

How to Change Professional Evaluation in Biology

Author: Beardsley, Timothy M.

Source: BioScience, 61(8) : 579

Published By: American Institute of Biological Sciences

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1525/bio.2011.61.8.1>

BioOne Complete (complete.BioOne.org) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at www.bioone.org/terms-of-use.

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non - commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

PUBLISHER
Richard T. O'Grady

EDITOR IN CHIEF
Timothy M. Beardsley

MANAGING EDITOR
James M. Verdier

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR
PEER REVIEW / PRODUCTION COORDINATION
Jennifer A. Williams

MANUSCRIPT EDITOR
Nathan N. True

Editors: Eye on Education: Beth Baker (educationoffice@aibs.org); Feature articles: Cathy Lundmark (features@aibs.org); Washington Watch: Robert E. Gropp (publicpolicy@aibs.org).

Editorial Board: Agriculture: Sonny Ramaswamy; Animal Behavior: Janice Moore; Animal Development: Paula Mabey; Botany: Kathleen Donohue; Cell Biology: Randy Wayne; Ecology: Scott Collins; Daniel Simberloff; Ecotoxicology: Judith S. Weis; Education: Charlene D'Avanzo; Environmental Microbiology: Rita R. Colwell; Environmental Policy: Gordon Brown, J. Michael Scott; Evolutionary Biology: James Mallet; Genetics and Evolution: Martin Tracey; History and Philosophy: Richard M. Burian; Human Biology: David L. Evans; Invertebrate Biology: Kirk Fitzhugh; Landscape Ecology: Monica Turner; Mammalogy: David M. Leslie Jr.; Microbiology: Edna S. Kaneshiro; Molecular Biology: David Hillis; Molecular Evolution and Genomics: David Rand; Neurobiology: Cole Gilbert; Plant Development: Cynthia S. Jones; Policy Forum: Eric A. Fischer; Population Biology: Ben Pierce; Professional Biologist: Jean Wyld; Remote Sensing and Computation: Geoffrey M. Henebry; Statistics: Kent E. Holsinger; Vertebrate Biology: Harvey B. Lillywhite.

BioScience (ISSN 0006-3568; e-ISSN 1525-3244) is published 12 times a year by the American Institute of Biological Sciences, 1900 Campus Commons Dr., Suite 200, Reston, VA 20191, in collaboration with the University of California Press. Periodicals postage paid at Berkeley, CA, and additional mailing offices. **POSTMASTER:** Send address changes to *BioScience*, University of California Press, Journals and Digital Publishing, 2000 Center Street, Suite 303, Berkeley, CA 94704-1223, or e-mail customerservice@ucpressjournals.com.

Membership and subscription: Individual members, go to www.aibs.org/aibs-membership/index.html for benefits and services, membership rates, and back issue claims. Subscription renewal month is shown in the four-digit year-month code in the upper right corner of the mailing label.

Institutional subscribers, go to www.ucpressjournals.com or e-mail customerservice@ucpressjournals.com. Out-of-print issues and volumes are available from Periodicals Service Company, 11 Main Street, Germantown, NY 12526-5635; telephone: 518-537-4700; fax: 518-537-5899; Web site: www.periodicals.com.

Advertising: For information about display and online advertisements and deadlines, e-mail adsales@ucpressjournals.com. For information about classified placements and deadlines, contact Jennifer A. Williams, AIBS (jwilliams@aibs.org).

Copying and permissions notice: Authorization to copy article content beyond fair use (as specified in sections 107 and 108 of the US Copyright Law) for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by the Regents of the University of California on behalf of AIBS for libraries and other users, provided that they are registered with and pay the specified fee through the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC), www.copyright.com. To reach the CCC's Customer Service Department, call 978-750-8400 or e-mail info@copyright.com. For permission to distribute electronically, republish, resell, or repurpose material, and to purchase article offprints, use the CCC's Rightslink service on JSTOR at <http://www.jstor.org/r/ucal/bio>. Submit all other permissions and licensing inquiries through the University of California Press's Rights and Permissions Web site, www.ucpressjournals.com/reprintinfo.asp, or e-mail journalspermissions@ucpress.edu.

Abstracting and indexing: For complete abstracting and indexing information, please visit www.ucpressjournals.com.

© 2011 American Institute of Biological Sciences. All rights reserved. Printed at Allen Press, Inc.

BioScience®

Organisms from Molecules to the Environment
American Institute of Biological Sciences

How to Change Professional Evaluation in Biology

A bold call for a new assessment system for professional productivity in biology appears on p. 619 of this issue. Lucinda A. McDade of Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden and Claremont Graduate University, together with colleagues at eight other institutions, describes a plan to create evaluation systems that are more easily applied to nontraditional forms of scholarly creation than the time-honored evaluation measure, citation in peer-reviewed journals with high impact factors. The nontraditional creations that the authors consider include collecting; curatorial work on specimens; and contributions to online resources, such as knowledge compendia, images, software, and data sets. Such works are becoming increasingly important to science, the authors plausibly maintain.

Because such works are not generally formally peer reviewed, the authors informally polled their own institutions, and their results seem to confirm the common impression that tenure committees and officials are often reluctant to take nontraditional publications into account when assigning credit and making hiring and tenure decisions. The authors, plus a number of endorsing organizations, commit themselves to revising what they see as an antiquated and harmful assessment system—one that seems to have had a more baleful effect on systematic biology than on some other areas.

Their efforts might also improve the assignment of credit for traditional publications in systematics. Current journal impact factors vary greatly between subfields and are a very crude indication of an article's value. Because the number of specialists studying some taxa is small, the impact factors of relevant journals are likewise small, if the journals are indexed at all. McDade and her coauthors propose, first, the systematic tracking of all forms of productivity, with automated systems employing unique identifiers to record intellectual creations and link them to individual researchers. They then favor, for some types of work, interactive assessment by the community of contributors, rather than traditional prepublication peer review. Interactive assessment should be superior to existing impact factors and measures such as the number of times a work is downloaded (which reflects in part how useful it is to practitioners, teachers, and students—a value distinct from scholarly originality).

The authors express the hope that biologists in other subdisciplines will make common cause and that tenure committees and administrators will start to use more comprehensive assessments of productivity once these are routinely generated. The proposal will likely find favor with *BioScience* readers, because many of them are systematic biologists who have paid a price for the broad reliance in academia on the traditional tools for assigning credit. Conventional peer review is unarguably showing signs of age with advances in technology. Its core principle is still important. In the future, however, it might more often be applied separately in interactive forums in efforts first to gauge the merit of and subsequently to improve scholarly works.

McDade and colleagues' proposal ought to stimulate a more systematic appraisal of the defects in current practice as well as efforts to expand assessment and develop novel ways for peers' evaluations to be used. The case for change is already strong. *BioScience* looks forward to hearing how it can most effectively be managed.

TIMOTHY M. BEARDSLEY

Editor in Chief

doi:10.1525/bio.2011.61.8.1