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Background

- French Agency Hcéres (HAUT CONSEIL DE L’ÉVALUATION DE LA RECHERCHE ET DE L’ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR*) was contacted
- Initiation of ERIEC (EUROPEAN RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION CONSORTIUM) and development of Terms of Reference, standards and methodology for the evaluation
- 3 members of ERIEC for ECRIN evaluation (Hcéres/AEI/ANVUR)

*Hcéres is the independent administrative authority responsible for evaluating all structures of higher education and research, or validating the procedures for higher education and research, evaluations conducted by other bodies.
Process, timelines and effort

- Self assessment report
  - 2019
  - 15 May
  - 2PM
  - Report provided by ECRIN based on the criteria
  - Evidences (documentation)

- On site evaluation
  - 25 to 27 June
  - 1PM
  - 3 days
  - 4 experts

- Draft Report
  - September /October
  - assessing the reference period
  - SWOT analysis
  - recommendations

- Final report
  - November
  - 36 K€
  - Publicly available
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Criteria

Peer review performed by an independent expert committee, based on ToR developed

- 3 criteria assessed:
  - Quality of services provided to support research and excellence,
  - Impact and relevance for society,
  - Sustainability and management efficiency.

(In addition, the evaluation will possibly consider other aspects such as research integrity/ethics and capacity building/interaction with higher education)

- 14 standards, grouped into 3 main domains:
  - Positioning and strategy,
  - Governance and management,
  - Activities
Results

- In depth discussion with the evaluators during the evaluation
  - in total 24 interviews (1h-1h30 each, with 2 evaluators and from 1 to 6 interviewees)
- Evaluation report taking into account the self assessment, the on site evaluation and providing
  - Strengths
  - Weaknesses
  - Recommendations

Challenge

- Workload and investment of the Direction
- Mobilising the people (preparation and on site evaluation)
## Usefulness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive aspects</th>
<th>Area of improvement/concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Independant evaluation</td>
<td>▪ First evaluation of RI (pilot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Professional evaluation methodology</td>
<td>▪ Evaluators selection and infrastructure’ knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Team strengthened in its activities</td>
<td>▪ Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Dialogue with governing bodies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Dialogue with stakeholders (internal, external)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Visibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Impact on strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions