

Process Research Evaluations – University of Twente

Step	What	SEP	When	Who and How
	Strategic planning cycle		ongoing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Faculty follows the planning of the university-wide schedule for Research Evaluations 2021-2030. - The Faculty or discipline formulates or updates its strategy as part of the preparation for an evaluation. - The Faculty may choose to discuss or include strategic issues related to the evaluation with relevant bodies such as societal stakeholders. - The Faculty collects and registers the data that will and might be needed during the evaluation as an ongoing process.
1	Startup meeting	Ch. 2, 3	<p>"T -/- 24"</p> <p>Month 1-2 [year 1]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategy & Policy (SP) contacts the Faculty concerned to announce the research evaluation and to schedule a meeting. - SP meets with the Faculty and relevant departments to discuss the procedure and format (and number, in case of midterm) of the evaluation and to formally start the process.
2	Strategic planning meeting(s)	Ch. 2 App. B	<p>"T -/- 22"</p> <p>Month 2-4 [year 1]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the annual dialogues between Executive Board and Faculty Board or in a separate meeting initiated by SP, the strategic planning is discussed (dean and relevant department head of the Faculty with the Executive Board) - During this meeting, the department's self-formulated aims and aspirations are discussed, how they relate to the Faculty's multi-annual plan, and their strategy to attain them. This includes a description of the quantitative indicators that will be used to support the narrative argument, the argumentation for their choice, as well as the case study(s). - The Faculty Board proposes to the Executive Board its preferred choice (local evaluation or joint evaluation with external participants) and substantiates this choice, including an explanation of how the research will be benchmarked. - The outcomes of this meeting form the starting point for the Plan of Action written by the Faculty as well as the self-evaluation.
3	Formulate Plan of Action (PoA)	Ch. 2, 3	<p>"T -/- 20"</p> <p>Month 4-5 [year 1]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Faculty formulates a draft PoA (also: action plan) together with the departments and sends it to SP for consultation. The PoA contains at least: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The names of the departments to be assessed; ▪ If additional evaluation of underlying research programmes or themes is proposed (incl. motivation): the information on these programmes or themes; ▪ The outline of the strategic process behind the evaluation, including the relevant relationships with the Faculty's multi-annual plan, the executive work agreements between the EB and the Faculty; ▪ In the case of deviation from the SEP: substantiation of the reason(s) for the proposed deviation(s); ▪ The planning of the process (according to the steps of this protocol); ▪ The profile and intended composition of the Assessment Committee (AC) such as number of members, diversity, expertise, name(s) of independent secretary; ▪ The names of the involved Faculty members and their roles (coordination, self-evaluation and the qualitative comparison with another institute); ▪ Additional questions for the AC, to be incorporated in the Terms of Reference; ▪ Additional information to be provided to the AC, e.g., a bibliometric analysis or stakeholder survey; ▪ How to meet the need for a benchmark with comparable research groups; ▪ The institution(s) selected for the international qualitative comparison, including motivation and proposed visit dates; ▪ In the case of a national/ joint evaluation: information about the other universities and their coordination; and ▪ The budget (if included). - SP and the Faculty meet to discuss the draft PoA. - The Faculty incorporates any feedback on the draft and sends the PoA to the EB for approval.

Process Research Evaluations – University of Twente

Step	What	SEP	When	Who and How
4	Accept Plan of Action	Ch. 2, 3	“T-/-18” Month 5-6 [year 1]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The EB decides on the PoA and informs the Faculty in writing.
5	Compose evaluation committee	Ch. 2, 3 App. G, H	“T -/- 15” Month 6-12 [year 1]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Faculty suggests one or more candidates with a strong academic track record for the position of chair of the evaluation committee (EC) to the EB. The Faculty substantiates the choice. - After approval of the candidate by the EB, the Faculty informally enquires about the availability of the intended EC chair and keeps the EB informed. - Once the chair has been selected, the Faculty proposes 8-10 candidate AC members to the EB, in consultation with the chair. The Faculty substantiates the choice of the candidates. The commission should be composed according to the guidelines in the SEP and should follow the agreements with respect to diversity amongst the team members. The proposal should include at least one PhD Candidate, one mid/early career researcher, and potentially one or more non-academic experts. - In consultation with the Faculty and the chair, the EB selects the members of the EC, and/or requests additional candidates if necessary. The EB verifies that the committee is well equipped to assess quality, relevance and viability of the research unit in its international context. - The Faculty informally enquires about the availability of the intended EC members and keeps the EB informed. - The EB requests all EC members and the secretary return a signed version of the Statement of impartiality and confidentiality to SP. SP collects all statements, shares them with the secretary and discusses any EC members’ potential (semblance of) conflicts of interest with the secretary, Faculty and/or EB.
6	Formulate Terms of Reference (ToR)	Ch. 2, 3 App. C	“T -/- 14” Month 6-12 [year 1]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SP sends a draft of the ToR to the Faculty. - The EB may include issues from previous quality assurance meetings in the ToR. - The Faculty and/or the EB formulate, if desired, one or more additional questions for the EC. If so desired, Scientific Directors (SD) of the institutes and the Faculty meet to discuss the draft ToR. - Foreseen deviations from the SEP must be included in the ToR. - In national or joint evaluations, the terms of reference are usually referred to as the discipline protocol and require additional prior agreements between the participating universities. - If the evaluation covers a discipline, the EC may be asked to make strategic recommendations for the entire discipline at the national level.
7	Accept ToR	Ch. 2, 3 App. C	“T -/- 13” Month 6-12 [year 1]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SP formulates the final version of the ToR. - The ToR is finalised and signed by the EB.
8	Appoint evaluation committee	Ch. 2, 3 App. G	“T -/- 12” Month 13-18 [year 2]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Before appointing the committee members, the board submits the final composition of the committee to the research unit. The research unit indicates whether it objects to the composition. - The EB sends all EC members, including the chair, as well as the secretary, an appointment letter and the ToR. - The EB informs the Faculty that the appointment letters have been sent and sends the ToR to the Faculty. - In case of a national /joint evaluation, the lead university will appoint the EC members, in consultation with the other participating universities.

Process Research Evaluations – University of Twente

Step	What	SEP	When	Who and How
9	Conduct qualitative comparison	Ch. 4	“T -/- 11” Month 13-18 [year 2]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The departments visit the benchmark institution(s) and use the comparison as input for the self-evaluation, specifically the departmental SWOT analysis.
10	Organise site visit	Ch. 2, 4 App. F	“T -/- 11” Month 13-22 [year 2]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Together with the departments and the EC, the Faculty drafts the programme of the site visit. - The Faculty informs the EB and SP about the final programme and organises the logistical and other practical matters.
11	Draw up self-evaluation	Ch. 2, 4 App. D, E	“T -/- 11” Month 13-22 [year 2]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Faculty shares a template for the self-evaluation for feedback with SP. If so desired, the Faculty and SP meet to discuss the template. - The Faculty coordinates the writing of the self-evaluation report, which should be no longer than 20 pages per department (excluding attachments and case studies). The self-evaluation refers to the Faculty Research Strategy and elaborates on the strategic discussions the department had with the EB as part of the Planning & Evaluation cycle and during the strategic planning meeting. - The Faculty shares the draft self-evaluation for feedback with SP and, if desired, a member of another Faculty. - The Faculty incorporates any feedback on the draft and organises a meeting to inform all participants about the procedure, and to reflect on the self-evaluation report and the programme of the site visit. - The Faculty finalises the self-evaluation report and sends the report to the EB.
12	Share self-evaluation	Ch. 2, 3 App. C	“T -/- 2” Month 22-23 [year 2]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least four, but preferably eight, weeks prior to the site visit, the EB sends the self-evaluation and other documentation (including at least the SEP and the ToR, with a fact sheet about the relevant scientific landscape in the Netherlands as appendix) to the EC.
13	Perform site visit	Ch. 2, 4, 5 App. F	“T” (From Month 25 [year 3])	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The EC holds a private kick-off meeting, in which at least are discussed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The ToR; ▪ The evaluation procedure; ▪ The writing procedure of the evaluation report; and ▪ The EC’s preliminary findings based on the written material. - The EC conducts interviews a broad range of employees and holds a private interim meeting. - At the end of the site visit the EC holds a private final meeting, which will be attended by the Rector Magnificus. - Afterwards, the chairperson of the EC presents a brief, general summary of the EC’s findings to the departments. The provisional findings are not published.
14	Write evaluation report	Ch. 2, 4, 5	“T +/- 1” Month 26-29 [year 3]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The EC writes the draft evaluation report (according to points 11-23 in paragraph 2c of the SEP). If specified before, it formulates special recommendations for programmes (disciplines) or themes within the Faculty. The EC sends the draft report to the Faculty. - The Faculty shares the document with the relevant departments and SD; all check the draft report for factual inaccuracies. If such inaccuracies are detected, the EC sees that they are corrected. - The EC sends the evaluation report to the EB for approval.
15	Accept evaluation report	Ch. 2, 3, 5	“T +/- 4” Month 29-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The EB accepts the evaluation report and thereby discharges the EC members of their duty. - The EB sends the evaluation report to the Faculty and asks for a written response.

Process Research Evaluations – University of Twente

Step	What	SEP	When	Who and How
			[year 3]	
16	Write Faculty response	Ch. 2, 3, 4	“T+/- 6” Month 30-31 [year 3]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Faculty sends a written response to the evaluation report to the EB, that includes follow-up actions regarding the EC recommendations to be taken by the Faculty and involved departments.
17	Accept Faculty response	Ch. 2, 3	“T +/- 6” Month 30-31 [year 3]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The EB responds to the Faculty response in writing, and asks the Faculty to propose how to incorporate the evaluation outcomes, where relevant, in the executive work agreements between the Executive Board and the Faculties, to be discussed during the next fall meeting (shaping dialogue).
18	Publish summary, report and position doc	Ch. 2, 3	“T +/- 4” Month 29-31 [year 3]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The EB writes a position document and sends it to the Faculty. - The EB publishes the summary of the self-evaluation (including case studies), the evaluation report and the EB’s position document on the institution’s website.
19	Discuss follow-up actions	Ch. 2, 3, 4	Biannually [year 1-6]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The EB, the Faculty and the departments involved discuss the evaluation preparations, outcomes, and follow up biannually (or at least annually) as part of the Planning & Evaluation cycle, during the spring and fall meetings (shaping dialogues). If deemed necessary, separate quality assurance meetings are arranged. - To substantiate the follow-up and to prepare for the next evaluation, the Faculty annually reports its performance on the indicators that were chosen from SEP-table E1 and used in the previous evaluation, or its performance on the indicators that will be used in the upcoming evaluation. - The EB and Faculty annually incorporate the outcomes and follow-up of the evaluations, where relevant, in the executive work agreements, to be discussed during the fall meetings.
20	Discuss in annual report	Ch. 2, 3	Annually [year 1-6]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Based on the most recent discussion of the state of affairs as part of the Planning & Evaluation cycle, the EB reports on research evaluations, conclusions, recommendations and follow-ups in the UT Annual Report.
21	Share outcomes and follow-up	Ch. 2, 3, 4	Annually [year 1-6]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The EB discusses an overview of research evaluation outcomes with the Supervisory Board annually. - The EB discusses an overview of research evaluation outcomes with the Deans and Scientific Directors during a meeting of UCoZ annually. - SP discusses an overview of the relevant research evaluation outcomes per specific topic with the relevant support services annually. - Follow-up actions will be monitored at regular intervals as part of the quality assurance cycle. To that end, annual information about the indicators that were used in the research evaluation, will be used to supplement factsheets at Faculty level, discussed at (semi-)annual meetings between the EB and Faculty boards.
22	Decide upon necessity of midterm		Annually [year 1-6]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In most cases, a midterm evaluation is no longer necessary. However, there can be exceptional cases, for instance when a EC evaluation calls for more drastic action, or in the case of a significant change in aims or strategy of a unit, or at the explicit request of the Faculty Board. - In special cases, the Faculty and the EB can decide, in consultation, that a midterm evaluation is useful or necessary. In this case, it is still possible to do a midterm review (MTR), similar to an external evaluation, but following a lighter procedure. - The following steps only apply in the special case where it is decided that it is necessary to perform a midterm evaluation.

Process Research Evaluations – University of Twente

Step	What	SEP	When	Who and How
23	<i>Option:</i> Startup midterm	Ch. 1, 3	“T +/- 13” * Month 1-2 [year 2]	- As part of the ongoing discussions about the evaluation outcomes, the EB requests the Faculty to conduct a midterm evaluation. The aim is to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ assess the state of affairs regarding the recommendations of the previous EC; and ▪ assess the strategy development for the following evaluation.
24	Formulate midterm plan of action	Ch. 1, 3	“T +/- 15” Month 4-5 [year 2]	- The Faculty formulates a PoA for the midterm, which should include at least: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The names of the departments to be assessed; ▪ The planning of the process (according to the steps of this protocol); ▪ The intended composition of the midterm committee, i.e., names of (non-Faculty) members and secretary, reflection on its diversity, expertise etc.; and ▪ The names of the involved Faculty members and their roles; - The Faculty sends the PoA for the midterm to the EB.
25	Accept midterm PoA	Ch. 1, 3	“T +/- 16” Month 5-6 [year 2]	- The EB takes a decision on the midterm PoA and informs the Faculty in writing.
26	Perform midterm	Ch. 1, 3	“T2” Month 7-11 [year 3]	- After approval of the PoA by the EB, the Faculty formulates the Terms of Reference, writes a self-evaluation, appoints the midterm committee and organises the midterm site visit. - The EC writes the midterm report and sends the draft report to the Faculty to check for factual inaccuracies. If such inaccuracies are detected, the EC sees that they are corrected. - The Faculty accepts the midterm report and thereby discharges the EC members of their duty.
27	Share report and response	Ch. 1, 3	“T2 +/- 1” Month 11-12 [year 3]	- The Faculty sends the midterm report including a written response to the EB.
28	Accept midterm Faculty response	Ch. 1,3	“T2 +/- 2” Month 11-12 [year 3]	- The EB responds to the Faculty response in writing, and asks the Faculty to propose how to incorporate the midterm outcomes where relevant in the executive work agreements between the Executive Board and the Faculties.

* depending on choice for midterm, the planning mentioned is a suggestion