Introduction

DMU is committed to academic excellence across the diverse contexts of its research. Evaluation of research is crucial to accessing research funding, accreditations, and to exercises such as the Research Excellence Framework. However, both internal and external drivers can sometimes result in this evaluation being carried out in an inappropriate way, in particular through the superficial use of bibliometrics. In order to clarify our position on this, DMU has signed up to the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (SF DORA), as outlined in the University's Knowledge Creation Implementation Plan (2022). DMU's Statement on the Responsible Use of Bibliometrics is informed by SF DORA and the Leiden Manifesto, and by our commitment to equality and diversity in all aspects of our activities.

This Policy Statement is deliberately broad and flexible to take account of the diversity of contexts and is not intended to provide a comprehensive set of rules. The purpose of this statement is to ensure that if bibliometrics are used in research evaluation they are used responsibly and in accordance with the principles set out below.

Background

Bibliometrics is a term describing the quantification of publications and their characteristics. It includes a range of approaches, such as the use of citation data and altmetrics to quantify the influence or impact of scholarly publications. When used in appropriate contexts, bibliometrics can provide valuable insights into aspects of research in some disciplines.

However, bibliometrics are sometimes used uncritically, which can be problematic for researchers and research progress when used in inappropriate contexts. For example, some bibliometrics have been commandeered for purposes beyond their original design. The journal impact factor was developed to indicate average journal citations (over a defined time period) but is often used inappropriately as a proxy for the quality or research impact potential of individual articles within a journal. Further, research "excellence" and "quality" are abstract concepts that are difficult to measure directly but are often inferred from bibliometrics. In some discipline areas, research data is simply not captured in Bibliographic tools, meaningforurefd.1 (t)-40n (n)-0.6 (o)-4.1(quae)0.5 (a)-7.4 (t).7 (e)0.7 , (f)-0

undermining this commitment. DMU adheres to the evaluation of research and researchers based on their own merits, not the merits of bibliometrics.

In line with the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment and the Leiden Manifesto, DMU will observe the following principles and support individual researchers to adopt them in any usage of bibliometrics. These principles apply to all processes involving research or researcher evaluation, from recruitment and selection to promotion, funding and redundancy. This supports priorities 1 and 2 of the University's Knowledge Creation Implementation Plan (2022)

1. **Bibliometrics will only ever supplement rather than supplant qualitative, expert assessment, and assessment of individual research performance will be carried out on the portfolio of research.** (Leiden Manifesto Principle 1 and 6; SF DORA Principle 1 and 4)

   While bibliometrics can sometimes be useful in challenging bias, they can sometimes also reflect and enhance bias. When assessing the research performance of individuals, or the quality of research outputs, bibliometric indicators should not be seen as a substitute for informed judgement and, should only be used to supplement rather than replace qualitative assessment. H-indices should never be used as a measure to compare researchers against each other, instead a portfolio approach based on both quantitative and qualitative assessment should be used in assessing research performance. Journal Impact Factors, or other journal ranking systems should not be used as a surrogate measure for the quality of individual research articles. DMU recognises that the scholarly content of a research publication is much more important than publication metrics or the identity of the journal in which it was published.

2. **Any assessment of research must recognise the disciplinary context** (Leiden Manifesto Pri..1 (r)-1.7 (s)-(io)-3 (n)-

4. **Data collection and the analytical use of bibliometrics will be open and transparent** (Leiden Manifesto Principles 4 & 5)

   It is recognised that data can be distorted and simple indicators may not reflect the complexity of the research process. Where used, bibliometric indicators should be selected for their reliability (i.e. accuracy, quality, transparency and coverage). Any limitations inherent in data sources must be explicitly acknowledged. Furthermore, thematic priority areas/institutes will be able to select the bibliometrics used to support evaluation of their performance at the individual and collective levels. Bibliometrics selected should be used consistently across all areas of research performance monitoring, and details of bibliometrics should be openly available to all p (it)1.r (t)1.Le