ESF Assembly ("cohort" or *college*) of Peer Reviewers

An informal consultation with the

Member Organisation Forum on Peer Review
7th Working Group Meeting
19 May 2010, Brussels

Farzam Ranjbaran,

Corporate Science Operations
European Science Foundation

1. Vision

2. Main Features

3. Potential benefits

4. Envisaged structure

5. Challenges

6. Multi-stage development

7. High-level implementation plan

Vision

A. Creation of an International assembly of peer reviewers as a formally established and legally registered entity managed by the ESF (*in some organisations this is referred to as a college or a cohort of reviewers*).

B. The structure and mandate of this body will be defined and implemented with the aims of *attracting, selecting, hosting and utilizing* a significant number of European and international highly qualified experts as members willing and available to engage in peer review across all areas of science.

C. This will not only be an extremely useful asset supporting the European research funding, performing and evaluating organisations in their individual and collaborative efforts but also will contribute to the setting of agendas for the future of peer review in Europe and internationally.

Main Features

1. Be a recognized cohort or assembly of experts

2. Embed some kind of Stratification according to scientific standing and expertise, as well as seniority in the cohort/college

3. Be managed by the ESF but to have a certain degree of self-organization

4. Be credible and appealing – attract the best

5. Governance by a dedicated steering/governing body

6. Terms of membership at least 3 years

7. Details of usage and membership modlities to be defined

Potential Benefits

1. Facilitate delivery of standard, high-quality, common Peer Review

2. Attract the best and therefore assure quality of content

3. Allow easy delivery/exchange of reviewer names to/with MOs and other partner organisations

4. Possible Role in influencing Peer Review Practices in a general policy/agenda (e.g., role of incentives for the practice, usage of *bibliometrics*)??

5. Possible role for Accreditation ??

6. Possible role for Training ??

Envisioned Structure

Tentative and rough estimation of the Size

Current ESF research taxonomy: approx. **800 subfields**

→ 10-20 experts for subfield needed *(TBC)*

→ **8.000-16.000 members needed**

Quality assurance (=reviewer quality)

Several options:

➢ Former/current awardees

➢ Provision of names by MOs (common criteria to be developed and agreed upon)

➢ European-wide peer voting (e.g. every 3-4 years)

Challenges

1. **Buy in and approval**

2. **Budget and Resources**

3. **Legal issues**

4. **Uncertainties and risks**

5. **Definition and agreement on quality standards and taxonomy of research fields**

   - internationally compatible and comparable

   - including system for regular updates

6. **Management of database**

7. **Selection process for members**

   - Current/former awardees

   - Provision of names by MOs

   - European-wide peer voting

Some open Questions

- Choice of a name: **CoISee** for **Co**hort of **I**nternational **S**cientific **e**xpert **e**valuators
- Owners:
  – ESF MOs to start, and to add others, or start more widely?
- Joint versus sole custody
  – All owners have direct access versus centrally managed by the ESF
- Nomination/approval of the governing body
- Nomination/approval of the members
- Budget
- Project Planning and Approval

Outline Implementation Plan

Multi-Phase Development

Phase 0:

Mandate and Preparation

- Sep 2009
- Apr 2010

Phase 1:

Pool Incremental Expansion

- Apr 2010
- May 2012

Phase 2:

College Implementation

- Nov 2011
- Dec 2012

Phase 3: Launch and Operation

- Jan 2013
- XX