

The Declaration on Research Assessment

Academy statement on DORA

We are delighted to be a signatory of [the Declaration on Research Assessment \(DORA\)](#), an initiative aiming to improve the ways in which the output of research is evaluated by funding agencies, academic institutions, and other parties.

We have made changes to our research programmes processes to reflect the principles of DORA, including through:

1. Creation of a statement on what DORA means for applicants and reviewers (see annex)
2. Implementing a change in the application and review process: asking applicants to describe their 3-5 most significant achievements
3. Implementing a change in the review process: asking applicants and reviewers to resubmit if their submissions have conflicts with the Academy guidance on DORA (e.g. use of Journal Impact Factor)

In addition to these changes, we have also made the decision to apply the principles of DORA across all Academy activities where the outputs of research are, or could, be used to evaluate people. This has included prizes, nominations and selection to Fellowship, as well as review panels for visas. We endeavour to uphold the principles of DORA across all Academy activities, reflecting the interconnectedness of the people who make up the R&D community in the UK.

(published March 2022)

Annex: Research programmes – core guidance surrounding DORA for applicants and reviewers

The Academy's research programmes are aligned with the principles of the [Declaration on Research Assessment \(DORA\)](#), which is a set of principles aiming to improve the ways in which the output of research is evaluated by funding agencies, academic institutions, and other parties.

The outputs from research are many and varied, and as a funder of engineering research the Academy needs to assess the quality and impact of these outputs in order to make awards - it is thus imperative that research output is measured accurately and evaluated wisely.

For applicants and reviewers we would like to emphasise that all outputs are welcome and considered valuable to the Academy. Outputs can include open data sets, software, publications, commercial, entrepreneurial or industrial products, clinical practice developments, educational products, policy publications, evidence synthesis pieces and conference publications that you have generated.

With regard to research articles published in peer-reviewed journals, we ask applicants to use a range of article metrics and indicators on personal/supporting statements as evidence of the impact of individual published articles and other research outputs. The Journal Impact Factor in particular is unacceptable for inclusion in any part of an application, and applicants may be asked to resubmit if anything is found to contradict this as part of the eligibility checks. Reviewers who utilise the Journal Impact Factor or who rely too heavily on metrics and do not show evidence of having understood and evaluated the content of research may be asked to resubmit reviews.