Format 2 Self-evaluation report for midterm reviews

The national *Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021* (SEP) no longer prescribes the organisation of midterm reviews (MTRs). However, as these have proven valuable since their introduction in 2003, the University of Groningen does uphold the obligation to carry out internal self-evaluations in between two external assessments. As outlined in GRAP chapter III, MTRs are mainly aimed at preparing for the next external assessment and generally will not involve site visits or appointment of external PRCs.

Below, the Groningen format is described for the layout of the reports required for a midterm review (MTR), comprising two components:
   A)   A concise self-evaluation report, to be written once every six years.
   B)   The annual research in- and output numbers, to be included in the University's annual report
In addition, we provide:
   C)   suggestions to simplify and clarify the self-evaluation report for a MTR

A) Format self-evaluation report for midterm review
The self-evaluation report for a MTR, to be drawn up in between two external research assessments, will as a rule be written at the level of the SEP institute and should be confined to 5-10 pages per institute (excluding tables and appendices). However, it may also zoom in at programme level, subject to the conditions described in GRAP section I.4, summarized as follows:
   •   If the previous and/or next external assessment was or will be organized at programme level, the self evaluation must also be performed at programme level. The main text may then be extended with max. 5 pages per programme.
   •   If national or joint external assessment at programme level is not feasible, but the Faculty Board deems external evaluation of the programmes necessary, an extended midterm review can be proposed by the Faculty Board. The self-evaluation report may then follow the format for external assessments (GRAP format 1), although a more concise text is still advised.

The following topics must be addressed:

I) Managerial retrospective of developments since the last external assessment:
   a.   Summary of major recommendations by previous Peer Review Committee.
   b.   Planned measures / changes in response to PRC's assessment.
   c.   Response scientific advisory board to b.
   d.   Realisation / progress so far.

II) Significant ***changes*** (since previous self-evaluation) in:
   a.   Mission (research area, fundamental / curiosity-driven vs. applied / demand/driven, mono- vs. multi-/ inter- / cross- disciplinary, target groups / stakeholders)
   b.   Strategy / policy.
   c.   Organisation. E.g. such as:
       o   Management (authority, division of tasks Faculty – Institute – Programmes – Basic units).
       o   Number, name, management and size of the research units.
       o   Research collaboration within Institute, University, nationally and internationally.
       o   Recruitment, selection, training and supervision of PhD´s (Graduate School, participation in inter-university schools or networks).
       o   Housing, facilities, budget for organisation of and visits to conferences, courses etc.
       o   Teaching- and administrative burden and technical support academic staff.
   d.   Funding (Direct, Research grants, Contract research).
   e.   Composition staff (tenured, non-tenured, postdocs, PhD´s; age distribution; % female) size research capacity academic and support staff.
   f.   New key publications and/or most important societal outputs.
   g.   Output: (trends in) annual numbers of academic, professional and popular publications, dissertations, patents, outreach activities etc. (SEP tableD1, cells 1 and 4).
   h.   Demonstrable use of the output by peers and societal groups: citations, reviews, patents/licenses, collaborations, etc. (SEP tableD1, cells 2 and 5).
   e.   Demonstrable recognition of the output by peers and societal groups: awards, grants, invited lectures, memberships, Top publications, other assessments (NWO, ERC, Horizon2020, etc.).

III) SWOT analysis:
   a.   List of major (changes in) strengths & weaknesses (internal) and opportunities & threats (external, see SEP Appendix D4).
   b.   Conclusions.

IV) Planned adjustments / measures for remaining period until next external assessment.

C) Suggestions to simplify and clarify the self-evaluation report for a MTR

1) If desired, the self-evaluation report can be *limited to* reporting:
     a)   the *four parts* described under A) above (I - IV);
     b)   at *Institute level*, only where needed / desired supplemented relevant information per programme;
     c)   of major *changes* only compared tot he previous self-evaluation;
     d)   by the *Institute's research director*, based on previous contibutions and/or discussions with programme leaders that don't have to be included literally.

2) For *full publication lists, reference to* the CRIS (PURE) suffices (provided it is up to date).

3) *Explanation Mission and Relevance to society*:
     Mention explicitly what position is strived for along two 'axes':
       -    fundamental / curiosity driven vs. applied / demand driven,
       -    monodisciplinary vs. multi-, inter- or crossdisciplinary.
     Also state clearly what *stakeholder groups* are targeted.
     See also the *Evaluating research in Context* (EriC) website for useful tips.