

swissuniversities

swissuniversities

Effingerstrasse 15, PO Box
3001 Bern

www.swissuniversities.ch

2021-2024 Open Science Program

Reviewers Consolidated Evaluation Report Summary

1. Project Information

Title and Acronym (short title) of the project :	Open Science for Arts, Design and Music OS-ADM
Primary action line :	Alternative forms of publication
Secondary action line (if applicable) :	Participation to international initiatives
Proposal deadline :	31 May 2021

No	Participating institution(s)	
1	Applicant institution <i>SUPSI – Scuola universitaria professionale della Svizzera italiana</i>	
2	Partner institution <i>FHNW – Fachhochschule Nordwestschweiz</i>	<i>To be completed in case of cooperation</i>
3	Partner institution <i>HES-SO – Haute École Spécialisée de Suisse Occidentale (ECAL, EDHEA, HEAD)</i>	<i>Same</i>
4	Partner institution <i>HKB – Hochschule der Künste Bern</i>	<i>Same</i>
5	Partner institution <i>HSLU – Hochschule Luzern Design & Kunst</i>	<i>Same</i>
6	Partner institution <i>ZHdK – Zürcher Hochschule der Künste</i>	<i>Same</i>

swissuniversities

Total project costs

CHF 798'460.–

Total federal contribution requested

CHF 348'460.–

2. Project Reviewers

Reviewer A

Last and First Name

Institution

Reviewer B

Last and First Name

Institution

3. Evaluation Synthesis

Scores are between 0 and 5.

0 = The proposal does not meet the criteria or cannot be evaluated due to missing information.

1 = Fail. The proposal does not meet the criteria or has serious inherent weaknesses.

2 = Passable. The proposal generally meets the criteria, but has significant weaknesses.

3 = Good. The proposal meets well the criteria, but has a number of major issues.

4 = Very good. The proposal meets very well the criteria, but has a small number of issues.

5 = Excellent. The proposal meets all relevant aspects of the criteria. Any issues are minor.

Score

1. Objectives & Relevance 4/5

2. Impact 4/5

3. Implementation 4/5

Total 12/15

4. Reviewers recommendations to the Open Science Delegation

Approval :

Conditional approval :

Approval conditional on the requirement to advocate not just for Open Access options provided by publishers ("gold OA"/"green OA"), but also for alternative/innovative business models (for example "platinum"/"diamond").

Refusal :

5. Consolidated Evaluation

5.1 Strengths and weaknesses

Relevance with the action lines alternative forms of publication, participation to international initiatives & national monitoring (Grade: 4/5)

A) Strengths

The project addresses directly the action line "alternative forms of publications" and includes institutional publications from participant organisations and engagement with national publishers. It presents a convincing case for the specific needs of the Arts, Design and Music (ADM) discipline.

The project builds on established good practice in Switzerland, and in particular all the Swiss schools of arts and design, and is connected internationally. The annex includes a list of initiatives it wishes to leverage/engage with.

The proposal includes several letters of support from key stakeholders at the national and international level emphasising the importance of the project and the alignment with the action lines.

B) Weaknesses

Talks and negotiations with publishers should advocate not just for Open Access options conventionally provided by publishers ("gold OA"/"green OA"), but also for real alternatives ("platinum"/"diamond") and innovation in this area. This step is considered as crucial for advocating alternative forms of publication and must be considered as a condition for the approval of the project application.

The project mentions "institutional publications" but uses the terminology throughout the document in two contexts which are not always clearly defined: 1) output of the organisations' researchers 2) official journals/publications produced by the institutions. This creates some confusion for example in understanding whether the aim is to have 100% OA for an institution's own journals or for outputs from these institutions regardless of where they are published.

Impact (Grade: 4/5)

A) Strengths

The project is addressing a real need for clarity on how open access can be achieved in alternative format of research outputs that are common in Arts, Design and Music, and combines effectively the commission of legal advice and the production of educational material for the particular disciplinary fields contained under the ADM umbrella.

The project is very well structured, and involves relevant institutions willing to evolve their own publications and integrate them in the international OA infrastructure, as well as working with commercial publishers.

The project is ensuring sustainability by leveraging the funding to have a central team developing the guidance and training, but the delivery and long-term support is insured by local teams.

B) Weaknesses

The project is less clear on how it will reach out to international networks and bring into the project the expertise and experience those networks have already accumulated, though it is stated as an objective.

It should be made clearer that all material produced (whether guides, case studies, recordings, training and educational material, or publications) will/can be provided under FAIR conditions at the end of the project to the best extent possible. Providing material openly on "institutional websites" is not enough for achieving FAIRness.

Implementation (Grade: 4/5)

A) Strengths

The project is extremely well presented, with defined objectives and a clear project plan. The project is very well structured, and the work packages are organised in a logical chronological sequence. The risk analysis is thorough and is likely to allow for quick adaptation even if the risk of the timing falling behind is not addressed (see weaknesses).

The project is a collective initiative with a clear leadership team and full participation and commitment of all partner institutions which will ensure sustainability beyond the project.

The project will enable institutional publishing to meet OA requirements and be integrated into the wider international OA ecosystem, which supports alternative publication models.

B) Weaknesses

A weakness, which is also a strength in a way, is possibly its ambition, as it is a large project with many contributors, and managing and coordinating everything to meet objectives/milestones is going to be challenging. The resources allocated to WP4 for the negotiations with international, national and institutional publishers seem insufficient.

Governance of the project could be reinforced with a steering committee to include external expertise who can play the role of "critical friend" but also be an escalation route for any conflicts (members could be drawn for example from those who have provided letters of support). The sustainability beyond the end of the project is entirely reliant on the sustained engagement of local teams and their organisation.

Risk analysis did not include any risks caused by unforeseen delay to the project, and how those would be remediated, or activities re-prioritised.

5.2 Key additional remarks from the reviewers

Regarding the budget

The budget seems commensurate with the project's ambitions and is fairly split between the participants.

Budget is presented in significant details, which gives some assurance that the project can be delivered with the funding requested.

Funding provided should be to support institutional journals being fully OA and indexed in DOAJ, rather than to pay for OA article processing fees (APCs) to make individual articles written by researchers from those institutions available in OA.

Regarding the proposal

A very ambitious and exciting project which brings together participants to leverage all benefits and develop and implement good practice together, with clear objectives, supported by very well-developed project and stakeholder engagement plans.

Pragmatic approach with a balanced focus on institutional publications, where those involved have larger influence, and reach out to national and international publishers.

Good approach to embed resilience by pooling resources to have a central service for the project to develop guidance and training, with the aim to empower local teams to then provide the ongoing support.

Most comments on weaknesses are looking at the detail and offer suggestions for fine tuning but the proposal is overall very professional and well presented. However, a key condition of funding has been added in relation to talks/negotiations with publishers to ensure that alternatives beyond Green and Gold OA are advocated.

6. Specific comments for each criteria

6.1. Pertinence

A) Relevance: Is the project in line with the relevant action lines?

How does the project meet specifically the objectives of the relevant action lines (namely alternative forms of publication, participation to international alternatives and national monitoring) from the [Open Access Implementation Plan](#)?

The project is overall in line with the relevant action line. While it should embrace alternative forms of publications more fully ("platinum"/"diamond OA"), it also covers participation in international initiatives, and some elements of monitoring.

In the case of a top-down project by call for tenders, how would the offer also meet the additional specifications requested by the tender? (Please note that this question does not apply to bottom-up projects).

N/A

B) Coherence: How well does the project fit?

Can you give examples of innovative components/ elements of your project compared to similar initiatives/ projects?

The project plans to develop guidance, training and best practice for publications which are rich with outputs other than text, in various media, where there are legal issues with copyright, re-use of third-party images, etc. It is building on existing national and international projects and initiatives and has a good outreach communication plan to ensure wide dissemination.

To what extent do you find the interoperability (as defined in the FAIR principles) measures foreseen by the project (or the offer) at national and international level satisfactory?

The project has identified participants who have committed to work together, and with international initiatives such as DOAJ and DARIAH, which should help ensure consistency, but as the project is dealing with other media it will need to consider how the FAIR principles can best be applied. The applicants suggest using open licences (CC-BY and/or CC0, p. 9) that facilitate accessibility and reusability in line with the FAIR principles. Moreover, they aim at DOIs for all publications (p. 11, Table 7). This approach should apply to training material as well to foster findability with DOIs in line with the FAIR principles. It should be clarified more explicitly during the project where exactly products, material and publications of the project will be made available and (in line with the FAIR principles) a FAIR repository hosted at a long-living institution should be used. By contrast, providing material on an "institutional website" (e.g. p. 7, Table 5; p. 15, Table 13) will not be satisfactory for ensuring FAIRness of the produced material. It should be made clearer that all produced material (whether guides, case studies, recordings, training and educational material, or publications) should be provided under FAIR conditions at the end of the project to the best extent possible. For interoperability in particular, the (meta)data of produced material should be machine-readable and follow common standards in the discipline. As suggested in Table 21 (Risk management), maintenance of the website is a risk. Therefore, the suggested mitigation strategy should be pursued here.

6.2. Viability

A) Impact: What difference does the project make?

How do you assess the expected benefits for the following target groups: the swissuniversities' members, their partners, the Swiss scientific community?

The project describes in detail how their communication strategy and the guidance and training will be used to reach all these different communities. (see Table 7)

How does the project promote interdisciplinarity to produce effects outside its own field of application?

By involving national networks outside academia in the relevant fields and collaborating with existing projects and networks. Various tables describe this approach in the proposal.

To what extent will the proposed results and/or services strengthen the position of the Swiss scientific community at the international level?

It is focused on disciplinary fields of ADM which are internationally relevant, will produce guidelines released under an open license and collaborate with networks such as DARIAH to communicate the project results at an international level and strengthen the role Switzerland has in this field.

How can the planned communication, promotion, standardization and exploitation measures guarantee the future positioning of the envisaged service at national and international level?

The communication of the project addresses specific targets with different communication tools and different aims. All relevant stakeholders are involved. This is well mapped out in the proposal. However, it is questionable whether involving publishers only in 2024 (p. 9) will be sufficient to ensure timely completion of negotiations.

What measures does the project propose to promote gender and cultural diversity?

Diversity will be promoted in the project teams (central and local). The gender balance of training participants has been identified as a possible risk. The proposal states that the project "will aim at" this goal, but does not answer the question what specific measures will be used to do so.

How do the measures dealing with age diversity respond to the needs of researchers or pilot users at different stages of their career? The proposal states that the produced tools "are meant to" take age diversity into account but does not answer the question "how" in any way. An analysis of challenges due to age diversity and different career levels is missing

Guidance and training are intended to be adapted to all stages of researchers careers and students.

Additional question for projects/offers targeting the development of services or e-infrastructures: How does the project address the services usability (adaptation to different digital skills levels) and e-accessibility issues (adaptation to specific disabilities)?

The documentation published online will be developed following the web content accessibility guidelines. The open licenses also allow republishing research results, for example for text-to-speech readers. SUPSI has relevant experience gained through other projects).

Durability: Will the benefits last?

Which risks are foreseen regarding the viability of the project once the Program funding has come to an end, and how does the project address these risks?

A very detailed risk register has been included in the proposal, with a mechanism to manage this risk. This is a very thorough section of the proposal. Since a major output of the proposed project are open resources, material and case studies, providing this material clearly suggests lasting benefits beyond the project period. However, this depends on providing the material under FAIR conditions (in particular, accessibility and reusability without cost). Beyond that, continued central and local services beyond the project period appear as very desirable.

6.3. Resource mobilization

A) Effectiveness : Is the project achieving its objectives?

What indicators and verification measures have been considered to ensure the progress of project activities?

The proposal includes a very clear timeline for each component of the project. The project is organised in work packages, which have individual timeline and resource allocation. See table 14 to 19.

How does the adopted work plan support the achievement of the project objectives?

The plan is very clear on what needs to be achieved when and present a logical chronology of activities. It is also balancing the resources available centrally and locally throughout the project timeline, as well as the engagement with external expertise, which has already been identified.

Is the governance of the project organized in such a way to enhance the partners' confidence in its success (with a special focus on participation in decision-making)?

swissuniversities

This is a very detailed and well-structured project proposal and its clarity and professional approach should be commended. The project lead has agreed the governance with participants during the preparation of the submission. I would advise to maybe add a steering committee including external members not part of the project teams to offer oversight and advice on what is a very large project with many different parts to coordinate – members could be drawn from those organisations which have provided support letters.

How relevant do you find the risk management matrix?

Very detailed and capturing well risk to be considered, but also suggesting remedial actions. The only risk I thought was missing was that of the project being delayed for any reasons, and how this would be handled.

B) Efficiency: How well are resources being used?

How could the available resources be improved or optimized (or even completed during project implementation) to achieve the objectives?

The proposal highlights that in kind contribution is important for participants and that the project start has been delayed to 2022 to enable local teams to budget for their funding contribution. This seems to be well balanced.

To what extent will this project help to avoid duplication of effort and redundancy among swissuniversities members?

The project involves all the Swiss schools of art and design and their relevant staff. It is also benefiting from existing tools and experiences by collaborating with existing projects and networks.

Involving relevant stakeholders and all swissuniversities members in the field will help avoid duplication. FAIRness should be embraced more fully for the produced outputs (educational material, publications etc.) by using FAIR repositories instead of an institutional website.

To what extent does the consortium or the project team have the necessary skills to achieve the objectives?

This question was not really addressed other than specifying that the project is carried by Iolanda Pensa and Davide Fornari. Short biographies are provided which seem to indicate that both have significant project experience, including the coordination of many participants and relevant subject expertise.

7. Final Additional Remarks regarding this Application