in this research will be selected to be invited to present their case at the [9th. Latin American and Caribbean Social Science Conference](#), to be held in Mexico City, Mexico, June 7-10, 2022.

Who can answer the questionnaire?

Specialists and/or authorities of the organization in charge of a call/instrument to finance research projects in some of the countries of the Global South, with focus on **developing economies of South Asia: Bangladesh, India and Sri Lanka**.

It is possible to answer one form for the most representative call/instrument for the promotion of oriented research in your organization; or two or more forms for each of the most relevant calls/instruments for the promotion of oriented research in your organization.

How will my responses be used and stored?

The results of this questionnaire will be used in a CLACSO-IDRC study. The survey is personalized. Those who complete the questionnaire will be referenced as contributors to this research in the final report. However, their personal contact information will be used exclusively for the purposes of this research and will be kept strictly confidential. The controller of this project is CLACSO and the final results will be published in June 2022 in a CLACSO-IDRC report.

Contact

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the project coordinator, Dr. Laura Rovelli, Coordinator of the Latin American Forum for Scientific Evaluation (FOLEC-CLACSO):
folec@clacso.edu.ar

Consent to participate

Please check the box below to indicate that you agree to participate in this study:

- I have read the participant information on the previous pages and understand what the research consists of.
- I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw from the survey at any time, without having to give a reason, and without any consequences.
- I understand that I am giving the research team the right to use and make available the information I share (even if it is not attributed to me and/or my organization, if indicated) without further consent in the following ways:

A) Publications in scholarly journals and other media; or talks at public conferences.

B) Reports, online media, blogs, policy briefs.

* Consent

Consent YES NO

Disclaimer

CLACSO-IDRC is not responsible for the content of the questionnaires created through the SurveyMonkey service, or for the opinions expressed in them.

I. Contextual and instrument characteristics

I.1 General characteristics of the organization

Question 1: In which country is your organization located?

Question 2: What is the name of your organization?

Question 3: What type of organization is your organization? (Check the appropriate option)

- Public university
- Private university
- Public-private university
- International university
- National Research Center
- Regional Research Center
- International Research Center
- National Council of Science, Technology and Innovation
- Regional Council for Science, Technology and Innovation
- Ministry/Secretariat for Science, Technology and Innovation or other type of governmental entity with responsibility for the definition of STI policies
- National Agency of Science, Technology and Innovation or other type of governmental entity with responsibility for the execution of public policies in STI
- Other (Specify)

Question 4: ¿How much does your organization encourage and promote the following aspects?

	A lot	Little	Nothing
Ethics and integrity (of the research proposals, their research teams and of the people involved in the evaluation processes).			

Social commitment and participation of society's stakeholders			
Open access and open science			
Equity, diversity and inclusion of underrepresented groups.			
Consideration of balances with respect to certain aspects (geographic, institutional, thematic, gender, etc.) in the distribution of research resources.			
Interdisciplinarity			

Question 5: Does your organization promote responsible evaluation of research?

- Yes (Specify)
- No
- Don't Know

Question 6: Does your organization support any of the existing statements, recommendations, or principles on responsible research evaluation? (Check all that apply)

- San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA; <https://sfdora.org>)
- Leiden Manifesto on Research Metrics (<http://www.leidenmanifesto.org>)
- Hong Kong Principles (<https://www.wcrif.org/guidance/hong-kong-principles>)
- Global Research Council's Statement of Principles on Peer Review and Merit (https://www.globalresearchcouncil.org/fileadmin/documents/GRC_Publications/Statement_of_Principles_on_Peer-Merit_Review_2018.pdf)
- Science Europe's Recommendations on Research Assessment Processes (<https://www.scienceeurope.org/our-priorities/research-assessment/>)
- Assessment framework developed by your own organization. If you have a link to such an evaluation framework, please copy it here:
- Other (Specify)

Question 7: Does your organization have a formal definition of research quality?

- Yes (Specify)
- No
- Don't know

Question 8: Which of the following statements about the assessment of targeted research proposals are implemented in your organization? (Please check all that apply)

In this questionnaire, "oriented research" refers synthetically to "research oriented to the search for solutions to development problems".

- o (i) All units/departments in your organization follow the same processes to evaluate research proposals according to the same procedures.
- o (ii) Your organization adapts the procedures for evaluating research proposals according to different fields of knowledge and/or when different research products are intended to be obtained.
- o (iii) Your organization provides training for people involved in the evaluation of research proposals (reviewers, members of expert panels, etc.).
- o (iv) Your organization provides written guidelines to persons involved in the evaluation of research proposals (reviewers, members of expert panels, etc.).
- o (v) Your organization explicitly informs reviewers and/or members of expert panels of the tools and criteria that MUST NOT be used in the evaluation of research proposals.
- o (vi) Your organization asks reviewers and/or panel members to complete a form specifically designed to address all aspects of the research proposal to be evaluated.

Question 9: If you answered (iii) or (iv) in Question 8: What aspects does the training/guidelines consider for persons involved in the evaluation of targeted research proposals? (Check all that apply)

- o Defining, identifying and dealing with conflicts of interest
- o Tasks and roles to be performed
- o Tools, metrics and criteria to be used in the evaluation of targeted research proposals
- o Procedures and organization of the meetings of the panel of experts
- o Ethical standards of behavior to ensure impartiality with respect to gender, race, disciplinary fields, organizations of affiliation of research proposals, and the seniority or academic leadership of the applicants.
- o None of the above
- o Other (Specify)

I.2 Characteristics of the instrument

In this questionnaire, "instrument" refers to the programs or competitive funds for stimulating research implemented by your organization.

Question 10: What is the name of the instrument for the promotion of targeted research?

I.2.1 Temporal aspects

Question 11: When (year) was this instrument created?

Question 12: How long does funding last? (Check the appropriate option)

- o Up to one year
- o More than one year and up to two years
- o More than two years and up to three years

- o More than three years and up to five years
- o More than five years

Question 13: Does this instrument have regular calls for proposals since its creation? (Check the appropriate option)

- o Yes
- o No
- o Don't know
- o Not applicable

Question 14: How often do they call for proposals? (Check the appropriate option)

- o Annual (every year)
- o Biennial (every two years)
- o Triennial (every three years)
- o Quadrennial (every four years)
- o Proposals for targeted research are received and evaluated as they arrive. There is no call for proposals, research proposals may be submitted at any time.
- o Other (Specify)

I.2.2 Financial aspects

Question 15: Which research items can be financed with this instrument? (Check all that apply)

- o Salaries of the investigators involved in the research proposal
- o Salaries of support personnel (technical, administrative) for the implementation of the research proposal
- o Expenditures on instruments, materials and inputs needed to carry out the research activities
- o Investments in equipment and infrastructure
- o Other (Specify)

Question 16: How much is the maximum total amount - in current U.S. dollars - financed by this instrument per selected research proposal?

Specify whether this amount varies - and by what percentage - according to any criteria (e.g., number of people involved in the proposal, geographic location of the proposal, etc.).

I.2.3 Responsible person for submitted proposals

Question 17: Who can be responsible for the proposals submitted to the instrument? (Check the appropriate option)

In the options below, non-academic actors refer to companies, cooperatives, small rural producers, family producers, government public agencies (federal, state, municipal), government secretariats / ministries, non-governmental organizations, social and union organizations, hospitals , educational centers (initial, primary, secondary, technical, etc.).

- Academic actors only (researchers; research groups; research centers, public and private)
- Academic and non-academic actors of any kind (who contribute knowledge to the proposed research)
- Only non-academic actors (eventually incorporating researchers to the work team).

I.2.4 Cognitive aspects of the instrument

Question 18: Which discipline of knowledge - alone or in combination - may be involved in the oriented research proposals submitted to the instrument? (Please check all that apply)

- Arts
- Agricultural Sciences
- Medical and Health Sciences
- Natural and Exact Sciences
- Social Sciences
- Humanities
- Engineering and Technology
- Multidisciplinary, Interdisciplinary, and/or Transdisciplinary (some combination of the above fields).

Question 19: Does this instrument delimit the problems or topics to which targeted research proposals should be addressed?

- Yes
- No

Question 20: If you answered Yes to question 19, what methods does your organization use to identify and delimit the problems or topics to be addressed by the targeted research proposals submitted to the instrument? (Please check all that apply)

- Defined by SDGs
- Defined by the development objectives of the region or continent
- Defined by the country's development priorities
- Exploring problems present in the territory or in specific organizations and identifying scientific and technological knowledge needs to address them.
- Organizing workshops/seminars with suppliers and demanders of knowledge on topics of interest
- Interviewing different actors in society

- o Organizing workshops with specialists in topics of interest.
- o Other (Specify)

II. Evaluation Process

II.1 Aspects of the ex ante procedure

II.1.1 Evaluation systems implemented in your organization

Question 21: What systems does your organization currently implement for the evaluation of targeted research proposals? (Please check all that apply)

- o (i) Peer review - double-blind by experts/specialists external to your organization (external reviewers do not know the identity of the applicants and vice-versa)
- o (ii) Peer review - double-blind conducted by experts/specialists internal to your organization (internal reviewers do not know the identity of the applicants and vice-versa)
- o (iii) Peer review - single-blind conducted by experts/specialists external to your organization (external reviewers know the identity of the applicants, but the latter do not know who the reviewers are)
- o (iv) Single-blind peer review conducted by experts/specialists internal to your organization (internal reviewers know the identity of the applicants, but the applicants do not know who the reviewers are).
- o (v) Open reviews conducted by experts/specialists external to your organization (the identity of both external reviewers and reviewers is known to all).
- o (vi) Open reviews by experts/specialists internal to your organization (the identity of both internal reviewers and nominators is known to all)
- o (vii) Panel of external specialists discusses and reviews individual evaluation reports to classify research proposals as fundable or non-fundable.
- o (viii) Internal peer review panel discusses and reviews individual evaluation reports to rank research proposals as fundable or non-fundable.
- o (ix) Research proposals are evaluated, ranked and classified as fundable or non-fundable according to a set of quantitative criteria.
- o (x) Other (Specify)

II.1.2 Criteria for the integration of expert panels

Question 22: If you answered (vii) or (viii) in Question 21, what are the criteria for the integration of the specialist panels? (Please check all that apply)

- o Degree of experience and academic knowledge
- o The degree of experience and knowledge in the practice of the development problems to be addressed by the research proposal.
- o To ensure the disciplinary diversity of the composition of the panels of specialists

- To ensure institutional diversity in the composition of the panels of specialists.
- To guarantee gender parity in the composition of the panels of specialists.
- None of the above
- Other (Specify)

II.2 Aspects of the ex post procedure

II.2.1 Institutional communication of evaluation results

Question 23: Are the evaluation results public and accessible?

- Yes
- No

Question 24: If you answered Yes to Question 23, which part of evaluation information is made public and accessible? (Check all that apply)

- The number of research proposals submitted
- The level and degree of compliance with the terms and conditions of the call for proposals
- A detailed description of the criteria used for the evaluation of the research proposals and for the final selection of the research proposals to be funded.
- A description of the reviewers of the research proposals (number, country of residence, gender, disciplinary fields of action, level of training, etc.).
- A description of the members of the panels of specialists (number, country of residence, gender, disciplinary fields and areas of practice, level of training, etc.).
- The minimum, maximum and average number of evaluations for each research proposal.
- The total amounts funded by disciplinary fields and development problems to be addressed.
- A complete list of the research proposals selected for funding (including their titles, those responsible for them and their institutional affiliation, the development problems they address, the disciplinary fields and non-academic actors involved, and the resources allocated).
- The complete list of the research proposals (funded and unfunded, including their titles, the persons responsible for them and their institutional affiliation, the development problems they address, the disciplinary fields and non-academic actors involved, and the resources allocated).
- Other (Specify)

II.2.2 Personalized return of evaluation results

Question 25: Do people responsible for the proposals submitted to the instrument receive a personalized feedback or evaluation report on their proposal?

- Yes

o No, research proposal sponsors receive a notification indicating whether or not their research proposal was selected for funding.

Question 26: If you answered Yes to Question 25. Assuming that customized returns in addition to informing whether or not the proposal was funded and providing detailed suggestions that contribute to overcoming its major weaknesses, which of the following statements best represents the characteristics that such a report has? (Check the appropriate option)

- o Does not include evaluations made by reviewers
- o Includes all the evaluations made by the reviewers
- o Includes an overall judgement made by the panels of specialists
- o Includes all the evaluations made by the reviewers and an overall judgment made by the panels of specialists
- o Other (Specify)

II.2.3 Informational inputs and their emphasis for the evaluation

Question 27: What informational inputs does your organization require for the evaluation of targeted research proposals? For each option, please indicate the importance of each informational input in the evaluation.

In this questionnaire "counterparts" refers to the non-academic actors associated or partners of the research proposals.

	Very important	Moderately important	Less important	No importance	Dont'n Know
Research proposal					
CVs of those responsible for the proposals					
CVs of research team members					
Quantitative indicators (number of: peer-reviewed publications, publications in high impact journals, highly cited publications, citations, H-index, funded projects, patents, etc.) of those in charge of the proposals					
Quantitative indicators (number of: refereed publications, publications in high impact journals, highly cited publications, citations, H-index,					

funded projects, patents, etc.) of the research team members.					
Quantitative indicators of refereed publications of local/regional circulation of those responsible for the proposals.					
Quantitative indicators of refereed publications of local/regional circulation of the members of the research team.					
Written commitment that the data generated in the framework of the proposal and the research results obtained will be open access.					
Letters of interest in research results from counterparts involved in research proposals					
Interviews with the counterparts involved in the research proposals about their interest, their characteristics and the commitments they assume in carrying out the proposals.					
Evaluation reports by reviewers					

II.2.4 Instrument competence level

Question 28: What is the ratio of funded proposals to proposals submitted? (Check the option that most closely matches)

- Up to 25%
- More than 25% up to 50%

o More than 50% up to 75%

More than 75% up to 100%

III. Evaluation Criteria

III.1 To assess the ability of the targeted research proposal to meet the instrument's objectives

Question 29: What aspects does your organization require reviewers and/or panels of specialists to evaluate in order to assess the ability of the targeted research proposal to meet the objectives of the instrument? For each option indicate the importance of each aspect in the overall assessment.

	Very Important	Moderately important	Less important	No importance	Don't Know
The importance of the problem or need to the stakeholders interested in the solution.					
The strength of the justification for the need for original research to solve the proposed problem.					
The concordance between the problem posed and the expectations expressed by the counterparts.					
The involvement of relevant actors from the governmental, productive or social sector linked to the problem to be addressed.					
The formation of inter-institutional teams that contribute to the exploration and implementation of the solutions to be found.					
The formation of multidisciplinary research teams, composed of the disciplinary fields necessary to comprehensively address the selected problem and the exploration of solutions.					
The relevance of the proposed research in terms of its contribution to possible solutions.					
The relevance of the expected research results for the stakeholders involved.					
Potential economic and social impact of the research results.					
Potential contribution of the research proposal to public policies					
Potential contribution of the research proposal to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), grand challenges or other mission-driven initiatives.					
The planning of strategies aimed at the application of research results/implementation of solutions in collaboration with participating partners					
The willingness and ability of partners to facilitate the implementation of solutions					
Feasibility of the implementation of the results to be obtained					
The clarity of the proposal on the conditions necessary for the implementation of the results to be obtained.					
The adequacy of the identification of the set of non-academic actors that should be					

involved in the implementation of the results to be obtained and the feasibility of the strategies to make their participation (including the population affected by the problem) viable in the implementation of the results to be obtained.					
Adequacy of the mechanisms for the transfer and appropriation of the results to be obtained by the interested counterparts.					
Clarity in the delimitation of the population that would benefit from the implementation of the research results.					
Specific characteristics of the counterparts involved in the proposal as potential co-financiers and/or co-producers of knowledge.					

III.2 To assess the academic merits of proposals for targeted research

Question 30: What aspects does your organization require reviewers and/or panels of specialists to evaluate in order to assess the academic merit of proposals for targeted research? For each option, please indicate the importance of each aspect in the overall evaluation.

	Very Important	Moderately important	Less important	No importance	Don't Know
Clarity of the description of the problem to study					
Accuracy and agreement of the objectives, questions and hypotheses / propositions					
Strength of the rationale for the research raised					
Conceptual relevance or academic interest of the problems to be addressed					
Originality of the expected results or solutions to be explored at the national / local level					
Originality of the expected results or solutions to be explored in the international arena					
Adequacy of the research design, methods and techniques to meet the objectives set					
Adequacy and updating of the bibliography					
If the composition of the research team brings together the disciplinary fields necessary to comprehensively address the selected problem and explore solutions					
Feasibility of the investigation in relation to knowledge and experience of those responsible for the proposal					

Feasibility of the investigation in relation to the concordance between the allocation of resources, the objectives, expected results and schedule of activities					
Systematic of the interactions foreseen with the counterparts involved during the development of the project					
Expected impact of the results in terms of solving the problems raised					
The generation of training spaces (undergraduate and graduate) and the development of research experiences for young people within the framework of the proposal, including the preparation of graduate and postgraduate theses					
The relevance and scope of the dissemination strategies of research results					

III.3 Policy adjustments to mitigate potential biases in the selection process of research proposals aimed at funding

Question 31.1: Has your organization made any of the following policy adjustments to address any possible bias and / or discrimination observed in the selection process of research proposals for funding? (Check all that apply)

	whose non-academic counterparts have had little or no link with academic actors	who are linked with counterparts, whose access to research is difficult	that are located and / or are linked with counterparts located in peripheral areas	that ensure the greatest diversity of disciplines and fields of knowledge	that ensure the greatest diversity of problems addressed	that ensure gender balance	Other Consideration (Specify)
Always they are of high quality, give priority to funding proposals ...							
Introduction of quotas to balance the funding of proposals ...							
No adjustments derived from institutional criteria of research policies are introduced in the							

selection process of proposals to be financed							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Question 31.2: Is there another policy adjustment not considered before? ¿Which one?

Question 32: Is there any other aspect that you consider important to report that was not covered in this questionnaire?

Question 33: We would be grateful if you could complete the following contact information:

o Full name:

o Position held in the organization:

o E-mail:

o Telephone:

o Cell phone:

Thank you very much for your valuable collaboration