

# Research School Accreditation Committee

## GUIDELINES FOR THE PRESENTATION OF THE APPLICATION FOR ACCREDITATION

For both initial accreditation and re-accreditation  
(ECOS/AV/2465, July 2011)

The application for the accreditation or re-accreditation of a research school should consist of:

- Main document.  
This document should follow the format described below. This format is based on the criteria for accreditation in Article 6 and the criteria for re-accreditation in Article 7 of the “ECOS Protocol”, that can be downloaded from [www.knaw.nl/ecos](http://www.knaw.nl/ecos).  
This document, including its annexes, should not exceed 10 pages. During the handling of the application, the Accreditation Committee can request further information in writing or at a personal meeting with the applicants. **If the main document exceeds 10 pages, the Accreditation Committee will reject the application for accreditation.**  
The Accreditation Committee would like to receive the main document as an individual document, separate from the appendices (see next item).
- Appendices.  
Appendix 1 is the report of an international peer review committee that has evaluated the research school over the preceding period of accreditation. Preferably, this should be a SEP evaluation. Alternatively, multiple SEP evaluations can be submitted if they are accompanied by an index clearly showing which parts of each report concern the research school or its constituent groups. It is not obligatory to send this information to the Accreditation Committee as hard copy; when the information is available on the internet, the Accreditation Committee prefers to receive the reference(s) to the relevant web pages.  
When a SEP evaluation still has to be arranged before the application is submitted to the Accreditation Committee, in drafting the document(s) for the SEP evaluation and/or the instructions to the peers it is advisable to follow the categories specified in the format of the main document.

The Accreditation Committee appreciates brevity in the application for the accreditation or re-accreditation of a research school. The application should be concise and to the point.

The application must be sent to:

Research School Accreditation Committee  
Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences  
Postbus 19121  
1000 GC Amsterdam.



## **FORMAT OF THE MAIN DOCUMENT TO APPLICATION FOR ACCREDITATION OR RE-ACCREDITATION**

**(submit: twelve copies of the main document)**

Please note that:

- The main document (including its annexes) does not exceed 10 pages.
- Each page has a minimum margin of 2 cm on the left, the right, the top and the bottom.
- Font size is 10 or larger.
- Line spacing is single or more.

**NB: Parts of the main document can be covered by:**

- **the report(s) of an international peer review committee that has evaluated the research school or its constituent groups (preferably SEP evaluations)**

**- the self-evaluation report(s) on the research of the research school or its constituent groups**  
**The report(s) must be accompanied by an index clearly showing (i.e. including page number and section number) which parts of the report(s) concern the research school or its constituent groups.**

**Year of submission:**

**Year/years in which the previous accreditation(s) was/were awarded:**

**Name of research school (Dutch):**

**Name of research school (English):**

**Acronym/abbreviation:**

**Contact details of research school**

Contact person:

Address, postal code and place:

Telephone number:

E-mail address:

Website:

**University acting as secretary:**

**Contact details of university acting as secretary**

Contact person:

Address, postal code and place:

Telephone number:

E-mail address:

**Institutes and/or faculties participating in the research school**

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

**Institutions with which the research school has a formal partnership**

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.



## 1. Mission

The research school's scientific mission.

## 2. Research context

**NB: As regards the quality of research, the Accreditation Committee is guided by SEP evaluations and self-evaluations. The following questions are intended to come to an impression of the quality and cohesion of the research context. When possible, the questions can be covered with references to SEP evaluations and self-evaluations, with additional explanation wherever necessary.**

- a. Research programme and scientific output
- b. Cohesion
  - Intra-university and inter-university cooperation
  - Cooperation with para-university institutes and other non-university organisations
- c. Composition of the research groups, scale of involvement of senior researchers in the research school
- d. Positioning in the national and international field and cooperation with research groups in the Netherlands and abroad

For re-accreditation: under a–d, in particular mention changes in the research school's research programme compared with the situation at the time of the original application or the previous application for re-accreditation.

## 3. Educational context

### 3.1. Training and supervision programme

This section, or the training and supervision programme attached as an annex to the main document, should at least address the following points:

- a. Structure of the training and supervision programme
- b. Final attainment aims of the programme
- c. Description of the objective of the programme in terms of professional fields
- d. Rights and duties of the instructors and the trainee researchers
- e. Procedure for selecting, prioritising and approving research projects for PhD students
- f. Policy on male/female ratio among PhD students

For re-accreditation: under a-f, in particular mention changes in the research school's training and supervision programme compared with the situation at the time of the original application or the previous application for re-accreditation.

### 3.2. Quality assurance in Education and Supervision Programmes

This section, or the training and supervision programme attached as an annex to the main document, should at least address the following points:

- a. Criteria for senior researchers responsible for training and supervision;
- b. The male/female ratio among the research school's senior researchers;
- c. Appointment of and budget for guest researchers and guest lecturers;
- d. System of internal quality assurance for training and supervision.

## 4. Education in Bachelor's and Master's phase

Interaction and coordination with Bachelor's and/or Master's education; with particular reference to any changes in the case of applications for re-accreditation.



## 5. Career prospects for alumni

An outline of the career prospects for PhD students from the research school, which should at least make a distinction between scientific and non-scientific jobs occupied by alumni of the research school after completing their training and graduating. (This should be in the form of expectations in the case of initial accreditation and on the basis of data about alumni in the case of re-accreditation.)

**Points 6 to 9 only have to be completed for applications for re-accreditation**

## 6. Graduation rate

### 6a. Please fill in the table.

Enrolment			Success rates				Total		
Starting year	Male / female	Total (male + female)	Graduated after (≤) 4 years	Graduated after (≤) 5 years	Graduated after (≤) 6 years	Graduated after (≤) 7 years	Total graduated	Not yet finished	Discontinued
T-8	#M #F	#	# / %	# / %	# / %	# / %	# / %	# / %	# / %
T-7	#M #F	#	# / %	# / %	# / %	# / %	# / %	# / %	# / %
T-6	#M #F	#	# / %	# / %	# / %	-	# / %	# / %	# / %
T-5	#M #F	#	# / %	# / %	-	-	# / %	# / %	# / %
T-4	#M #F	#	# / %	-	-	-	# / %	# / %	# / %

Based on SEP, table 5.5

"Graduated" is defined here as "when the approval of the thesis review committee has been secured". Otherwise, it must be clearly shown what definition was used when filling in the table.

All PhD students must be included in the table, including special cases (such as PhD students on maternity leave, PhD students with part-time appointments. Special cases can be explained in a footnote).

### 6b. What is the median time (in years) to be graduated? What are the outliers?

## 7. The measures taken in response to criticisms made at the time of the previous accreditation or re-accreditation

## 8. The measures proposed in response to the most recent external peer review

## 9. Male/female ratio among the members of the permanent staff, the post-docs and PhD students in the research school

Category	Total	Men	Women
Permanent staff	#	# / %	# / %
Post-docs	#	# / %	# / %
PhD students	#	# / %	# / %

(# = absolute number, % = percentage of relevant category)

**Points 10 to 12 must be completed for applications for both accreditation and re-accreditation**

## 10. Organisation and Management

For initial accreditation:

- Formal structure, management and organisation of the research school
- Formal powers of the research school in terms of designing and implementing its own personnel and investment policy, as laid down in regulations and/or management decisions
- Arrangements for carrying out the tasks of the "secretary" (when more than one university is participating)



For re-accreditation:

Changes in management and organisation compared with the situation at the time of the last application for re-accreditation.

## 11. Financial resources

A. Expectations for coming period

- Anticipated number of PhD students in the coming years.
- Available capacity for training and supervision, including an explanation of how it will be financed in the next four years.

B. Agreements made on educational and administrative costs, broken down among the participating institutions for the next 4 years.

C. Financial track record

An overview of the research school's annual financial resources during the last period of accreditation, broken down into direct funding, research grants and contract research (in the case of new accreditation, data for the participating groups over the last four years).

The following table must be completed for the total of all groups in the research school.

	Year-5	Year-4	Year-3	Year-2	Year-1	Year now
Direct funding (1)	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %
Research grants (2)	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %
Contract research (3)	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %
Other (4)	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>fte / %</b>	<b>fte / %</b>	<b>fte / %</b>	<b>fte / %</b>	<b>fte / %</b>	<b>fte / %</b>

Based on SEP, table 5.4 (first part)

Notes:

(1) Direct funding by the university / KNAW / NWO

(2) Research grants obtained in national and international scientific competition (e.g. grants from NWO, KNAW and European Research Council)

(3) Research contracts for specific research projects obtained from external organisations, such as industry, governmental ministries, European Commission and charity organisations

(4) Funds that do not fit the other categories

## 12. Organisation and management

The following table must be completed for the total of all groups in the research school:

	Year-5	Year-4	Year-3	Year-2	Year-1	Year now
Tenured staff (1)	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte
Non-tenured staff (2)	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte
PhD students (3)	#	#	#	#	#	#

Based on SEP, table 5.2 (first part)

Note 1: Comparable with WOPI categories HGL, UHD and UD

Note 2: Comparable with WOPI category Researcher, including post docs

Note 3: Standard PhD (employed) and Contract PhDs (externally or internally funded but not employed)



## APPENDICES TO APPLICATION FOR ACCREDITATION OR RE-ACCREDITATION

### **A: For *initial* accreditation (submit: twelve copies of appendices 1-5)**

#### Appendix 1 : Report of International Peer Review

- The Accreditation Committee has drawn up guidelines for the international peer review. They are based on a peer review according to SEP 2009-2014 and can be found in the document "Introduction" (this document can be downloaded from [www.knaw.nl/ecos](http://www.knaw.nl/ecos)).

#### Appendix 2 : Training and supervision

- Training and supervision programme.
- Policy document /agreement setting out the rights and obligations of instructors and trainee researchers.

#### Appendix 3 : Research (*When possible, refer to relevant passages in SEP evaluations*)

- Outline of the research programme.
- List of participating research groups. (Names of senior researchers and input of staff and material resources).
- List of publications in the last two years.
- List of (not more than) five key publications of each tenured staff member in the last five years, grouped under each line of research.

#### Appendix 4 : Formal basis of the research school

- Management decision or Regulation (in the case of a local research school) or Common Arrangement (in the case of an inter-university research school) that constitutes the formal basis of the research school.

This should include a description of the powers delegated to the management of the research school with regard to the recruitment and selection of tenured personnel and temporary staff. The decision, regulation or arrangement should also clearly explain the tasks and powers of the different bodies in the research school with regard to research policy and education policy, the recruitment and selection of the staff that will be employed in the research school and the use of the research school's funds.

#### Appendix 5 : Partnership agreements

- Partnership agreements with non-university research institutions (when applicable).
- Partnership agreements with international institutions (when applicable).

### **B: For re-accreditation (submit: twelve copies of appendix 1; two copies of appendices 2 and 3)**

#### Appendix 1 : Report of International Peer Review

- The Accreditation Committee has drawn up guidelines for the international peer review. They are based on a peer review according to SEP 2009-2014 and can be found in the document "Introduction" (this document can be downloaded from [www.knaw.nl/ecos](http://www.knaw.nl/ecos)).

#### Appendix 2 : List of publications

- List of (not more than) five key publications of each tenured staff member in the last five years, grouped under each line of research.

#### Appendix 3 : Formal basis

- Management decision or Regulation (in the case of a local research school), or Common Arrangement (in the case of an inter-university research school), that constitutes the formal basis for the research school.