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It was founded in 2002 as a public foundation aimed at the improvement of the Spanish Higher Education System by means of evaluation, certification and accreditation of programmes, institutions and academic staff.

ANECA was created to promote and ensure quality in Spanish higher education institutions at the national and international level.
To contribute promoting the quality assurance of the Spanish higher education system within the framework of the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance of Higher Education in the European Higher Education Area.
Procedure PEP: It evaluates the CVs of applicants for access to non-permanent academic staff positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation results for each position - 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedure ACADEMIA: accreditation for access to permanent (tenure track) positions (civil servants):

The applications are evaluated by 21 accreditation committees.

**2019**: 2.815 applications have been submitted to ANECA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Evaluated Applications</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CU</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TU</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2187</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the call for proposal of 2018, a total of 10,581 applications were received. The 69.5% (7,359) were submitted by civil servant academic staff and the rest (3,222) to the position of PhD-holder teacher (lecturer).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Favorable</th>
<th>Non favorable</th>
<th>Not evaluated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ordinary call</strong></td>
<td>6764</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>7359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreement-related</strong></td>
<td>2574</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>3222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9338</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>10581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A pilot project to evaluate the six-year period of knowledge transfer and innovation was set up in 2018 and can be applied for in parallel with the six-year period of research.

After the deadline for submission of applications (22 January 2019), the number of applications submitted for evaluation was 16,790.

The 2018 pilot project has been completed and a total of 16,329 applications have been evaluated.
Six-year period of research Evaluations:

15th April 2020: 10,715 applications (63.6% of the total of applications):
- 4,352 positive decisions (40.61%)
- 6,363 negative decisions (59.39%)

14th May 2020: 2,886 applications (17.1% of the total)
- 1,070 positive decisions (37.1%)
- 1,816 negative decisions (62.9%)

10th June 2020: 1,195 applications (7.1% of the total)
- 528 positive decisions (44.05%)
- 667 negative decisions (55.95%)
What is the scope of OS that we should address?

We encourage the extension of the current concept of *open science* to that of *open knowledge*.

Firstly, we must indicate where we are (where Spain is) in terms of research and in open knowledge, in order to know where we are starting from. **We must avoid victimizing positions.**

**Realistic and objective incentives should be set** for open publishing, open science and open knowledge.
What specific aspect of the OS can we modify?

ANECA could promote a stronger orientation of the work of researchers towards **transfer**, without neglecting or failing to encourage basic research.

ANECA can redirect, if necessary, the evaluation **criteria for contributions in an open environment**.
What would be the objective?

Consolidate the **six-year period of transfer**, with clear open knowledge criteria.

We think it is necessary **to adjust the criteria** (and we are working on it) so that a good part of the research is made known (leads to transfer), while at the same time encouraging and motivating research in basic science.
¿What incentives do we have to change the situation?

Annual calls for six-year period of transfer.

To value in the procedures of accreditation of the academic staff the effort for the open knowledge.

To value in the procedures of accreditation of universities the effort to give to know the results of the research and of the transference of its researchers

ANECA International Quality Labels on open knowledge.
What challenges do we see? (I)

The first call for six-year period of transfer has had different problems. In addition to the delay in resolving it, due to the **number of applications**, among other things, **the call did not include clear and objective criteria**. Mainly the **interests of large publishers** and distributors of scientific production to curb access to information with economic and copyright barriers. That the aim is to create **new indices to evaluate research**, to the detriment of all the work that has been consolidated in this respect after 34 years of research.
Inertia to continue doing things as usual by all those involved: universities, Public Research Offices, researchers and evaluators.

On the other hand, a clear distinction should be made between open knowledge and open publishing with payment. There are journals that, even though they are in the JCR and publish in open publishing (so they could be considered as Open Science), in fact fall into the category of predators. It should be considered that they should be discarded when evaluating the publications made in them.
What we stand for:

Open knowledge