# **Academy of Medical Sciences ‘Team science’ Working Group**

# Call for evidence Questions

Please ensure that you have read the [*notes and guidance*](http://www.acmedsci.ac.uk/policy/policy-projects/team-science/team-science-call-for-evidence/) before completing this form.

Thank you for taking the time to answer these questions. The value of your answers is greatly increased if you are able to elaborate on any points you make, and provide illustrative examples wherever possible.

A note on our definition of ‘team science’: For the purposes of this project, 'team science' is defined as any team-based research involving two or more research groups (even if they are all within the same institution) that aims to result in an academic publication or other research output.

*A note on individual respondents’ anonymity: Only the Secretariat will see your response in full. We will provide the Working Group members with, and publish, only anonymised quotes and aggregate information regarding individuals’ responses. The Secretariat would only de-anonymise your response if we have obtained your explicit permission.*

***Please make your answers as short or as long as required. Please return the completed form to*** [***teamscience@acmedsci.ac.uk***](mailto:teamscience@acmedsci.ac.uk) ***by the end of (midnight on) Friday 7 November 2014.***

**\* Mandatory fields**

Name\*:

Job title\*:

Organisation/institution\*:

Email address\*:

Telephone number:

Is this evidence submitted as an organisational or individual response?\*

Organisational / Individual

1. What are the drivers for the increasing importance and growth of 'team science'?
2. What are the barriers to the further growth of 'team science'?
3. What are the incentives and disincentives for the broad research community in fostering and developing 'team science'?

3a. Incentives

3b. Disincentives

1. What are the incentives and disincentives for the individual researcher in taking part in 'team science'?

4a. Incentives

4b. Disincentives

*We have identified four key stakeholder groups in which we seek to influence policy and practices: researchers, publishers, employers and funders - including those funders undertaking research assessment exercises.*

1. Please select all of the stakeholder groups below that apply to you as you provide this response.

Individual researcher / Publisher / Employer / Funder / None of these groups

***Please answer the questions below based on the stakeholder group(s) you selected, and then proceed to questions 6 and 7.***

***If you selected ‘None of these groups’, please proceed directly to questions 6 and 7.***

Questions for Individual Researchers.

5R1. We would like some details about you as an individual to help analyse our responses.

Approximately how many years - as a cumulative total - have you been an active researcher?

5R2a. As as student?:

5R2b. Outside of being a student?:

5R3. Are you:

Male / Female / Other

5R4. Could you give some examples that illustrate the types/breadth of 'team science' you have participated in throughout your career?

5R5. Tell us about a great/successful experience you have personally had of 'team science'.

5R6. Tell us about a time when a personal 'team science' experience did not go well and why it went wrong.

5R7. Drawing on your own experience, what tips would you give a young researcher about how to thrive in 'team science'?

5R8. Again, based on your own experience, what are the pitfalls of being involved in 'team science' and how could these best be avoided or mitigated?

5R9. Do you have any additional comments?

Questions for Publishers.

5P1. Does your organisation have policies whereby author contribution statements are requested or mandated for publication in any of your journals?

5P2. If your organisation has such policies in place:

* How were they developed?
* How were (and are) they implemented?
* How are the policies communicated to authors*?*
* How have you evaluated the impact they have had?
* How could they be improved? What more could be done?

5P3. If you are not aware of any such policies in your organisation, what are the barriers to their development?

5P4. What improvements could feasibly be made in scientific publishing to improve the recognition of individual researchers’ contributions to ‘team science’?

5P5. Do you have any additional comments?

Questions for Employers.

5E1. Do you employ individuals whose research activity is mostly and/or entirely ‘team science’? If so, please provide examples.

5E2. What mechanisms exist that enable you as an employer to evaluate ‘team science’ research activity as part of the research ‘track record’ of individuals seeking employment or promotion?

5E3. If your organisation has such mechanisms in place:

* How were they developed?
* How were (and are) they implemented?
* How are the mechanisms communicated to job applicants and decision makers (e.g. members of promotion panels)?
* How have you evaluated the impact they have had?
* How could they be improved? What more could be done?

5E4. If you are not aware of any such mechanisms in your organisation, what are the barriers to their development?

5E5. What mechanisms could feasibly be developed and implemented in the future to capture this activity for recruitment and promotion in organisations that employ researchers?

5E6. Do you have any additional comments?

Questions for Funders.

5F1. Do you fund individuals whose research activity is mostly and/or entirely ‘team science’? If so, please provide examples.

5F2. What mechanisms exist that enable you as a funder to appraise applicants’ ‘team science’ research activity as part of their research ‘track record’ when they seek funding?

5F3. If your organisation has such mechanisms in place:

* How were they developed?
* How were (and are) they implemented?
* How are the mechanisms communicated to applicants and decision makers (e.g. members of funding panels)?
* How have you evaluated the impact they have had?
* How could they be improved? What more could be done?

5F4. If you are not aware of any such mechanisms in your organisation, what are the barriers to their development?

5F5. What mechanisms could feasibly be developed and implemented in the future to capture this activity for appraising applications in organisations that fund researchers?

5F6. Do you have any additional comments?

6a. As stated before, we identified four key stakeholder groups in which we seek to influence policy and practice: researchers, publishers, employers and funders including those funders undertaking research assessment exercises.

Would you exclude any of these groups, or include any others?

6b. Can you list these groups (and any that you have added) in order of priority (highest to lowest)?

***Please answer the questions below in accordance with the guidance at the start of each question.***

7a. ***If you are a researcher and therefore have already answered questions 5R1-9, do not answer this question:*** What is being done by researchers to assist themselves to gain appropriate recognition for their contributions to 'team science' projects? What more do you think they could reasonably do?

7b. ***If you are a funder and therefore have already answered questions 5F1-6, do not answer this question:*** What is being done by funders to assist individual researchers to gain appropriate recognition for their contributions to 'team science' projects? What more do you think they could reasonably do?

7c. ***If you are a publisher and therefore have already answered questions 5P1-5, do not answer this question:*** What is being done by publishers to assist individual researchers to gain appropriate recognition for their contributions to 'team science' projects? What more do you think they could reasonably do?

7d. ***If you are an employer of researchers and therefore have already answered questions 5E1-6, do not answer this question:*** What is being done by employers to assist individual researchers to gain appropriate recognition for their contributions to 'team science' projects? What more do you think they could reasonably do?

Thank you very much.

We are passionate about facilitating individual researchers to participate in team science.

We very much appreciate the time and effort you have made in answering these questions. Your input will help us better understand this issue, so that we can work to inform future policy in this direction.

*Publication and attribution of your responses*

The Academy reserves the right to:

* Publicise information about who has responded.
  + For organisational responses, this would be limited to the name of the organisation.
  + For individuals' responses, this would be limited to anonymous aggregate data such as the career stages and host institutions of respondents.
* Publish any responses submitted:
  + For organisational responses, this will be in full and not in an anonymised form, unless you have obtained approval from the Lead Secretariat, [Dr Richard Malham](mailto:richard.malham@acmedsci.ac.uk).
  + For individuals' responses, only the Secretariat will see your response in full. We will provide the Working Group members with, and publish, only anonymised quotes and aggregate information regarding individuals’ responses. The Secretariat would only de-anonymise your response if we have obtained your explicit permission.
  + **For individuals:**
    - **Are you happy for the Secretariat to de-anonymise your response? [YES/NO]**
    - **Are you happy for the Academy to publish your response on our website? [YES/NO]**

**We may wish to contact you to let you know about the study’s progress. Please tick the box below if you DO NOT wish to be contacted about the study’s progress.**

Individuals or organisations providing written evidence may subsequently be invited to provide oral evidence to the Working Group. This would involve them expanding on their written submission and/or answering a refined/novel set of questions of interest to the study.

* **For individuals: Are you happy to be invited to provide oral evidence? [YES/NO]**