

ALLEA Working Group Meeting “Evaluating for Science”

Launch Meeting: Thursday 25 June 2009

Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, Amsterdam



Proposal

Proposal for the minimal contents of a self-assessment report, discussed on 25-6-2009 at the first meeting of the ALLEA working group ‘Evaluation for Science’ in Amsterdam

TO BE INCLUDED IN THE SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT

- 1. Objective of the research, mission of the institution**
- 2. Composition of the groups in the institution.** (Group leaders, scientific staff, postdocs, PhD students, supporting personnel)
- 3. Available resources** (infrastructures, equipment, methodology, funding)
- 4. Research environment and embedding** (national context, (inter)national positioning in the field, guest researchers, preferably bringing their own money)
- 5. Quality:**
 - 3-5 key publications per group/subgroup
 - 3-5 most significant results/highlights relevant to the discipline, per group/subgroup
 - number of articles in top 10% of publications relevant to the discipline; ditto for top 25%
 - 3-5 most important books or chapters of books, insofar as relevant
- 6. Productivity(input-output ratio)**
 - number of articles in refereed periodicals
 - number of books, chapters of books
 - number of completed PhDs and number of PhDs ‘on the way’
- 7. Earning capacity for competitive funds**, national and international
- 8. Academic reputation** for each research coordinator (prizes, invitations to address major conferences, conference organisation activities, editorships, membership of academies)
- 9. Valorisation/impact/applicability** in the broad sense: socio-cultural relevance and/or technical or economic impact
- 10. Feasibility and vitality** of the Institution or programme, available infrastructure and methodology in the future
- 11. Plans and vision for the future**, possibly including opportunities and threats

Evaluation might be done using a 5-points scale (to be discussed)

Excellent (5), very good, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory(1)

To discuss: the relative weight of each criterium.

Peter van der Vliet, chairman