



Recognition & Rewards quality features *survey*

Dear dean,

Welcome to the Recognition & Rewards quality features survey, which aims to map approaches to staff development and assessment at faculties in The Netherlands and analyse how they work in their respective environments.

There should be only **one response** per faculty. The respondent should have an overarching view of setting-up and implementing academic career assessment procedures and practices for academic staff at faculty level.

The survey is composed of 3 sections:

- The profile of your faculty
- Staff development approach and Academic career assessment at your faculty
- Recognition & Rewards reform process

Disclaimer

Your information is treated confidentially. The data are stored in a secure environment. You are not obliged to answer all questions in the questionnaire, but of course having a dataset of complete responses is of great importance for our research.

The aggregated results of the survey will be presented in a slide deck, which we intend to present at the E&W Broad meeting on 5 June 2025. Individual answers will only be shared with the 'disciplineoverlegorgaan', the national Recognition & Rewards steering group and the national Recognition & Rewards programme team. However, if you agree, we could publish the individual answers of your discipline and create transparency about the use of quality features in your discipline. It will take approximately 15 minutes to complete the survey.

The deadline for completing the questionnaire and submitting your response is **12 April**.

Glossary

Academic assessment refers to the methods used to evaluate the performance, outputs and impact of academic activities for the purposes of recruitment, performance evaluation and career progression. By academic assessment we mean assessment at the recruitment, development, appointment and promotion of academic staff.

Quality features / quality criteria refer to both the quantitative and qualitative weighting of academic performance in the areas of education, research, impact, leadership and patient care.



Profile of your faculty

Please provide the following information about your faculty.

1. Name of the faculty in Dutch:

[text]

2. Name of the faculty in English:

[text]

3. Respondent's name:

[text]

4. Respondent's job title/position:

[text]

The respondent should have an overarching view of setting-up and implementing academic career assessment procedures and practices for academic staff at faculty level.

5. Respondent's contact details (email address is sufficient):

[text]

The contact details of the respondent are meant to be contacted for an interview, in which we can interpret the results.

6. Please indicate your university or university medical centre:

- Amsterdam University Medical Centre (Academic Medical Centre, VU University Medical Center, AMC Medical Research)
- Delft University of Technology
- Eindhoven University of Technology
- Erasmus Medical Centre
- Erasmus University Rotterdam
- Leiden University
- Leiden University Medical Center
- Maastricht University
- Maastricht University Medical Centre+
- Open University
- Protestant Theological University
- Radboud University
- Radboud University Medical Centre
- Theological University of Apeldoorn
- Utrecht Theological University
- Tilburg University
- University Medical Center Groningen
- University Medical Center Utrecht
- University of Amsterdam
- University of Groningen
- University of Humanistic Studies
- University of Twente
- Utrecht University



- Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
- Wageningen University & Research

7. Please indicate the discipline of your faculty:

- Agriculture/Applied Life Sciences
- Natural and Life Sciences
- Technology
- Healthcare
- Economics
- Law
- Behavioural and Social Sciences
- Language and Culture
- Education (as an academic field)
- Religion and theology
- Other, ...

8. Please indicate the disciplineoverlegorgaan your faculty is part of:

- Decanenoverleg Sociale Wetenschappen
- Disciplineoverleg Letteren en Geesteswetenschappen
- Disciplineoverleg Theologie en Religiewetenschappen
- Disciplineoverleg Wijsbegeerte
- Landelijk Decanenoverleg Economie en Bedrijfskunde
- Landelijk Decanenoverleg Geneeskunde / Bestuurscommissie Onderzoek & Onderwijs NFU
- Landelijk Techniek Decanenoverleg / Raad voor Technische Wetenschappen
- Landelijk Overleg Bètadecanen
- Raad van Decanen Rechtsgeleerdheid
- Other, ...

9. What is the total number of academic staff (full time equivalent, FTE), working at your faculty?

- < 50
- 100-99
- 100-499
- 500-999
- 1000-1499
- ≥ 1500
- Difficult to answer

Staff development approach and academic career assessment

Now we would like to focus on academic career assessment (for the purposes of recruitment, development, appointment and promotion of academic staff) in your faculty.



10. At what moments is your faculty assessing the quality of the work of its academic staff? [select all that apply]

- During recruitment
- During development of academic staff
- For promotion decisions
- As part of regular appraisals
- During contract renewal
- I don't know/difficult to say
- Other (please specify)

11. Which of the following tools does your faculty use to monitor staff development and promotion? [select all that apply]

- Narratives, evidence-based CVs or biographical sketches
- Quantitative indicators (e.g., publication counts, citations)
- Leadership competencies
- Teamwork competencies
- Other (please specify)

12. What is your perspective on the future of the current career progression procedure in your faculty?

- Significant changes are expected soon
- Minor adjustments are likely
- No changes are anticipated
- I am unsure

13. In your opinion, what are the main strengths of your faculty's academic career assessment system?

You can mention up to three strengths and three challenges.

14. In your opinion, what are the main challenges of your faculty's academic career assessment system?

You can mention up to three strengths and three challenges.

15. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

Please select one of the following options: 1) Completely disagree; 2) Disagree; 3) Neutral; 4) Agree; 5) Completely agree; 6) Don't know; 7) Not applicable

Antwoordopties in tabelvorm

1. When talking about the work of the academic staff of my faculty, the quality of their work is more important than the quantity.
2. In my faculty, more innovative and creative kinds of output are recognised and rewarded, alongside publications for instance.
3. In my faculty, the societal relevance of the work of our academics is appreciated.
4. In my faculty, it is possible for academics with a talent for teaching to become full professor.
5. In my faculty, the focus is on development (instead of assessment).
6. In my faculty, we appreciate the different talents and ambitions of our staff.
7. In my faculty, we recognize academics that follow Open Science principles in their work.
8. In my faculty, we encourage an entrepreneurial attitude.
9. In my faculty, we encourage to work together with societal or business partners.



10. In my faculty, we assess leadership competencies when selecting people for leadership roles.
11. In my faculty, team goals, and everyone's contribution to this, are discussed in the different teams.
12. In my faculty, we give room to openly discuss horizontal mobility options.

16. Which of the following evidence is currently used at your faculty for assessing academic careers?

Tick the best suitable answer.

Antwoordopties in tabelvorm per kwaliteitskenmerk

- This quality feature is compulsory for all of our academic staff
- This quality feature is optional; academics may choose this quality feature if it fits their profile
- The use of this quality feature is explicitly discouraged at our faculty
- I do not know
- Not applicable (for each item)

EXAMPLE

A research portfolio or alike, documenting progression and reflection in research practice

☐ This quality feature is compulsory for all of our academic staff ☐ This quality feature is optional; academics may choose this quality feature if it fits their profile ☐ The use of this quality feature is explicitly discouraged at our faculty ☐ I do not know ☐ Not applicable (for each item)

Research

General

1. A research portfolio or alike, documenting progression and reflection in research practice
2. Publication strategy

Research products for peers

3. Journal articles and reviews (refereed/non-refereed)
4. Book chapter (refereed/non-refereed)
5. Books, source publications and exhibition catalogues (refereed/non-refereed)
6. Editorship of volumes and special issues (refereed/non-refereed)
7. Digital infrastructures and databases
8. Presentations and conference proceedings (refereed/non-refereed)
9. Designs
10. Data sets and software

Use of research products by peers

11. Reviews
12. Use of data sets, software and facilities
13. Citations of articles, books and other products
14. Meta-analyses
15. The use of research materials, syntax and code



Marks of recognition by peers

16. Research grants awarded to individuals
17. Grants awarded to major collaborative research projects
18. Prizes awarded to individuals or collaborative research projects
19. Secondary appointments and membership of scientific councils or committees
20. Editorships, council memberships, organisation of conferences and scientific meetings

Other

21. Other quality features for *research*, namely: [Several text options]

Teaching and learning

1. A teaching portfolio or alike, documenting progression and reflection in teaching practice
2. Interview with candidate on teaching and learning
3. In-class observations
4. Summative external peer review of university teaching
5. The advice of a 'pedagogical expert' or an external peer reviewer
6. Past teaching performance (global duration, quantity, quality and target groups: bachelor, master or other)
7. University Teaching Qualification (BKO)
8. Senior Teaching Qualification (SKO)
9. Supervision competence (BSc and MSc students)
10. Supervision quantity (BSc and MSc students)
11. Course followed on supervisory skills
12. Sample of course materials and/or Open Education materials
13. Professional development (being a didactic expert)
14. Designing teaching methods (examples of newly developed teaching programs or methods, e.g. a course)
15. Performing teaching and creating an attractive learning environment (examples of lectures/courses)
16. Evaluating students and teaching methods (capable of providing feedback to students, colleagues and evaluating teaching methods, including through the regular revision of courses in content and pedagogy)
17. Coordination in teaching and learning
18. Education development and innovation
19. Teaching grants
20. Student evaluations
21. Newly developed or significantly redeveloped courses
22. Membership of institutional educational committees
23. Educational scholarship
24. Other quality features for *teaching and learning*, namely: [Several text options]

Impact

General

1. An impact portfolio or alike, documenting progression and reflection in impact practice

Research products for societal target groups

2. Books, source publications, guidelines, and catalogues for a professional readership
3. Clinical knowledge- and expertise centers (inter)nationally
4. Products, intellectual property (patents and licences), materials and prototypes



5. Films, documentaries and exhibitions for a professional audience
6. Websites for professional visitors
7. Book chapters in publications for a general readership
8. Software, digital media and serious games for general users
9. Lectures, masterclasses and conferences for a general audience
10. Blogs and forums for general readers

Use of research products by societal target groups

11. Projects in cooperation with societal parties
12. Contract research
13. Use in education
14. References in professional and public domains

Marks of recognition from societal target groups

15. Financial and material support by society
16. Membership of civil-society organisations
17. Secondary appointments within civil society organisations
18. Public prizes
19. Science communication and outreach (e.g. public lectures, TV/radio appearance, article in newspaper, citizen science, collaborations with schools, public services or others)

Other

20. Other quality features for *impact*, namely: [Several text options]

Patient care [if applicable]

1. A patient care portfolio or alike, documenting progression and reflection in clinical practice
2. Other quality features for *Patient care*, namely: [Several text options]

Personal leadership, leadership, development and team spirit

1. Leadership (incl. managerial tasks and leadership positions in the organisation)
2. Supervision competency (PhD candidates)
3. Supervision quantity (PhD candidates)
4. Collaboration within the team
5. A leadership portfolio or alike, documenting progression and reflection in leadership style and practice
6. Inter-sectoral mobility (mobility of academic staff from the higher education or research sectors to industry or other sectors of employment and vice versa)
7. Academic service, like contribution to committees and projects within the university
8. Number of staff currently supervising
9. Number of research projects with management responsibility (e.g. as workpackage leader)
10. Course followed on leadership skills
11. Mentoring and peer-coaching of teaching colleagues
12. Other quality features for *personal leadership, leadership, development and team spirit*, namely: [Several text options]



Recognition & Rewards reform process

In the third part of this survey, we will focus on the Recognition & Rewards reform process in your faculty. In the position paper 'Room for everyone's talent', we wrote that in the assessment of academics the emphasis should be less on quantitative results (such as number of publications) and a greater emphasis on quality, content, scientific integrity, creativity, contribution to science, academia and/or society, and acknowledgement of the academic's specific profile and domain(s) in which the academic is active.

In the road map 'Room for everyone's talent in practice', we then translated that into the following actions:

- Each institution translates the *Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment* to its own context.
- We specify which quality features will be used in education, research, leadership, impact and patient care in recruitment, development, appointment and promotion.
- We actively involve appointment advisory committees in changes.
- We make greater use of evidence-based CVs and assessment portfolios when appointing and promoting academic staff.

17. If reforming academic career assessment (for the purposes of recruitment, development, appointment and promotion of academic staff), at which stage is your faculty?

- Reform processes are being considered, but a decision on the reform has not been made yet
- Reform processes are foreseen and a revision of processes is under development
- Reform processes are planned, processes have been revised and developed, but implementation has not yet started
- Reform processes are planned, processes have been revised and developed, and a piloting phase is ongoing
- Reform processes are in a transition period: processes have been revised, developed and piloted, and implementation has started
- Reform processes are well established and fully implemented across the whole organisation
- An earlier reform process is being evaluated and a revision of processes is under development
- No reform is being or has recently been considered or implemented

18. In your reform process, to which extent is your faculty addressing the following actions:

- Translate the strategy of the faculty into a personnel plan, such as a Strategic Personnel Plan (SPP)
- Implement the ten CoARA commitments in your research assessment procedures
- Specify which quality features will be used in education, research, leadership, impact and patient care in recruitment, development, appointment and promotion
- Organise training for appointment advisory committees for assessing academic work in the different domains
- Make greater use of evidence-based CVs and assessment portfolios in the appointment and promotion of academic staff
- Recognise the diversity of contributions to, and careers in, research in accordance with the needs and nature of academic work



- Create more diversity and flexibility in academic profiles
- Base assessment primarily on qualitative evaluation for which peer review is central, supported by responsible use of quantitative indicators
- Abandon inappropriate uses in research assessment of journal and publication-based metrics, in particular inappropriate uses of Journal Impact Factor (JIF) and h-index
- Recognise Open Science activities in academic assessment and career progression
- Recognise leadership competencies and/or responsibilities in academic assessment and career progression
- Recognise teaching competencies and/or responsibilities in academic assessment and career progression
- Recognise societal impact competencies and/or responsibilities in academic assessment and career progression
- Recognise entrepreneurial competencies in academic assessment and career progression
- Recognise clinical competencies and/or responsibilities in academic assessment and career progression
- Other, namely

Answer options:

- Our faculty is addressing / implementing this
- Our faculty is currently discussing this
- Our faculty will not address this
- I do not know/Not applicable

19. After the reform, academic career assessment (for the purposes recruitment, development, appointment and promotion of academic staff) in our faculty will be primarily based on:

- Purely qualitative assessment (narratives)
- Responsible use of metrics
- Balanced use of qualitative assessment and (responsible use of) metrics
- Not defined yet
- I do not know / difficult to say

20. What is the role of academic staff in the reform process?

- Academic staff (or their representatives) are actively participating in discussions on reform and in developing new processes for academic career assessment
- Academic staff (or their representatives) are consulted on the reform principles and/or steps, but are not actively involved in developing new processes for academic career assessment
- Academic staff (or their representatives) are kept informed of the reform process, but do not have an active role in the reform discussions processes or in the development of new processes for academic career assessment
- Other (please specify)

Many thanks for completing this questionnaire!



References

Some of the questions and answers in this survey are based on questions in or inspired by a survey by the CoARA Working Group on Reforming Academic Career Assessment https://www.eua.eu/downloads/contributions/coara_wg_aca_survey.pdf. More information on this working group: <https://coara.eu/coalition/working-groups/wg-reforming-academic-career-assessment/>

Other questions were based on or inspired by a survey developed in the STAFF-DEV project. More information on this project: <https://www.eua.eu/our-work/projects/eu-funded-projects/staffdev.html>

This survey is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial CC BY-NC. This information may be freely used, copied, and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the source is acknowledged