

# ALL European Academies

**“Towards a European Evaluation Protocol  
for Institutional Evaluations”**

ESF MOF Evaluation of Publicly Funded Research  
29–30 November 2010, Smolenice (SAS)



## European National Academies

### ALLEA: ALL European Academies - European Federation of National Academies of Sciences and Humanities

- ▶ **Members: 53 national academies from 40 countries** (Council of Europe)
  - ▶ Special responsibility for and relationship with neighbourhood countries (Mediterranean / Middle East; Caucasus and CIS)
  - ▶ N.B.: 18 Academies also currently members of ESF; ALLEA = observer in gov.
- 
- ▶ **Diverse roles of National Academies in Europe:**
    - science advice / think tanks;
    - science support: grants; fellowships; prizes etc.;
    - science promotion: outreach; education; young academies;
    - science production: institutes & programmes; publishing



## ALLEA activities

- ▶ Framework conditions for science and research in Europe
- ▶ Advisory Bodies on :
  - Science **Policy** (incl.: funding mechanisms; balance of blue-sky and mission-oriented research; research infrastructures; science & society, etc.);
  - Science & **Ethics** (incl.: research integrity; science & human rights; freedom and responsibility of science; etc.);
  - **Intellectual Property Rights** (incl. analysis of tensions between intrinsic curiosity / market / public interest);
  - Science **Education** and career support (incl.: support for inquiry-based STEM education; Young Academies; etc.);
  - **Evaluation** (incl.: institutional evaluations; societal impact and internationalisation; specificities of non-science fields [SSH, engineering etc.] )
- ▶ **Regional** Networks (e.g.: SEE; Mediterranean), **Interest Groups** (such as “learned societies” or “Open Access”)

## ALLEA and evaluation (some history)



- ▶ Memorandum on institutional evaluation  
(based on experiences with NL Standard Evaluation Protocol [academy; research council; rectors' conference])  
Ex.: Evaluation of ESF Standing Committees  
(some ambiguity: programme or institution?)
- ▶ First Identification Committee of the ERC Scientific Council  
(initial set of basic rules of operations: emphasis on science-driven management; individual excellence)
- ▶ Perceived demand for science-based, multi-dimensional, international institutional evaluations  
Ex.: evaluation of the 69 research institutes of BAS [together with ESF]

## ALLEA and evaluation (nat./internat.)



### Examples of Academy-lead in internat. evaluations

- ▶ Nordic Academies: transformation of Baltic post-Soviet Academies;
- ▶ German Academies: analyse selection process of the “excellence initiative”
- ▶ Royal Society: assessment of science systems in the Muslim World;
- ▶ InterAcademyCouncil: assessment of procedures of the IPCC  
etc.
- ▶ Lead/participate in EU-funded projects:
- ▶ e.g.: SIAMPI (societal impact)



## Towards an EEP: structure & rationale

Rationale: scientists/researchers at the centre

- ▶ Simplify evaluation procedures (referee fatigue)
- ▶ Strengthen elements of self-assessment
- ▶ Scientific value of evaluations (ex-post / ex-ante)
- ▶ Commonly agreed principles in order to achieve comparability of evaluations (institutions; funders; disciplines) [≠ one size fits all]
- ▶ Societal relevance: capture different dimensions [soc.; pol.; ind., etc.]

Structure: Working Group “Evaluating for Science”

- ▶ Regional, disciplinary, typological, institutional spread
- ▶ Combine delegation and individual selection
- ▶ Analyse and compare national systems: commonalities
- ▶ Agreement on minimal guidelines (consensus seeking)

## Towards an EEP: principles



“Institution”: unit, institute, program, faculty, cluster [mid/long term]

Against the background of the validity of the ER(HE)A & IU concepts, the WG recognizes the importance of

- ▶ fundamental research and the often **long timescales** involved for discovering or developing new knowledge;
- ▶ **freedom** in scientific enquiry and the need to allow a diversity of approaches in research;
- ▶ seeking support from a diversity of funding sources as indicating **independence** of research from a single research agenda;
- ▶ linking innovative **research** to innovative **teaching** and to a meaningful interaction with other and diverse sectors of **society**;
- ▶ research **collaboration** across disciplines, institutions and countries;
- ▶ **responsive structures** able to adjust to the needs of innovative research (genuine institutional rejuvenation).



## Towards an EEP: main elements

- ▶ Focus on **mid-to long-term needs** : **retrospective and prospective**
- ▶ **Three core functions**:  
producing, transmitting and transferring (new) knowledge
- ▶ Four criteria: quality – productivity – vitality – societal impact
- ▶ Assess leadership's ability to **embrace change** (qual.)
- ▶ Appropriate scientometric **indicators to inform** scientific peer-review
- ▶ **Self-assessments** (and their discussion) constitute the chief scientific value of evaluations (ex-post / ex-ante)
- ▶ Emphasis on extended **site visits** by peer review committee
- ▶ **Societal impact**: interaction with stakeholders as appropriate





## Towards an EEP: some recommendations

- ▶ Respect (or revise) the **mission** statement (e.g.: data centres)
- ▶ Explain choice of indicators and of **service provider**
- ▶ **Training** in drafting self-assessment reports (adjusting visions)
- ▶ Site visits by peer review committee to involve **all levels** and categories of staff relevant to achieving the mission statement
- ▶ Positive internal **communication**:  
*self-assessment also a function of visibility support (regular submission of data; research information system)*
- ▶ **Publication** of the report
- ▶ Ensure (and monitor) **follow-up**



## Towards an EEP: data clusters

### Context:

- ▶ **M** Mission & structure and functioning of management, incl. strategy
- ▶ **A** Staffing (scientific and support staff; career development)
- ▶ **A** Resources (infrastructure , equipment, funding)
- ▶ **A** Environment (comparisons; cooperations)

### Quality and productivity:

- ▶ **S** Highlights / key results (science AND society, vide mission)
- ▶ **A** Competitiveness (funding acquired; peer recognition of staff)
- ▶ **A** Quantitative measurement of output (incl. PhD's, as appropriate)

### Societal relevance:

- ▶ **M** Policies for interaction with non-academic stakeholders and successful examples;
- ▶ **S** Societal impact of research (changes in behaviour), including applications with economic impact

Vitality: synthesis comments (peer review) and SWOT analysis (**S**elf-assessment)

## Towards an EEP: ambitions & next steps



Ambition: scientists/researchers at the centre

- ▶ Single data collection point (**research information systems**)
- ▶ **Portability** of (individual) data
- ▶ Compatibility of evaluations: **transparency** of the system (added value for higher level funders [governments])
- ▶ Show dimensions of **societal impact** of fundamental research (**long-termism**)

Next Steps:

- ▶ Recommendations with view of specific fields (SSH; engineering etc.)
- ▶ National implementation (lead by members)
- ▶ Relate to MOF's (ex-post evaluation; peer review; science & society)
- ▶ Compare to university ranking exercises and EU-funded pilot projects ,  
(DG EAC: U-MultiRank; DG RTD: "Assessing")



## — ALLEA – ALL European Academies

### More Information

[ruediger.klein@allea.org](mailto:ruediger.klein@allea.org)  
[www.allea.org](http://www.allea.org)



**ALLEA** Secretariat  
P.O Box 19121  
1000 GC Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
T: +31 (0)20 5510754  
F: +31 (0)20 6204941  
E: [secretariat@allea.org](mailto:secretariat@allea.org)