

Leiden protocol for research assessments

2021-2027

INTRODUCTION

The Netherlands has a long standing tradition of research assessment through peer review. According to the Higher Education and Research Act (WHW), universities are responsible for the quality assurance of their own research. Since 1994 universities have evaluated the quality of their research using a common protocol, the core of which is the assessment of the quality of the research by a committee of scientific peers. In 2019-2020 the Association of Universities (VSNU), the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) have drawn up the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) for the period 2021-2027. All research assessments at Leiden University in this period will be conducted in line with the SEP 2021 – 2027¹.

This Leiden University protocol functions as an internal instruction for these research assessments. It also contains suggestions for the internal mid-term assessments that can be held three years after each external assessment. This protocol describes the procedures, deadlines and division of roles between the University Executive Board, the Faculty Executive Board and the research unit.

Please note that the information in the SEP is leading: this protocol is meant as a manual to the SEP to explain how the rules of the SEP are put into practice at Leiden University. An exception to this rule is the mid-term assessment for which the Leiden protocol provides suggestions.

Important elements in the new SEP:

1. The three assessment criteria (1) research quality, (2) relevance to society, and (3) viability, have been maintained. Four specific aspects have been introduced: (1) Open Science, (2) PhD policy and training, (3) academic culture, and (4) human resources policy. Reflection on the aspects should be integrated in the discussion of quality, relevance and viability.
2. Performance will no longer be scored; all assessment will be qualitative.
3. The mid-term review is no longer mandatory, but annual follow-up discussions are.
4. The new SEP requires that a summary of the self-evaluation report, including the case studies, is published after the assessment, this in order to make research accessible to a wider public.

¹ With exception of assessments that were to take place in 2020 but have been postponed until 2021 due to the Covid-19 situation, these will take place according to the previous SEP.

EXTERNAL RESEARCH ASSESSMENT ACCORDING TO SEP

1. SEP 2021 – 2027

- At Leiden University the aims of the research assessment for the research unit are:
 - reflection on its strategy and ambitions;
 - feedback on the quality, relevance and viability of its research in (inter)national context, taking into account its performance on Open Science, PhD policy and training, academic culture, and human resources policy;
 - evaluating its management and academic leadership;
 - external accountability for its research activities and -output.
- The responsibility for external research assessments rests with the University Executive Board (hereinafter: University). This is in line with the Higher Education and Research Act (WHW), where quality assurance is a function of the Board of the University. This does not, however, affect the responsibilities and competences of the Faculty Executive Board (hereinafter: Faculty) in terms of the organisation of the research.
- The University carries out its formal role in research quality assurance in close consultation with the Faculty. In certain cases it may be necessary to hold consultations with the research unit concerned. These consultations always take place in agreement with or through the intervention of the Faculty.

2. The research units

- The Faculty proposes to the University which research units are to be assessed. According to the SEP a research unit can be institutes, departments, research groups or multidisciplinary clusters with their own research strategy, or other relevant units as defined by the board that commissions the evaluation (SEP p. 7).
- The SEP defines the minimum size of a research unit as 10 research FTE permanent academic staff (excluding PhD students and post-docs). Often, such units comprise different research programmes and the assessment should take these into consideration as well. The decision on the level(s) of assessment is taken in consultation between the Faculty and the University.
- The SEP notes that a research unit to be assessed should have been established at least three years previously and adds that if units of a more recent date are to be assessed, their self-evaluation should indicate their stage of development so the assessment committee can take this fact into account. In principle, all research has to be assessed.

3. Scheduling and managing an assessment

- The Faculty is responsible for appointing an administrative coordinator within the research unit, whose task is to make the practical preparations for the assessment and who, if requested, can also provide the secretary of the assessment committee with further information.
- If Leiden University acts as the coordinator (penvoerder) of a national assessment, or a joint assessment with one or more universities, the department of Strategy and Academic Affairs coordinates the assessment process on behalf of the University, in consultation with the other participating universities.

Action plan

- The University will notify the Faculty well in advance in writing about the proposed start of a specific research assessment. In practice, this will mean approximately eight months before the start of the year in which the assessment will take place. In this notification the Faculty is requested to draw up an Action Plan for the assessment, to be approved by the University.
- In the case of a national or joint assessment the Action Plan is drawn up by the coordinating Faculty after consultation with all participating Faculties. The coordinating university then submits the Action Plan to the Universities involved.
- The Action Plan should contain at least the following elements:
 - whether the assessment will take place at the local level, at the national level or jointly with one or more partner universities;
 - if and how a benchmark can be provided;
 - a profile of the assessment committee and the required expertise;
 - the nomination of the chair and members of the assessment committee;
 - the nomination of a secretary of the committee;
 - the preparation at the level of the research unit:
 - self-evaluation
 - possible specific assessment criteria
 - the desirability/possibility of a bibliometric analysis
 - a budget estimate;
 - a global time schedule.
- The Faculty submits the Action Plan to the University for approval at least six months before the assessment is scheduled to take place.

Terms of Reference

- The University in consultation with the Faculty can add elements to the standard Terms of Reference for research assessments .
- The University or the Faculty can present one or more specific strategic questions to the assessment committee, e.g. in response to the content of the self-evaluation.

Composition of the assessment committee

In the case of a local assessment, the procedure is as follows:

- The Faculty will substantiate the nominations of the members of the assessment committee in terms of academic excellence, areas of expertise and independence, and will include a short curriculum vitae of the chair and members.
- The University will present the nominations of the committee members in confidence to one or more external expert(s) for advice on the expertise and independence of the candidates.
- We advise not to approach any committee members before the University has approved the composition of the committee. It is not uncommon for the University to require changes to the committee composition.
- The Faculty notifies the University at least four months before the assessment visit of the final composition of the assessment committee. The committee will then be appointed by the University. The appointment of the committee secretary will follow the same procedure.
- The University notifies the committee members of their appointment through an official letter, which is accompanied by the Terms of Reference of the assessment, the SEP and the Statement of Impartiality and Confidentiality.

In the case of a national or joint assessment, the coordinating university, after consultation with the other participating universities, will appoint the members of the assessment committee.

Budget

- The Faculty is responsible for producing a budget estimate for the assessment (included in the Action Plan) which must be approved by the University.
- The costs of preparing the assessment (producing and printing the self-evaluation, activities of the administrative coordinator) will be met by the Faculty.
- The University will meet the costs of the site visit, such as the remuneration and expenses of the assessment committee and the secretary. Guidelines for these expenses can be found in APPENDIX 3.

Bibliometric analysis

The University will cover the costs [max. t.b.d.] of relevant quantitative and/or qualitative analyses for the self-evaluation in accordance with the SEP, for example a study providing insights into the unit's performance and/or position or the connection of its research to society. Typical studies to these ends are:

- Advanced bibliometric analyses, e.g. as evidence of past performance or to identify Strength, Promising & Risk areas (SPR analysis)
- Analyses to identify connectedness of research to society, whereby the connection of a unit's research is unfolded on the basis of the communities to which it belongs (ABC analysis)
- Comprehensive mixed-method analysis of scholarly quality, broader impact and collaboration, and how these relate to the goals and missions of the unit (evaluative inquiry)

- Responsibility for payment (for example of the expenses of the assessment committee) rests with the Faculty or research unit. The expenses can be reclaimed afterwards from the University.

4. Self-evaluation and additional documentation

- The self-evaluation written by the research unit should first be approved by the Faculty. The Faculty then submits the self-evaluation to the University. Only after approval by the University can the self-evaluation be made available to the assessment committee.
- Since the self-evaluation has to be available to the assessment committee one or two months prior to the site visit, it must be submitted to the University at least ten (working) weeks prior to the assessment visit, in order to allow time for any modifications which may be necessary.
- We recommend to send a draft of the self-evaluation for consultation to the department of Academic Affairs well in advance.
- A bibliometric analysis can be included as an appendix to the self-evaluation. In the case of a national or joint assessment the bibliometric analysis for all research units involved will usually be provided as a separate report.
- Some researchers are employed by another university or research institution in addition to Leiden University. In these cases only the research output related to their Leiden position should be included in the self-evaluation.
- In the self-evaluation report, the research unit has to identify output indicators for research quality, relevance to society [and viability]. These indicators are selected by the research unit and not dictated by the SEP. The university also does not specify which output indicators should be used. However, within the university a model for indicators of societal output and impact has been developed, which might prove of use to research units preparing a self-evaluation (Appendix 2).
Other organisations have also developed discipline-specific quality indicators. This includes the KNAW, which has published reports on quality indicators for the Humanities and the Social Sciences ² and the VSNU³. In addition, the UK Research Excellence Framework (REF) document of 'Panel criteria and working methods' lists a large number of examples of 'impact' across the whole scientific spectrum ⁴.
- In the case of a national or joint research assessment the research units and Faculties involved will have to reach a consensus on which output indicators to use.
- For certain categories of employees, such as professors by special appointment and guest researchers, separate publication overviews can be set up, in order to provide transparency regarding the link between input and output.
- It is possible to provide the assessment committee with additional (quantitative) information through a dedicated online location.

² <https://www.knaw.nl/shared/resources/actueel/publicaties/pdf/20111023.pdf> (humanities) and <https://www.knaw.nl/shared/resources/actueel/publicaties/pdf/20131001.pdf> (social sciences)

³

https://www.vsnul.nl/files/documenten/Feiten_en_Cijfers/VSNUL_Definitieafspraken_onderzoeksinzet_en_output_KUOZ.PDF

⁴ <https://www.ref.ac.uk/publications/panel-criteria-and-working-methods-201902/>

5. Site visit

- The management of the research unit, under the responsibility of the Faculty and in consultation with the chair of the assessment committee, is responsible for the programme of the site visit.

6. Assessment report

- In addition to the public assessment report, the assessment committee can write, or can be requested to write, a confidential management letter to the Faculty, with a copy to the University. This management letter relates to possible sensitive information of a personal nature or sensitive business information about the (future) position of the research unit.
- In the correction phase of the draft assessment report the management of the research unit can, in consultation with the Faculty, ask the assessment committee to transfer sections of the report to a management letter in the event that circumstances such as, for example, contractual obligations toward external parties impede disclosure.
- When the assessment committee presents the assessment report to the University, the University verifies, together with the Faculty, that the report is complete and consistent with the Standard Evaluation Protocol. The University also verifies that the report complies with any additional requirements stipulated in the Terms of Reference. In the event that the University or the Faculty requires any further information or explanation of the report, the University will ask the committee chair via the secretary of the committee to include this additional information or clarification in the report.
- The University can decide, in consultation with the Faculty, to reject the assessment report. The University makes this decision known to the chair of the assessment committee.
- When the University has accepted the assessment report, it formally discharges the members of the assessment committee. The University expresses its appreciation for the work of the committee in a letter to all committee members.

7. Public accountability and follow-up

- When the University has accepted the assessment report, it asks the management of the research unit, through the Faculty, to respond to the assessment by the committee. The follow-up actions proposed by the research unit in response to the report should be SMART (specific, measurable, assignable, realistic and time-related).
- The Faculty presents the response of the research unit to the University together with its own management view on both the report and the response of the research unit, no more than six weeks after the assessment report has been accepted.
- After receiving the response of the research unit and the view of the Faculty, the Rector of the University holds a meeting with the Dean of the Faculty and the management of the research unit where the findings of the committee and the response of the research unit are discussed. Together these parties decide on the follow-up actions in response to the assessment report. They also decide how these actions will be monitored. This meeting takes place no more than four weeks after the Faculty has presented its reaction to the University.

- If the assessment committee has written a confidential management letter, this will be discussed between the Rector and the Dean of the Faculty.
- In consultation with the Faculty and the management of the research unit, the University drafts its public management response with regard to the assessment report. The management response will be published on the university website together with the report and a summary of the self-evaluation document, including the case studies within six months of the site visit.

ANNUAL AND MID-TERM REVIEWS AND OTHER LIGHT ASSESSMENTS

1. Midterm and other light assessments

The **mid-term review** is no longer mandatory and effectively discouraged by the SEP. It states that a mid-term review should only be conducted in exceptional circumstances. The SEP does, however, require that the Executive Board and the research unit discuss the follow-up to the assessment report and position document at least annually as part of the quality assurance cycle.

Leiden University, however, encourages a light and qualitative mid-term assessment when the external assessment was very critical and is then used

- to monitor the follow-up actions taken in response to the last external assessment (retrospective)
- to determine further profile choices and ambitions in preparation for the next external assessment and, if necessary, define new SMART follow-up actions (prospective).

Leiden University will also allow such a **light and qualitative review** to be used as a first assessment of a new research unit, in preparation for the first six-year external evaluation.

Requirements for these light assessments

- a brief self-evaluation is produced
- an assessment committee is appointed by the Faculty. The committee generally has an uneven number of members - at least three and at most five - of whom at least one is external to Leiden University.

The costs of these mid-term and other light assessments are borne by the Faculty.

The results of these assessments do not have to be presented on the university website.

2. Annual reviews

The Strategy Evaluation Protocol demands that the follow-up to the assessment report and position document will be discussed at least **annually** by the executive board and the research unit as part of the quality assurance cycle. In Leiden, the faculty boards will conduct these annual discussions with the research units and will update the executive board on progress and/or potential issues during the regular meetings that are held twice-yearly (the *periodieke bestuurlijke overleggen*)

APPENDIX 1: FORMAT ACTION PLAN EXTERNAL RESEARCH ASSESSMENT (DUTCH)

APPENDIX 2: IMPACT MATRIX

APPENDIX 3: GUIDANCE FOR THE SWOT

APPENDIX 1: Format plan van aanpak externe onderzoek visitatie Bijlage bij Leiden protocol research assessments 2021-2027

SEP-eenheid: <<naam SEP eenheid>>

Jaar van beoordeling: <<jaar>>

Betreft periode <<jaar t/m jaar>>

1. Inleiding en aggregatieniveau

Hieronder wordt het plan van aanpak beschreven voor de onderzoeksbeoordeling van de/het <<naam SEP-eenheid>>. De beoordeling betreft de periode <<jaar t/m jaar >>. De vorige visitatie heeft plaatsgevonden in <<jaar>> en had betrekking op de periode <<jaar t/m jaar>>.

Destijds is << naam SEP-eenheid>> <<landelijk/lokaal >> gevisiteerd. Dit keer is gekozen voor een <<landelijke/lokale >> visitatie omdat: <<beschrijf beknopt de redenen voor de gemaakte keuze>>. (indien van toepassing) De andere partner universiteiten die betrokken zijn bij de visitatie zijn: <<namen Universiteiten>>. De penvoerende universiteit is: <<naam Universiteit>>.

Het instituut is <<(wel)/niet>> aangesloten bij een landelijke onderzoekschool, <<naam landelijke onderzoekschool>> en (indien van toepassing) de landelijke onderzoekschool wordt wel/niet meegenomen in de beoordeling omdat:<< beschrijf beknopt de redenen voor de gemaakte keuze>>.

Binnen het instituut is voor deze onderzoeksbeoordeling een coördinerend team samengesteld van <<aantal personen>>. Dit zijn: <<namen plus rol van leden coördinerend team>>.

Het instituut omvat <<omvang in FTE aan vaste onderzoeksstaf>> onderzoeksfte. Uitgaande van het SEP zal er een beoordeling plaatsvinden op instituutsniveau.

Toelichting:

- <<naam SEP eenheid>> De SEP-eenheid betreft meestal een instituut.
- <<jaar van beoordeling>> Het jaartal waarin de beoordeling plaatsvindt is het jaar waarin de visitatiecommissie de SEP-eenheid bezoekt (al dan niet online).
- <<landelijke/lokale >> De visitatie kan plaats vinden in samenhang met SEP-eenheden van andere Nederlandse universiteiten (een landelijke visitatie) of alleen betrekking hebben op de SEP-eenheid binnen Leiden Universiteit (een lokale visitatie). Een tussenvorm is ook mogelijk. Ook is het aan te bevelen om te kijken of het handig is de (eventuele) landelijke onderzoekschool in de visitatie op te nemen. Zeker in geval van een landelijke visitatie is dit aanbevolen. Zie hierover de handreiking kwaliteitsbeoordeling onderzoeksscholen (te downloaden op de [website van de vsnu](#))
- <<omvang in FTE aan vaste onderzoeksstaf>> Het SEP schrijft een aggregatieniveau voor van minimaal 10 onderzoeksfte vaste wetenschappelijke staf.

2. Analyse

Er wordt <<een/geen>> bibliometrische analyse uitgevoerd. <<Licht de wenselijkheid en (on)mogelijkheden hiervan toe>>.

(indien van toepassing) Deze analyse wordt gedaan door het instituut zelf/CWTS/anders en richt zich op de volgende aspecten: <<beschrijf te analyseren bibliometrische indicatoren>>.

3. Profiel en benoeming van de visitatiecommissie

De commissie zal bestaan uit <<aantal>> leden en een voorzitter. De commissie wordt voorgezeten door: <<naam voorzitter met naam instelling en land en M/V>> en bestaat uit de volgende leden: <<namen leden met naam instelling, land, M/V en expertise in enkele trefwoorden>>.

Bij het samenstellen van de commissie is rekening gehouden met de volgende criteria en randvoorwaarden: <<beschrijf beknopt op welke criteria/gronden de commissie tot stand is gekomen en of hierbij reeds een externe blik/ toets op heeft plaatsgevonden>>.

Een korte biografie en CV van de beoogde commissieleden en voorzitter is in de bijlage bijgesloten.

De commissie wordt bijgestaan door een onafhankelijk secretaris, te weten <<naam secretaris>> van onderzoeksbureau <<naam bureau>>.

Toelichting:

- <<aantal>> Voor een lokale visitatie wordt doorgaans een commissie samengesteld die bestaat uit zo'n 4-6 personen (inclusief voorzitter). In het geval van een landelijke visitatie loopt dit op tot 7-8 personen.
- <<criteria>> Bij het samenstellen van de commissie dient o.a. rekening te worden gehouden met de man/vrouw verhouding, de wetenschappelijke expertise, eventuele ervaring in relevant maatschappelijk/bedrijfsleven/overheid/NGO veld, en natuurlijk onafhankelijkheid. *N.B.: Voordat CvB de commissiesamenstelling (via goedkeuring van het PvA) heeft geaccordeerd mogen geen formele afspraken met potentiële commissieleden gemaakt worden.* Commissieleden moeten het SEP formulier inzake onafhankelijkheid tekenen.
- Na akkoord op het PvA door het CvB krijgen de commissieleden een formele uitnodigingsbrief en email namens CvB voor zitting in de commissie, waarbij meegestuurd worden: de ToR voor de commissie (zie format in Appendix 3 bij Leiden protocol) en het standaard Statement of Impartiality and Confidentiality met daaraan toegevoegd ruimte voor eventuele opmerkingen daarbij door het commissielid.
- <<naam secretaris>> Een groslijst van secretarissen met ervaring is beschikbaar bij de afdeling SAZ

4. Voorbereiding

Er is een Terms of Reference (ToR) opgesteld waarin de opdracht voor de visitatiecommissie is geformuleerd (zie bijlage <<x>>). Na goedkeuring van het plan van aanpak en de Terms of Reference zal de SEP-eenheid een zelfevaluatierapport opstellen volgens de SEP-richtlijnen .

Toelichting:

- Het format voor de Terms of Reference is een bijlage bij het SEP.
- Eventuele specifieke vragen voor de evaluatie criteria (in aanvulling op standaard SEP criteria, kunnen worden aangegeven in de ToR in de vorm van een of (maximaal) twee aanvullende vragen voor de commissie.
- Een voorbeeld van een format voor een zelfevaluatierapport is een bijlage bij het SEP. In geval van een landelijke visitatie is het aan te raden om tegelijk met het PvA met de betrokken instituten een gezamenlijk format voor de zelfevaluaties af te spreken.

5. Begroting

Kosten <<voor SEP-eenheid >>:	
(Externe) projectleider voor begeleiding van voorbereiding visitatie (optioneel)	
Drukkosten zelfevaluatie (optioneel)	
Kosten voor Universiteit /CvB:	
Onkostenvergoeding commissieleden <<aantal leden x aantal dagen x vergoeding per dag >>	
Onkostenvergoeding voorzitter <<vergoeding per dag x aantal dagen >>	
Reis- en verblijfkosten (hotel, diner) commissieleden	
Vergaderkosten (zaalhuur, catering) site-visit	
Secretaris (zie offerte in bijlage x) << aantal dagen/dagdelen x vergoeding per dag/dagdeel (incl BTW), plus eventuele reis/verblijfkosten>>	
Bibliometrische analyse (optioneel, zie ook bijlage x)	

Toelichting:

- <<(externe projectleider)>> Sommige instituten kiezen ervoor om de organisatie van de visitatie uit te besteden. Dat is mogelijk, maar de kosten zijn dan voor het instituut of de faculteit. SAZ heeft een aantal namen van geschikte projectleiders.
- <<aantal dagen>> Het aantal dagen inzet per commissielid voor een zelfstandige visitatie ligt gemiddeld rond 5 dagen. Voor de voorzitter is dit aantal vaak hoger, rond de 7-10 dagen.
- <<vergoeding per dag>> Hanteer voor de tijdsinzet van commissieleden een bedrag van 300 euro per dag.
- <<reis- en verblijfskosten commissieleden>> Geef een schatting van de totale reiskosten van de commissieleden met een beknopte toelichting. De standaardvergoeding is op basis van economy class en afwijkingen moeten vooraf met SAZ worden afgestemd.
- N.B.: U wordt verzocht aan commissieleden geen harde toezeggingen te doen vanuit faculteit/instituut voordat het Plan van Aanpak en de begroting door het CvB zijn goedgekeurd.
Wees expliciet of genoemde bedragen in de begroting incl. of excl. BTW zijn (o.a. secretaris, bibliometrische analyse, vergaderkosten, projectleider, drukkosten).
- Spreek met secretaris af of tarief/offerte incl. of excl. reiskosten is.
- Let bij inhuur secretaris (met name bij landelijke visitaties) op de inkoopregels van de universiteit, zie <https://www.medewerkers.universiteit leiden.nl/financien--inkoop/inkopen-aanbesteden-en-bestellen>.
- T.a.v. declaratie van kosten bij de universiteit geldt het volgende:
 - Voor elke onderzoeksvisitatie is bij SAZ/CvB een apart SAP nummer beschikbaar voor declaraties van kosten. Vermeld deze bij alle declaraties aan centraal.
 - U wordt verzocht declaraties zoveel mogelijk gebundeld in een totaal in te dienen. Eventuele toelichting of uitsplitsing graag als bijlage toevoegen.
 - Zorg ervoor dat de kosten die voor het kalenderjaar reeds zijn gemaakt/voorgesloten door faculteit/instituut, en conform afspraak in PvA gedeclareerd kunnen worden bij CvB, voor begin december van dat kalenderjaar worden ingediend via de reguliere financiële route.
- T.a.v. de secretaris:
 - Offerte en opdrachtverlening richting secretaris (na goedkeuring PvA door CvB) loopt bij voorkeur via SEP-eenheid.
 - Voor een zelfstandige visitatie kan uitgegaan worden van 7-8 dagen inzet van de secretaris, mits de taken alleen bestaan uit het bijwonen van de visitatie en het schrijven van het visitatierapport.

6. Tijdschema

	Stap	Trekker	Periode / deadline
1.	Coördinerend team samenstellen en opstellen concept plan van aanpak	SEP-eenheid	
2.	Polen (informeel) van commissieleden gelet op mogelijke bereidheid en beschikbaarheid	SEP-eenheid	
3.	Plan van aanpak inclusief bijlagen naar CvB (door tussenkomst FB)	SEP-eenheid	
4.	Goedkeuring PvA door CvB	SAZ/CvB	
5.	Aanstellen commissieleden	SAZ/CvB	
6.	Opstellen zelfevaluatie	SEP-eenheid	
7.	Vaststellen programma van visitatie	SEP-eenheid	
8.	Zelfevaluatie inclusief appendices naar CvB (door tussenkomst FB)	SEP-eenheid	
9.	Goedkeuring zelfevaluatie door CvB	AZ/CvB	
10.	Versturen zelfstudie met appendices, programma en eventuele aanvullende achtergrond informatie aan visitatiecommissie	SEP-eenheid /secretaris	
11.	Visitatiebezoek	SEP-eenheid	
12.	Oplevering visitatierapport aan CvB/AZ	Commissie/secretaris	

Toelichting:

- Bedenk bij alle stappen dat er rekening gehouden moet worden met aanleverdeadlines naar faculteit, CvB en commissie.
- Andere beoogde stappen kunnen naar eigen inzicht bijgevoegd worden.
- T.a.v. visitatiebezoek: Een site visit commissie varieert van 1 tot 2 dagen. Een programma voor bezoek bij een lokale visitatie neemt vaak al twee dagen in beslag. Voor landelijke visitatie is per instituut soms maar twee uur tot halve dag beschikbaar met de commissie in een totaal programma voor de commissie van meestal niet meer dan twee dagen.
- Reken voldoende tijd voor het bezoek van de commissie als die vrijheid er is.
- Oefen vooraf het gesprek met de commissie ook met de betrokkenen (zeker de PhD's) met wie de commissie spreekt

Bijlagen bij PvA:

Bijlage 1: Korte biografie beoogde commissieleden

Bijlage 2: Terms of Reference visitatiecommissie

Bijlage 3: Offerte secretaris van visitatiecommissie

Bijlage 4: Offerte bibliometrische analyse (optioneel, alleen als bibliometrische analyse extern gedaan wordt)

Bijlage 5: Format hoofdstukindeling zelfstudie (optioneel, alleen bij een landelijke visitatie)

Toelichting:

- De Terms of Reference (ToR) for Assessment committee kan worden gemaakt in het format bij het SEP. U kunt extra vragen toevoegen.

APPENDIX 2: IMPACT MATRIX

(last update: August 2015)

Interaction with > Deliverables v	Academic field (scientific interactions)	Professional field (professional interactions)	Commercial sector / (non) Governmental sector (interactions with companies / enterprises / public entities)	Society at large (public interactions)
Knowledge production and exchange (results)	<u>Outreach activities for/with peers</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (Co)Publications (articles, books, comments) (refereed vs. non-refereed, open access) ▪ Outcomes of specific research projects, dissertations (PhD supervising) included ▪ Education to bachelor/ master students ▪ Active participation in scientific/ academic associations 	<u>Outreach activities for/with professionals</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (Co)Publications / interviews in professional journals, manuals, books ▪ Lectures for professionals ▪ Projects / events with/for professionals 	<u>Outreach activities for/with specific companies and public entities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (Co)Publications / interviews in business or governmental media, manuals, books ▪ Lectures for employees, officials / round table discussions ▪ Collaborative projects / events with companies or public entities 	<u>Dissemination of academic insights to general audiences</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ General (co)publications (books, articles / comments / interviews in papers, public journals, magazines) ▪ Public lectures ▪ Open access ▪ MOOCs, etc.
Knowledge utilization (effects)	<u>Use of research outcomes by peers</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of information, instruments, infrastructure / research facilities, datasets, tests, labs, models, processes, software tools or designs that the unit has developed or obtained ▪ Citations 	<u>Use of research outcomes by professionals</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of information, instruments, models, processes, software tools or designs that the unit has developed ▪ Advices to professionals ▪ Support of young professionals through a center of entrepreneurship, or incubators 	<u>Use of research outcomes by companies / public entities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of information, instruments, models, processes, software tools or designs that the unit has developed ▪ Contributions to clusters (BioScience Park, Museums, etc.), and standardization committees (CEN, ISO) ▪ Consultancy / Policy advice ▪ Contribution of expertise to aspects of societal importance (i.e. membership of committees, councils, etc.) 	<u>Use of research outcomes by general audiences</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contributions into public discussions on forums, television, in social media (You Tube, Blogs) and so on ▪ Contributions to events / exhibitions ▪ Added societal value alumni

Knowledge exploitation (revenues)	<u>Marks of recognition from peers</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Research grants / Science awards ▪ Membership of scientific committees, editorial boards ▪ Appointment as guest scholar/lecturer <u>Positions in rankings and EU-networking activities and alliances</u> <u>External funding</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NWO (Topsectoren included), EU (ERC, Collaborative programmes); other sources ▪ Budget for Impact 	<u>Returns/gains through:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contract research ▪ Courses / training for professionals (post-academic education) ▪ Participation in advisory boards (monitoring-, evaluation committees) ▪ Use of research facilities by professionals ▪ Practices / entrepreneurship (spin outs / spin offs) ▪ Secondary positions 	<u>Returns/gains through:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contract research (including consultancy) ▪ Professional training/courses (post-academic education) ▪ Participation in advisory boards (monitoring-, evaluation committees) ▪ Use of research facilities of and by companies / other bodies ▪ Patents / licences/disclosures/revenues 	<u>Returns/gains through:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public prizes ▪ (Paid) Open courses ▪ Appointments / positions paid by societal entities ▪ Employment / jobs
--	---	--	---	---

Explanation

- This matrix can be used as a tool to describe different types of impact of the scientific/academic work of the institute in relation to users and stakeholders.
- The matrix covers the demands of the SEP and is consistent with other contributions in the debate on impact and valorization.
- The matrix reflects the idea that impact of knowledge is only meaningful in relation to users, customers and stakeholders in the academic field, professional field, commercial and (non) governmental sector, or society at large. These different target groups are listed in the upper row of the matrix: 'interactions'.
- Three different types of deliverables of knowledge can be identified: Knowledge production and exchange (results of knowledge), Knowledge utilization (effects of knowledge in the various fields), and returns or gains of Knowledge exploitation. These deliverables are listed in the far left column of the matrix.
- In each cell of the matrix examples of the specific type of impact are presented. For the row 'Knowledge production and exchange' these examples refer to outreach activities, sometimes in collaboration with partners in the various fields. The row 'Knowledge utilization' refers to the use of knowledge generated by the research unit, or contributed by experts of the research unit, by a user in one of the target groups. The row 'Knowledge exploitation' refers to research activities or contributions of expertise which result in revenues or resources for the research unit or researcher(s). This category also includes marks of recognition from peers, positions in rankings and external funding.
- The examples in the matrix show a variety of impact activities, now placed in a more or less logical connection between scientific / academic output and different target groups. These examples should be seen as suggestions to the faculty or institute involved. The types of impact that are relevant will be very different for different faculties or institutes. An institute or faculty can use the matrix to describe those types of impact that are most relevant for the field. For example: the Faculty of Science may describe its patents portfolio and the Faculty of Law its annotations that play a role in Court. This also means that not all cells in the matrix have to be filled: the research unit can focus on those cells that are most appropriate for their type of research.

APPENDIX 3

Guidance for the SWOT-analysis in the self-evaluation of research assessments, SAZ, 26-10-2020

This guidance explains the role of the SWOT analysis in the self-evaluation within the context of the Strategy Evaluation Protocol 2021-2027 and aims to provide help with the process of the SWOT analysis.

The SWOT in the protocol

As in the former SEP, the self-evaluation needs to contain the results of a SWOT analysis. The self-evaluation describes the research unit's results in the past six years, but also focuses on the ambitions for the coming years. The SWOT is the basis for the strategy for the next six years and hence is forward-looking (see SEP pages 13, 19 and 33).

Be advised that the assessment committee often starts the assessment by reading the SWOT analysis. It is one of the more important parts of the self-evaluation and it gives the committee the first impression of the research unit.

The SWOT analysis consists of an internal (strengths and weaknesses) and external (opportunities and threats) analysis. The analysis can be followed by drawing up a confrontation matrix. The results of the analysis and confrontation matrix will be integrated in the self-evaluation. Yet, please do make sure that it can be read and understood stand alone, too.

The SWOT analysis as an instrument

The SWOT analysis is firstly an instrument of self-reflection on the unit's position in research and society, in relation to its scientific and management ambitions, also relative to the position of comparable units elsewhere, and opportunities for development. At the same time, it serves as a tool for guiding the discussion with the committee. The SWOT analysis should be honest, yet neither needlessly positive or negative, nor overly detailed. The SWOT analysis should preferably be the basis for a constructive dialogue with the committee and solicit the committee's advice on particular difficulties. Units are therefore advised to emphasize those issues and subjects that they wish the committee to address specifically. The SWOT is, however, not to be intended to initiate internal discussions with the Executive Board.

The S, W, O, and T of the SWOT analysis

The strengths and weaknesses in the SWOT analysis relate to the properties as well as the characteristics of the research unit itself and can be influenced by the unit. These are internal matters. The opportunities and threats relate to external developments that can affect the unit, like scientific, societal, economic or political developments. The unit cannot influence their occurrence, but can take them into account, anticipate their impact and/or commence action accordingly.

Input for the SWOT analysis

A SWOT analysis should be supported by evidence. It can be based on data, interviews, focus groups or other qualitative methods.

The strengths are those aspects which the unit does well and which might distinguish the unit from other units in this scientific field. A strength brings the unit a clear advantage that cannot be assumed as a given. Weaknesses are aspects of its internal organisation due to which the unit underperforms with regard to its aims or duties and/or compared to similar institutes. Strengths and weaknesses are inherent features of the unit. They are about people, resources (financial, knowledge, etc.), (ict) systems, and procedures.

An opportunity is an external development that can offer possibilities that can help the unit to improve its position and/or achieve its ambitions. Threats are external developments that can be harmful for the unit and/or its ambitions and need to be taken into account and should preferably be

met in a way that reduces potential damage. External developments can be diverse. Examples in the field of science are new technologies, research policy, changing legislation, and the behaviour of competitors.

Note that as the strategy for the research unit’s next six years must explicitly include the four specific aspects of Open Science, PhD Policy and Training, Academic Culture and Human Resources Policy, these four aspects need to be addressed in the SWOT as well.

The different elements of the SWOT need to be clearly distinguished. Take care not to mix up weaknesses and threats, or mix up strengths and opportunities. The identified strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats can be presented in different ways, like in a cohesive narrative with sections for each of the four elements, or as a list.

A SWOT analysis can be done with the use of questions. Below you find some examples. But other questions are also possible.

Internal organisation	<p>Strengths</p> <p>What distinguishes us? / What are we good at in comparison to others? Think about aspects like: people, academic culture, resources (financial, knowledge, infrastructure, etc.), innovative results, awards, (ict) systems, policy and procedures</p> <p>Other examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What makes us unique? • What do others see as our strengths? • What are we proud of? • What advantages does our staff have? • What makes staff want to work here? • What expertise makes us viable? • 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <p>What is not going well? / What do we miss/should we improve? Think about aspects like: people, academic culture, resources (financial, knowledge, infrastructure, etc.), innovative results, awards, (ict) systems, policy and procedures</p> <p>Other examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What might others see as our weaknesses? • What disadvantages does our staff have? • Why would staff consider leaving? • What expertise do we lack to be viable? •
External context	<p>Opportunities</p> <p>Which developments can help to achieve our ambitions? Think of examples in the field of new technologies, research policy, funding policy, changing legislation, socio-cultural patterns, and the behaviour of competitors.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which developments in science policy can open doors for us? • What topics related to our research are gaining in societal or political attention? • Where do we foresee economic opportunities arising? • What partners in- and outside of academia can we cooperate with in the coming years? 	<p>Threats</p> <p>Which developments/uncertainties can stand in the way of achieving our ambitions? Think of examples in the field of new technologies, research policy, funding policy, changing legislation, socio-cultural patterns, and the behaviour of competitors.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are other institutes doing that could affect our standing? • What economic, political or policy developments could limit our access to funding? • What institutions or organisations could become competitors? • What legislation or policies could hinder us?

	•	•
--	---------	---------

Both the SWOT in the previous self-evaluation report and the assessment report by the Committee can be useful starting points for your SWOT-analysis.

Confrontation matrix

A confrontation matrix can be used for further analysis of the results of the SWOT analysis. In such a matrix, the research unit and the external environment come together and the S, W, O and T can be combined in SO-, WT-, WO- and ST-pairs. In general the combinations mean the following strategies:

- Opportunities vs strengths: grow
- Threats vs strengths with: defend
- Opportunities vs weaknesses: improve
- Threats vs weaknesses: retreat

These pairs can then be weighed and prioritized accordingly for your strategy in the coming years. The confrontation matrix can equally help you to identify the discussion items for the commission.