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The quest for indicators for Humanities research

Recommendations of several reports influenced the central Dutch evaluation protocol.

Standard Evaluation Protocol
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QRiH a fitting system for humanities research evaluation
The Dutch evaluation context: SEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment dimensions</th>
<th>Quality domains</th>
<th>Research quality</th>
<th>Relevance to society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrable products</td>
<td>1. Research products for peers</td>
<td>4. Research products for societal target groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrable use of products</td>
<td>2. Use of research products by peers</td>
<td>5. Use of research products by societal target groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developing indicators for Humanities research

• Working group, under the auspices of the deans of Humanities faculties
• Panels involving all 17 Humanities research schools and over 200 researchers
• Analyzing research outcomes of two large Humanities faculties
• Experiences and approaches in other countries (VABB-SHW and CRISTiN)
  • Include books, large variety of journals
  • Context differs: direct financial consequences
Diversity in types and trajectories

- Diversity in types: catalogues, documentaries, designs, software, databases, etc.
- Orientation in languages: Dutch, other languages
- Trajectories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment dimensions</th>
<th>Quality domains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrable products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Research products for peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use of research products by peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrable use of products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Research products for societal target groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Use of research products by societal target groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrable marks of recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Marks of recognition from peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Marks of recognition by societal target groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The QRiH approach: Narratives

Narrative as the basic structure for the self-evaluation of the research unit.

- Address both the scientific and the societal mission of the research and supported this by concrete evidence.

- Elaborate the six SEP cells in the table with indicators:
  - Indicators authorized by panels & supervised by a national panel.
  - Indicators as described in general terms in the QRiH website, to be elaborated by the unit itself: “reasoned” indicators

- The unit is free in choosing to narrate the trajectory of quality and relevance... but evidence for each cell remains vital.
Content:
• Format for self-assessments
• Indicators
  • Authorized through panels
  • Broadly defined for further elaboration
• Lists of journals and publishers
• Examples
• Profiles of research domains
Using QRiH in assessments: first experiences

Outcomes of questionnaires for directors and policy makers involved in actual assessments:

- QRiH is known and appreciated as a tool, particularly its narrative form
- But the actual use is still hampered by:
  - Too many different groups of indicators
  - Profiles of research schools hardly used,
  - Lists of journals hardly used: Ambivalence regarding the status of lists of journals and publishers
  - Distinction with the (dominant and prevailing) SEP protocol

QRiH a learning process…..