**The Leibniz Association Senate Evaluation Procedure – Basic Principles
(passed on 6 January 2012, as amended on 27 November 2018)**

Attachment 2: Items and criteria for the evaluation of institutions in the Leibniz Association

Stage one: evaluation of a Leibniz institution

I.

Leibniz institutions conduct three different types of work:

— <u>Research</u>

— <u>Development and operation of research infrastructures</u>

examples: large-scale facilities, animal facilities, information infrastructures, cohort studies, panel data, collections (physical or data-related), social research infrastructures, e.g. Fellows Programmes etc.

— <u>Transfer</u>

- application of new knowledge (examples: technology transfer, clinical translation etc.)
- consultancy based on new knowledge (examples: reviews for governments and parliaments, involvement in advisory bodies etc.)
- communication of new knowledge (examples: exhibitions, citizen science, web-site, media outreach etc.)

These three types of work interrelate but they are differently weighted at the various individual Leibniz institutions. The Review Board takes this weighting into account and assesses it.

II.

Irrespective of how the three types of work are weighted, all Leibniz institutions are evaluated on five major **items**:

– overall concept (tasks and key results, changes and planning)
– controlling and quality management
– human resources
– cooperation and environment
– subdivisions (performance in work units to be defined by the institution).

The evaluation of these five items and the individual sub-items assigned to them is based on **criteria** which include quality (taking account of discipline-related international standards and the relevant discipline-specific indicators), originality, relevance for other areas of society, efficiency, demand etc.

III.

At every evaluation, the framework described under I. and II. is utilised with specific reference to the institution under consideration.

(a) As part of the **evaluation package (summarised in the Status Report)**, the Leibniz institution submits a self-presentation. It constitutes the point of reference for the evaluation and explains the institute's weighting of the three types of work it conducts, the amount of resources devoted to the five items and the respective results.

(b) During the evaluation visit, the Review Board jointly collates its assessments in closed sessions.

In this process, the items are seen in its references to other items. In order to evaluate an institution's functionality and arrive at an appropriate assessment of the institution as a whole, it is essential to examine the interlinkages between research and the promotion of junior researchers, for example, or between leadership structures and the use of resources.

The assessments are summarised in an **Evaluation Report**. The relevant draft is agreed upon in writing with the members of the Review Board after the evaluation visit.

IV.

Based on the structure used for the evaluation report, the following elucidates which sub-items should be evaluated according to which criteria:

Structure of the evaluation report stating the *sub-items* to be evaluated and the *criteria* for evaluating them

1. **[Summary]**

2. **Overall concept: activities and key results**
   - Overall concept and institution's activities (in research, development and operation of research infrastructures, transfer)
   - Key results, taking account of
     - qualitative indicators (highlights from the institution's spectrum of activities)
     - quantitative indicators
       (a) on scientific publications
       (b) on publications in organs outside of science and research, if applicable
       (c) on property rights/patents, if applicable
       (d) on spin-offs, if applicable
       (e) on policy advice papers, if applicable
       (f) on the use of research infrastructures (utilisation analysis), if applicable
       (g) on exhibitions (number of visitors, reception analysis), if applicable
       (h) on media outreach, if applicable
     as well as any other institution-specific indicators, if applicable

   Evaluation criteria: quality, response, perception, impact, competitiveness, visibility, quantity, originality, current relevance, risk appetite, coherence, plausibility, relevance for other areas of society etc.

3. Changes and planning

- Development since the previous evaluation
- Strategic work planning for the coming years

each taking account of

- key changes (particularly the winding-up and/or development of new research fields and new appointments to scientifically important positions) and its strategic controlling
- the recommendations issued after the previous evaluation

Evaluation criteria: plausibility, coherence, quality, response, perception, impact, competitiveness, originality, current relevance, risk appetite, relevance for other areas of society etc.

- Planning for a temporary or permanent increase in institutional funding by the Federation and the *Länder* ("extraordinary item of expenditure"), if applicable
    - content planning
    - financial planning

Evaluation criteria: quality, fit with overall strategic work planning, necessity for planned provisions (HR, equipment, investment resources) etc.

4. Controlling and quality management

- Funding and facilities
    - institutional funding
    - third-party funding: goals and revenue
    - spatial provisions
    - IT
    - special infrastructures, if applicable
- Organisational and operational structure
    - organisational structure (structure and personnel composition of management and management bodies, structure of subdivisions and other organisational units, if applicable)
    - operational structure (decision-making processes to manage the institute's work)
- Quality management
    - measures to ensure good scientific practice
    - animal welfare measures, if applicable
    - publication strategy (including handling of open access)
    - technology transfer strategy (e.g. acquiring/holding industrial property rights and patents)
    - quality management measures for research infrastructures
    - research data management (including handling of open data)
    - internal performance incentives such as performance-based funding allocation (LOM)
    - budget management via the programme budget
    - management of fundamental administrative workflows
- Quality management by the Scientific Advisory Board, the User Advisory Board (if applicable) as well as the Supervisory Board
    - structure and personnel composition of bodies
    - execution of responsibilities

Evaluation criteria: appropriateness, quantity, quality, competitiveness, efficiency, functionality, fit with overall concept etc.

5. Human resources

- Management
  - execution of responsibilities
  - recruitment and/or changes in scientific and administrative leadership
  - joint appointments
- Post-doctoral staff
  - promotion of post-doctoral staff
  - appointments at other institutions
  - proportion of fixed-term contracts
- Doctoral candidates
  - number of doctoral candidates and successful completions
  - average duration of doctoral studies
  - structured doctoral programmes
  - institution's appeal to junior staff
- Non-scientific staff
  - traineeships
  - vocational training measures
- Equal opportunities, work-life balance
  - gender percentage at the various levels of the hierarchy in research and scientific services
  - measures to promote gender equality (especially at the level of senior and leadership positions)
  - measures to reconcile work and family life

Evaluation criteria: appropriateness, fit with overall concept, efficiency, quality, effectiveness of measures etc.

6. Cooperation and environment

- Cooperation
  - collaborations with universities, especially if they involve joint appointments
  - total volume of teaching activities by institute staff at universities
  - involvement in and coordination of alliances such as Collaborative Research Centres, excellence clusters, Leibniz ScienceCampi etc.
  - cooperation with Leibniz institutes, involvement in Leibniz research alliances
  - other collaborations
- Institution's status in its scientific environment

Evaluation criteria: visibility, competitiveness, relevance, fit with overall concept, impact etc.

7. Subdivisions

- Responsibilities and results (research, development and operation of research infra-structures, transfer)
- Development since the previous evaluation and strategic work planning for the coming years

Evaluation criteria: quality, response, perception, impact, competitiveness, visibility, quantity, originality, current relevance, risk appetite, coherence, plausibility, relevance for other areas of society etc.

The assessment of each subdivision is pooled in a final graded vote: "excellent", "very good", "good", or "inadequate" (half-grades are possible; units graded as "inadequate" are not eligible to continue receiving joint funding from the Federation and the *Länder*).

Stage two: Senate statement on a Leibniz institution

Based on the evaluation report, the Leibniz Association Senate issues a science policy statement concluding with a recommendation to the Federation and the *Länder* on whether to continue joint funding. In this context, the following points are addressed:

- Institution's performance
  - conclusions drawn from the evaluation on scientific quality, both overall and with reference to the subdivisions
  - the institution's unique features
  - appropriateness of the statutory mission and its implementation by the institution and its bodies
  - appropriateness of use of resources

- Institutional added value
  - supra-regional importance
  - national interest
  - need for funding outside of university context
  - relevance for continuing to develop a specific area and its environment

- Importance within the Leibniz Association
  - involvement in joint Leibniz Association projects
  - contribution to Leibniz Association's profile building
  - compliance with the Leibniz Association's standards and guidelines

- Position in the European/international scientific context
  - visibility
  - national and international connectivity

- Importance for other areas of society
  - importance for policy-makers, administrations, the health service, industry/business, education, the public etc.