Co-funded by the European Union

OPEN ASIA
UNIFYING SCIENCE, EMPOWERING INNOVATION

MS5: SELF-EVALUATION OPEN SCIENCE TOOL

Project Acronym:	**OPEN-ASIA**
Project full title:	OPEN-ASIA: Boosting engagement of HEIs in Open Science in India and Malaysia
Project No:	101128493
WP / Task:	WP3/ MS5- Self-Evaluation Open Science Tool
Project partner	P8-EPDRI

This document is a deliverable within OPEN-ASIA (ref. nr. 101128493), funded by the European Union through the Erasmus+ programme, key action 2 - Capacity Building in Higher Education

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

SELF-EVALUATION OPEN SCIENCE TOOL

Dear Participant,

Within the Erasmus+ project OPEN-ASIA: Boosting engagement of HEIs in Open Science in India and Malaysia (Project No. 101128493), we are conducting a Self-Evaluation Survey on Open Science. The purpose of this survey is to collect information about the current status of Open Science policies, infrastructure, skills, societal engagement, inclusion of indigenous knowledge systems, and research incentives in universities in India and Malaysia. The collected data will be used to develop country profiles on Open Science implementation, identify skills gaps and training needs for researchers, staff, and students, and to support the adoption of best practices and policy recommendations for strengthening Open Science at institutional and national levels.

The survey consists of three chapters:

CHAPTER 1 - OPEN SCIENCE POLICIES AND INCENTIVES
CHAPTER 2 - OPEN SCIENCE INFRASTRUCTURE AND PRACTICES
CHAPTER 3 - OPEN ENGAGEMENT, AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE NEEDS

The survey takes approximately 20–25 minutes to complete.

Data Protection Notice:

Participation in this survey is voluntary. All responses will be collected anonymously and used solely for academic and policy-related purposes within the scope of the OPEN-ASIA project. No personally identifiable information will be disclosed. Data will be processed in accordance with the European Commission's Privacy Policy.

By completing this survey, you confirm your understanding and consent to the use of the information for the above-mentioned purposes.

EACEA Disclaimer:

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This survey reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

We highly appreciate your support and active participation.

Best regards,
The OPEN-ASIA Project Team

1. GENERAL RESPONDENT INFORMATION

1. In which country is your university based?

- ☐ India
- ☐ Malaysia

2. Please, select your institution:

- ☐ Narsee Monjee Institute of Management Studies
- ☐ Thapar Institute of Engineering and Technology
- ☐ University of Malaya/ Malaysia
- ☐ Universiti Malaysia Sabah
- ☐ University Malaysia Sarawak

3. Please select your current role/position within your institution:

- ☐ Rector / Vice-Chancellor / Deputy Vice-Chancellor
- ☐ Dean / Head of Faculty / Head of Department
- ☐ Research Office / Innovation Office staff
- ☐ Academic staff (Professor, Lecturer, Researcher)
- ☐ Technical / Support staff (Librarian, IT/Data manager, Administrator)
- ☐ Student (Master's / Doctoral level)
- ☐ Other (please specify)

CHAPTER 1 – OPEN SCIENCE POLICIES AND INCENTIVES

This chapter explores the existence and implementation of Open Science (OS) policies, strategies, regulations, and incentive mechanisms at both national and institutional levels. It examines how universities and governments support OS through legislation, action plans, and reward systems for researchers. The analysis provides insights into institutional readiness, alignment with international frameworks (such as the UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science), and the extent to which incentives and funding opportunities encourage the adoption of OS principles.

University staff involved:

1. Vice Chancellor / Rector / Deputy Vice Chancellor for Research or Academic Affairs – provides strategic information on institutional OS policy.
2. Head of Research Office / Director of Research & Innovation – familiar with research governance and policy compliance.
3. Librarians / Repository Managers – knowledgeable about OS policy elements related to open access and data.
4. Legal/Policy Officers (if any) – involved in drafting or implementing institutional policies.

A. Institutional OS Policy: Content, Implementation and Monitoring

1.1. Does your university have a formal Open Science policy or strategy?

- ☐ Yes, comprehensive policy in place
- ☐ Yes, partial policy in place
- ☐ In development
- ☐ No

1.1.2. Is the OS policy publicly available online?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

1.1.2.1. If yes, please provide URL:

1.1.3. To what extent does the OS policy apply to all faculties and research fields?

- ☐ Completely
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a moderate extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ Not at all

1.1.4. To what extent are researchers, students, and staff aware of and engaged with OS policies?

- ☐ Fully aware and engaged
- ☐ Partially aware and engaged
- ☐ Limited awareness and engagement
- ☐ Not aware or engaged
- ☐ If yes, describe awareness campaigns or training programs:_____

1.1.5. Is the OS policy written in a clear format and available in English?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

1.1.6. **Is your institutional Open Science (OS) policy aligned with international and global OS frameworks? (e.g., UNESCO OS Recommendation, Horizon Europe, Plan S, EOSC)**

- ☐ Completely aligned
- ☐ Largely aligned
- ☐ Moderately aligned
- ☐ Slightly aligned
- ☐ Not aligned at all
- ☐ Don't know / Not applicable

1.1.7. **To what extent does institutional leadership actively promote open science practices?**

- ☐ Strongly promotes
- ☐ Moderately promotes
- ☐ Minimally promotes
- ☐ No active promotion

1.1.8. **Did your university refer to best practices from other universities or networks when developing the OS policy?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
  - If yes, please specify: _____

1.1.9. **Does your institutional policy include?** (select all that comply)

- ☐ Open Access publishing guidelines?
- ☐ Research Data Management (RDM) requirements?
- ☐ Guidance on open licenses (Creative Commons, etc.)?
- ☐ Requirements for sharing methods/code for reproducibility?
- ☐ Open peer review or alternative evaluation methods?

1.1.10. **How is the Open Science (OS) policy implemented at your institution? (**Please indicate which measures apply)

	Fully implemented	Largely implemented	Partially implemented	Minimally implemented	Not implemented
There is an official action plan for OS policy implementation.					
Staff and researchers are regularly informed about the OS policy.					
The OS policy is integrated into research guidelines, grant procedures, or institutional regulations.					
Training or workshops are offered to support policy implementation.					

1.1.16 **Is there a monitoring process to track implementation of the policy?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

1.1.17 **What are the primary challenges your institution faces in implementing open science policies?**

- ☐ Lack of funding
- ☐ Lack of awareness or training
- ☐ Technical limitations
- ☐ Resistance from researchers

Other (please specify):

B. National OS Policy Context

1.2. Does your university align its policies with national strategies?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially

1.3. Are there national legal requirements or funding programs that support Open Science? (e.g., open access publishing, data management, research capacity-building)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

1.3.2. If Yes, please specify_____

1.4. Does your country have a national-level OS strategy or roadmap?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ In development
- ☐ Don't know

1.4.1. Which areas does the national OS policy cover? (Select all that apply)

- ☐ Open Access publishing
- ☐ Research Data Management (RDM)
- ☐ Institutional or national Open Repositories
- ☐ FAIR principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable)
- ☐ Open Educational Resources (OER)
- ☐ Open Peer Review
- ☐ Citizen Science / Public engagement in research
- ☐ Other (please specify):

1.4.2. Were stakeholders (universities, researchers, civil society) consulted in the development of the national OS policy?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Partially

1.4.3. Please confirm the country in which your institution is located:

- ☐ India
- ☐ Malaysia

1.2.3. Which government bodies or agencies are responsible for OS policy in your country? (Select all that apply)?

India

- ☐ Ministry of Education (MoE)
- ☐ Ministry of Science & Technology (DST – Department of Science & Technology)
- ☐ Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY)

- ☐ NITI Aayog (National Institution for Transforming India)
- ☐ UGC – University Grants Commission
- ☐ CSIR – Council of Scientific and Industrial Research
- ☐ ICAR – Indian Council of Agricultural Research
- ☐ ICMR – Indian Council of Medical Research
- ☐ DBT – Department of Biotechnology
- ☐ INFLIBNET – Information and Library Network Centre
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

Malaysia

- ☐ Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE)
- ☐ Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MOSTI)
- ☐ MASTIC – Malaysian Science and Technology Information Centre
- ☐ MyRDC – Malaysian Research and Development Classification System (under MOSTI)
- ☐ MyGRANTS – Malaysian Grants Management System (under MOHE)
- ☐ MAMPU – Malaysian Administrative Modernisation and Management Planning Unit (for digital/OS policy)
- ☐ Malaysian Citation Centre (MyCite)
- ☐ National Library of Malaysia
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

C. Funding and Institutional Support for OS

1.6. Does your university provide internal funding or grants to support Open Science practices (e.g., open access fees, data management)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

1.6.1. If yes, to what extent does your university provide financial support for the following research-related activities?

	Fully provided	Partially provided	Rarely provided	Not provided	Don't know
Research project grants					
Conference travel and participation					
Research infrastructure (laboratories, equipment, digital tools)					
Open access publication fees (e.g., APCs)					
Training and professional development					

Other (please specify)

D. Working Conditions and Recognition

1.7. **Are researchers rewarded or recognized for engaging in Open Science** (e.g., promotion criteria, awards, internal grants)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

1.8. **Are Open Science contributions considered in staff performance evaluations?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

1.9. **Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about your institution:**

		Fully agree	Somewhat agree	Don't agree	Totally disagree	No opinion
1	Vacancies for researchers are appropriately promoted nationally.					
2	Vacancies for researchers are appropriately promoted internationally (e.g., via EURAXESS).					
3	Shortlisting criteria and working conditions for researchers are transparent and clearly stated.					
4	Shortlisting committees for researchers consider creativity and independence of candidates.					
5	Researchers have access to fair salaries, benefits, and social security rights.					
6	The university encourages international and inter-sectoral mobility of researchers.					
7	The university provides mentoring and professional development opportunities at different career stages.					
8	Researchers' professional activities (teaching, research) are systematically evaluated to support career progression.					
9	The university provides career development support (mentorship, mobility programs, training).					
10	Researchers have stable and attractive employment conditions (salaries, contracts, benefits).					
11	Researchers have access to social security rights (maternity leave, pensions, unemployment insurance).					
12	The university encourages gender balance and non-discrimination in hiring and promotion.					
13	The university provides a stimulating research environment (modern facilities, equipment, collaboration opportunities).					
14	Researchers are encouraged to participate in national and international mobility programs (conferences, exchanges, project visits).					

CHAPTER 2 – OPEN SCIENCE INFRASTRUCTURE AND PRACTICES

This chapter explores whether universities have the necessary infrastructure, tools, and services to support Open Science practices. Adequate infrastructure is essential for researchers to store, share, and manage research outputs in line with FAIR principles, and for countries to build sustainable OS ecosystems.

University staff involved:

1. Vice-Chancellor / Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research, Academic Affairs) – strategic oversight of institutional infrastructure.
2. Director of Research / Research Office Manager – knowledge of institutional research systems.
3. Head Librarian / Repository Manager / Data Steward – responsible for repositories and data management services.
4. Head of IT / IT Officer – responsible for digital infrastructure, servers, and security.
5. Quality Assurance / Compliance Officer – for policies related to infrastructure and data governance.

A. Existence and Use of Open Science Infrastructure

2.1. **Does your university have an institutional repository for research publications?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
  - 2.1.1. If Yes, please provide URL: _____

2.2. Does your university have an institutional data repository?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
  - 2.2.1. If Yes, please provide URL: _____

2.3. Are your repositories publicly accessible to external users?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

2.4. To what extent do researchers actively use institutional repositories? Please select one option

- ☐ Completely
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a moderate extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ Not at all

2.5. Is your OS infrastructure connected to national/international platforms and aligned with global standards? (e.g., FAIR, open formats, APIs)

- ☐ Completely – fully connected and aligned with global standards
- ☐ To a large extent – most infrastructure is connected/aligned
- ☐ To a moderate extent – some elements are connected/aligned
- ☐ To a small extent – limited connection/alignment
- ☐ Not at all – no connection or alignment
- ☐ Don't know / Not applicable

B. Research Data Management and FAIR Principles

2.6. **Does your university provide secure storage solutions for research data?**
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

2.7. **Does your institution require researchers to address data management and sharing (e.g., Data Management Plans, RDM policies)?**
- ☐ Yes, mandatory for all research projects
- ☐ Yes, but only for specific funded projects (e.g., national, EU, donor-funded)
- ☐ Recommended, but not mandatory
- ☐ No institutional requirement
- ☐ Not sure / unknown

2.7.1. If yes, please describe the requirements or provide examples

2.8. **To what extent does your university provide tools for Research Data Management (RDM)?**
- ☐ Completely
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a moderate extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ Not at all

2.9. **Does your institution offer guidance or templates for Data Management Plans (DMPs)?**
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

2.10. **Does your institution require researchers to publish in open access journals or deposit publications in an open repository?**
- ☐ Mandatory for all publications
- ☐ Mandatory for specific funded projects
- ☐ Encouraged but not mandatory
- ☐ No policy

2.10.1. If applicable, specify repository used (e.g., institutional, national):

2.11. **To what extent does your institution financially or technically support researchers in publishing open access?** Please select one option
- ☐ Completely
- ☐ To a large extent
- ☐ To a moderate extent
- ☐ To a small extent
- ☐ Not at all

C. Technical Support and Sustainability

2.12. **What type of technical and user support is available for OS infrastructure at your institution?** (e.g., IT/data teams, helpdesk, training, online resources) Select all that apply:
- ☐ Dedicated IT or data management team
- ☐ Helpdesk or contact point for repository/data-related issues
- ☐ Training sessions or workshops for researchers and staff

- ☐ Online guidance and resources (FAQs, manuals, templates)
- ☐ Employment of external experts/consultants for infrastructure support
- ☐ Communication and awareness activities (emails, newsletters, webinars)
- ☐ No dedicated support available
- ☐ Other (please specify):

2.13. Are there dedicated institutional funds for supporting research infrastructure and staff development?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

2.13.1. **If yes, how easy is it for researchers to access institutional financial support for research?**

- ☐ Very easy – clear procedures, accessible funding, and quick approval.
- ☐ Somewhat easy – procedures exist but can be time-consuming or unclear.
- ☐ Neither easy nor difficult – access is possible but not straightforward.
- ☐ Somewhat difficult – funding exists but is hard to access due to bureaucracy or limited information.
- ☐ Very difficult – funding is rarely accessible or procedures are highly complex.
- ☐ Don't know

2.14. Does your university have a long-term plan or roadmap for maintaining and upgrading OS infrastructure?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

2.15. How intensively do you use the following infrastructure for your research/work?

	1-3 months	4-6 months	7-9 months	10-12 months	Don't use	Don't know
High-performance computing clusters						
High-throughput computing clusters						
Big data clusters (Hadoop-like clusters)						
Cloud virtual machines						
Single server						
Data repositories.						
Open Access journals.						
Preprint repositories.						
Open source code and software.						

D. National-Level Context

2.16. Does your country have national-level Open Science (OS) infrastructure or repositories accessible to universities?

- ☐ Yes, comprehensive infrastructure exists and is widely accessible
- ☐ Yes, but only limited infrastructure/platforms are available
- ☐ No, there is no national-level OS infrastructure
- ☐ Not sure / Unknownw

CHAPTER 3 – OPEN ENGAGEMENT, AWARENESS, AND KNOWLEDGE NEEDS

This chapter examines how universities engage with societal actors, policymakers, industry, and communities to increase the impact and relevance of research. Understanding institutional strategies for engagement helps assess how research results contribute to solving societal challenges and achieving SDGs.

University staff involved:

1. Vice-Chancellor / Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research, Community Engagement)
2. Director of Research and Innovation / Research Office Manager
3. Deans / Heads of Faculties or Schools
4. Knowledge Transfer, Outreach or Public Engagement Officers
5. Policy / Partnerships / Industry Liaison Officers

A. Institutional Strategies for Societal Engagement

3.1. Does your university have a formal strategy or policy that includes societal engagement and impact as part of its mission or strategic objectives?

Response	Yes	No
Policy	☐	☐
Strategy	☐	☐

3.2. Does your university have dedicated offices or established partnerships to support engagement? (e.g., industry, policy dialogue, community)

- ☐ Yes, dedicated offices/units exist within the university
- ☐ Yes, established partnerships exist (without dedicated offices/units)
- ☐ Both – the university has dedicated offices/units and established partnerships
- ☐ No, neither offices nor partnerships exist
- ☐ Not sure / Unknown

3.3. To what extent does your university encourage researchers to co-create solutions with societal actors (NGOs, governments, businesses)? Please select one option

- ☐ Completely – there is strong institutional encouragement and support for co-creation with societal actors
- ☐ To a large extent – there are several initiatives or policies promoting co-creation
- ☐ To a moderate extent – some activities exist but without consistent institutional support
- ☐ To a small extent – there are only isolated initiatives without strategic support
- ☐ Not at all – there is no institutional encouragement for co-creation

3.4. To what extent are researchers, staff, and students at your university familiar with Open Science principles (open access, FAIR data, open peer review, citizen science)?

- ☐ Completely familiar – broad and deep understanding across the institution
- ☐ Largely familiar – many are aware, but understanding is uneven

- ☐ Moderately familiar – some awareness exists, but limited in scope or depth
- ☐ Slightly familiar – only a few individuals or groups are aware
- ☐ Not familiar at all – there is little or no awareness of OS principles
- ☐ Don't know / Unable to assess

3.5. **What types of training or support would be most useful to strengthen awareness and practice of Open Science at your university?**

- ☐ Open Access publishing (journals, repositories, licensing)
- ☐ Research Data Management (RDM) and Data Management Plans (DMPs)
- ☐ FAIR principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable data)
- ☐ Open Peer Review
- ☐ Open Educational Resources (OER)
- ☐ Citizen Science and community engagement
- ☐ Use of institutional/national OS infrastructure (repositories, data networks, platforms)
- ☐ Legal and ethical aspects of OS (copyright, data protection, indigenous knowledge rights)
- ☐ Incentives and recognition for OS practices (career progression, funding opportunities)
- ☐ Other (please specify):

3.6. **Does your university have mechanisms to communicate research results to the general public** (e.g., press releases, science cafés, social media, policy briefs)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

3.7. **How often are open public lectures or science events organized to share research findings?**

- ☐ More than twice a year
- ☐ Twice a year
- ☐ Once a year
- ☐ Never

3.8. **Are researchers rewarded or recognized** (e.g., in promotion criteria, awards, internal grants) **for societal engagement?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

3.9. **Does your university track or evaluate the societal impact of its research?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

3.9.1. If Yes, which methods are used? (Select all that apply)

- ☐ Case studies of impact
- ☐ Societal impact indicators in project reports
- ☐ Surveys with external stakeholders
- ☐ Other (please specify)

B. Institutional Policies and Recognition of indigenous knowledge

3.10. **Does your university have a policy, guidelines, or curricula that integrate indigenous or local knowledge into research and teaching?**

- ☐ Yes – a formal policy or guidelines exist (approved by university leadership)
- ☐ Yes – indigenous/local knowledge is included in curricula or academic programs
- ☐ Yes – both policy/guidelines and curricula integration exist
- ☐ No – neither policy/guidelines nor curricula integration exist
- ☐ Don't know / Not sure

3.11. **Is inclusion of diverse knowledge systems explicitly mentioned in the university's research or academic strategy?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

5.2.1 If yes, specify _____

3.12. **Does your university recognize traditional or indigenous knowledge holders as research partners?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

3.13. **To what extent does your university involve indigenous or local communities in defining and carrying out research projects?** Please select one option

- ☐ Completely – collaboration with communities/indigenous groups is a standard practice in defining research problems.
- ☐ To a large extent – collaboration is common in many research projects.
- ☐ To a moderate extent – collaboration happens in some projects but is not systematic.
- ☐ To a small extent – collaboration is rare and limited to specific cases.
- ☐ Not at all – there is no collaboration when defining research problems

3.14. **Are there institutional ethical guidelines or codes of conduct for working with indigenous or local knowledge?**

Response	Yes	No
Ethical guidelines	☐	☐
Codes of conduct	☐	☐

3.15. **Are researchers rewarded or recognized for integrating indigenous or local knowledge in their research or teaching?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

3.16. **Are there partnerships with community organizations to facilitate knowledge exchange?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

C. National Context

3.17. **What are the main barriers to engaging societal actors in research at your university?** (Select all that apply)

- ☐ Lack of institutional funding for societal engagement
- ☐ Lack of time or incentives for researchers

- ☐ Limited awareness of societal engagement importance
- ☐ Absence of institutional strategy or policy for engagement
- ☐ Difficulty in building partnerships with other universities, research institutions, NGOs, government agencies, industry partners, or businesses
- ☐ Lack of staff trained in science communication
- ☐ Bureaucratic or legal barriers (contracts, agreements)
- ☐ Other (please specify):

3.18. **Are there national guidelines or policies that support integration of indigenous knowledge into research and education?**

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No