

Format self-evaluation reports in the Humanities

The format is based on the guidelines for self-evaluations Appendix D of the Standard Evaluation Protocol SEP 2015-2021 (p. 23, amended version 2016), with two main adaptations in accordance with nationally agreed protocol for evaluation in the Humanities in The Netherlands (Manual *Evaluation of Humanities Research according to SEP*):

1. The purpose of the narrative form of the self-evaluation report is to enable a coherent and combined description of scientific and societal aspects of quality and relevance of the research programme or unit (Manual p. 5-6);
2. The QRiH website provides definitions and descriptions of the various indicators for the six elements of table D1 of the SEP (p. 25). The indicators are both qualitative and quantitative in nature, and are either authorized by the National Authorization Panel (LAP), or relate to the results deemed important by the unit to be evaluated. www.qrih.nl

Note: In order to be able to write the narrative succinctly and concisely (sections 1-9), empirical data regarding results and organizations can be listed in the addenda (section 10). Websites may provide additional information, regarding protocols and regulations.

1. Introduction¹

1.1. Introduction (300 words)

(Very) Brief description of the organization, its collaborations and funding:

- Location of the programme. (which universities and research organizations are involved?)
- Main projects or parts of the programme.
- Main collaborations.
- Main funding structure.

1.2. Profile (300-400 words)

Main characteristics of the programme or unit):

- Mission statement and programme description;
- relevant (scientific) domain(s);
- relevant audiences (scientific, professional, general);
- typical products & publication types.

The [domain profiles at the QRiH site](#) may be helpful. The domain profiles can be used as national or international reference for the profile of the programme or unit.

¹ The first two sections of this format differ from the original SEP; the introduction (1) and the choice of indicators (2). Sections 3-6 are subdivisions of the SEP format, whereas other sections follow more closely the original SEP. Table D3b for research output follows the QRiH format. Note the position of Case studies as a possibility to accommodate complex and/or nested programmes such as subprogrammes, subunits, separate sections, or also possibilities to extend examples.

1.3. Ambition (300-400 words)

How is the above profile elaborated?

- Which were the leading intellectual ambitions?
- Which strategy has been deployed:
 - Intended audiences and means of communication.
 - Collaborations with others and ways of communication.

2. Relevant indicators (600-800 words)

Which indicators are relevant in order to be able demonstrate the achievements of the programme or unit, in terms of products, use and recognition? Please mind the distinction of authorized and reasoned indicators. For the description of indicators, see the QRiH website. <https://www.qrih.nl/nl/sep-evaluatie>

3. Scientific and societal results in the past period (1200-1400 words)

This section describes the results, not in tables or lists but in a narrative form, allowing to elaborate on reasoned as well as authorized results. The free format of the narrative allows to specify the results in relation to the SEP categories (products, use and recognition) in a random manner instead of a fixed order.

- Elaborate and demonstrate the claims in section 1.3 Ambition and 2. Relevant Indicators.
- Mention the results of hybrid outcomes or hybrid products as well as the special categories mentioned in the QRiH system, for both scientific and societal achievements.
- Mention the results for PhD education and programmes.
- Elaboration on characteristic elements or subunits of the programme or unit can be added as Case Studies in the addenda.
- The selection of five major scientific results and five major societal results may be listed in the addenda.

4. Conclusions of the self-evaluation (400-600 words)

Elaborate on the judgement given to the above results in terms of quality, relevance and viability. (see also the SWOT analysis).

5. (Organizational) context (400-600 words)

Relevant organizational and managerial characteristics of the programme or unit:

- Organizational structure
- Management and support
- Supervision and quality management (internally and externally)
- Funding

6. Past evaluation, future plans and SWOT analysis (600-800 words)

Which have been the specific goals of the past period and what are the goals of the coming ten years, also in reference to the past evaluation.

Which are the external factors and developments relevant in the achievement of goals, and what will be the relevant trends and developments for the next period.

Indicate also how the programme or unit is to be compared with other research groups. This benchmark can be derived from the relevant indicators chosen in section 2 and may be quantitative as well as qualitative in nature.

The SWOT analysis follows the format of the SEP 2015-2021 protocol, Appendix D4, p. 30.

7. PhD Programmes (400-500 words)

Following the SEP format, this section includes

- context, supervision and quality assurance.
- Participation in education, internally and externally;
- Quality of participating research schools;
- Admission and selection;
- Supervision, including preparation for future jobs.
- (future) jobs of graduated PhDs.

8. Diversity (150 words)

The policy regarding diversity, in the SEP format (Amended Version 2016, p.24), with reference to cultural and/or national background.

9. Research integrity, ethics and research data management (450 words)

Policies regarding research integrity, ethics and management of research data following the SEP format (p. 23), with reference to:

- Ethics and integrity committees, policies and regulations.
- Research Data Management
- Prevailing research culture.

10. Tables and addenda

Case studies

Case studies have a narrative format, and include sections 1 to 4 of this format with a size of three to five pages. Case studies allow for the self-evaluation of complex or nested structures of programmes or units in different levels of aggregation (see the manual). Case studies are addenda.

Table D3b Research Output (QRiH version)

1. The table Research Output D3b follows the QRiH format, in particular regarding the product categories for Peers, Professionals and General Audiences. The table is meant to enlist outcomes that are countable, but is non-exhaustive.
2. The Products for Peers focus primarily on authorized products. Other (reasoned) products can be added as separate entries, following the QRiH lists of indicators. Use the open rows (...). Outcomes also can be mentioned in the narrative.
3. The table is not exhaustive or prescriptive: choice of indicators follows from section 2 of this report. Add more rows where needed (see the website for product categories and the lists of authorized products).
4. Important outcomes occurring less frequently can be mentioned in the narrative instead of in this table.

Research unit	Year -5	Year --4	Year --3	Year --2	Year --1	Current Year
Books, source publications, exhibition catalogues (authorized)						
Journal articles and reviews (authorized)						
Book chapters (authorized)						
Editorship of edited volumes, theme issues (authorized)						
Proceedings						
Digital infrastructures and databases						
Films, documentaries, exhibitions and other audio-visual products						
...						
...						
Books, source publications, catalogues for a professional readership						
Articles and reviews in professional journals						
Book chapters for a professional readership						
Editorship of an edited volume or theme issue of a professional journal						
Digital infrastructures and databases for professional users						
Films, documentaries and exhibitions for a professional audience						
....						
....						
Books, source publications, catalogues for the general public						
Articles and reviews in general magazines						
Book chapters in publications for a general readership						
Editorship of an edited volume or theme issue of a general magazine						
Digital infrastructures and databases for general users						
Films, documentaries and exhibitions for a general audience						
....						
....						
PhD theses						
Total publications and products						

Version 21 september 2017