

## **Criteria relevant to the mapping of academic output in African Studies**

The AEGIS Working Group on the Evaluation of Academic Output (Clara Carvalho – ISCTE Lisbon; Pierre Boilley - Cemaf Paris; Leo de Haan – ASC Leiden; Andreas Mehler – IAK/GIGA Hamburg; Dieter Neubert – BIGSAS Bayreuth; Carin Norberg – NAI Uppsala) was asked by the Leiden Plenary of 2007 to compile an overview of the systems used to evaluate AEGIS centres and propose criteria relevant to the mapping of academic output in African Studies.

The Working Group has concluded that it is essential to differentiate between different evaluation objectives such as:

- the application for and evaluation of research projects or research programmes (project funding);
- the evaluation of individual researchers, including an assessment of their research activities (with a possible effect on salary and/or administrative budget); and
- the evaluation of institutes such as research centres and university departments (and the possible influence on core funding with or without research funds).

The working group stresses that evaluation in and of AEGIS member centres is not – and should not be – limited to scientific output such as articles, papers and books alone. Issues such as policy relevance, outreach and capacity building in both their own countries and in Africa are important too. For the time being, the focus is on research, leaving issues such as teaching and library/documentation for a later date.

From the first inventory in 2006/2007, subsequent discussions in the Working Group and the (limited) responses to the 2007/2008 questionnaire, it has been concluded that the evaluation criteria indicated in Table 1 are relevant. At its Bordeaux meeting on 2 September 2008, the AEGIS Plenary endorsed the list of evaluation criteria.

It should be noted that the precise mix may differ according to the varying objectives explained above, such as the evaluation of individual researchers, research projects and institutes. For example, since research proposals for project funding are usually assessed by criteria such as the relevance of the topic, innovative aspects, methodology, and the quality and experience of the applicants, the evaluation of their outcome will in general also follow these criteria, in addition to the specific objectives proposed in the project proposal.

Table 1: Criteria relevant to the mapping of academic output in African Studies (with a focus on research)

Scientific	
	Publications/publication pattern
	Articles in refereed journals;
	Articles in double-blind refereed journals;
	Articles in journals on the ISI list (Institute for Scientific Information);
	SSCI credits received (ISI's Social Science Citation Index)
	Refereed books and book chapters;
	Double-blind refereed books and book chapters
	Non-refereed journal articles, books and book chapters
	Reports
	Research output other than publications, such as databases
	Participation at international conferences
	PhD projects supervised
	PhD projects completed
Policy and societal relevance	
	Reports for external parties
	Dissemination of research results for a general audience or those being put in practice
	Activities on non-scientific boards or for other organizations
External funding received from	
	Scientific organizations such as research councils
	Non-scientific organizations
Internationalization	
	International participation in networks,
	Joint research projects
	Joint publications
	International funding
Capacity building in the South	
	PhD supervision
	Research-oriented training, for example workshops, study programmes, courses
	Joint research projects
	Joint publications