



Report
No. 7 | 2020

Mid-term evaluation of 2016 Centres for Excellence in Education

Publisher: Norwegian agency for international cooperation and quality enhancement in higher education
Date: December 2020
Chief editor: Ragnhild Tunesvik
Prepared by: Caroline Erviksæter, Rolf Hughes, Tina Bering Keiding, Terje-André Kvinlaug, Michael Kölling, Linda Lien, Anja Moberg, Ann-Marie Pendrill, Richard Reece, Siri Terjesen, Marit Ubbe
ISSN: 2535-5961
ISBN: 978-82-8421-011-7

The report can be downloaded from diku.no

Preface

The Ministry of Education and Research launched the initiative “Centres for Excellence in Education” (Sentre for fremragende utdanning - SFU) in 2010. The programme was established and administered by NOKUT prior to 2019, when it was transferred to Diku as part of Diku’s portfolio of Quality Enhancement Programmes.

By means of the Centres for Excellence in Education (SFU) programme, leading academic communities in Norway are awarded resources to further develop their teaching and education. The initiative is a long-term effort to stimulate educational development and innovative approaches to learning in Higher Education at Bachelor and Master levels. The centres have a particular responsibility to disseminate knowledge and practices leading to enhanced quality in higher education both within and beyond their host institutions.

Each SFU Centre receives an initial grant for a period of five years with the possibility to renew their status for an additional five years after a mid-term evaluation. The mid-term evaluation is carried out towards the end of their first funding period and informs the decision on whether funding for a second period will be granted.

There are currently 12 Centres for Excellence in Education. In 2020, the four centres awarded SFU status in December 2016 were subjected to the mid-term evaluation process. These were:

- CCSE – Centre for Computing in Science Education
- CEFIMA – Centre of Excellence in Film and Interactive Media Arts
- Engage – Centre for Engaged Education through Entrepreneurship
- Excited – Centre for Excellent IT Education

This evaluation report provides an overview of the evaluation process, an assessment of the four 2016-centres, as well as the individual assessment of these centres. The report was submitted to the Diku Board for their formal decision regarding funding for a second period.

Diku would like to thank the expert panel for their conscientious work that took place during the Covid-19 pandemic. The panel has produced a report that, we anticipate, will be of value for existing centres in years to come and for the further development of the Centres for Excellence in Education programme.

Diku – Norwegian Agency for International Cooperation and Quality Enhancement in Higher Education – aims to contribute to increased quality of Norwegian education.

We promote development and innovation in education, encourage international cooperation and digital learning methods.

Through investigations, analyses and counselling, Diku contributes to expand and strengthen the knowledge base for quality enhancement in education. The aim is to provide authorities and actors in the education sector with a more informed basis for developing their policies, strategies and measures.

Content

1 SFU mid-term evaluation 2020	4
The evaluation process	4
The expert panel	4
Ways of working	5
2 Key findings across the site visits	7
What worked well	7
What worked less well	7
Points to consider	8
Overall summary	9
3 Centre for Computing in Science Education – CCSE	10
Overview	10
Evaluation of achievements of the first round of funding	10
Evaluation of centre plan for the second round of funding	11
The panel's recommendations	12
4 Centre for Excellence in Film and Interactive Media Arts – CEFIMA	13
Overview	13
Evaluation of achievements of the first round of funding	13
Evaluation of centre plan for the second round of funding	14
The panel's recommendations	14
5 Centre for Engaged Education through Entrepreneurship – Engage	16
Overview	16
Evaluation of achievements of the first round of funding	17
Evaluation of centre plan for the second round of funding	18
The panels' recommendations	19
6 Centre for Excellent IT Education – Excited	20
Overview	20
Evaluation of achievements of the first round of funding	20
Evaluation of centre plan for the second round of funding	21
The panels' recommendations	23
Appendix	24

1 SFU mid-term evaluation 2020

The evaluation process

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to determine if the centres should be funded for a second five-year period (see attached mandate).

In designing the evaluation process, Diku drew on the experience from former SFU mid-term evaluation processes organised by NOKUT. Diku also received useful input from the four centres that had already completed the mid-term evaluation process. To prepare the 2016-centres for the evaluation and to ensure transparency, the criteria were discussed with each of the centres ahead of the process.

Through the evaluation process, the 2016-centres applied for a second funding period and with that a prolongation of the status as a Centre for Excellence in Education. Their past performance and future plans were evaluated by an expert panel. Through the comprehensive evaluation with written feedback to the centres, followed by site visit meetings and the final report, the centres were challenged but also advised on how to improve their performance.

The evaluation criteria were set in accordance with previous practice for mid-term evaluations: *i) the results from the first period and ii) the centre plan for the second period and the centres continuation strategy after the Centre funding ends.* The two criteria were treated as being equally important. However, it should be noted that sufficient results from the first period is required to write a good and ambitious centre plan for the second period that meets the expectations for dissemination and impact of a Centre for Excellence in Education.

The evaluation was conducted on the basis of background material and documentation provided by each Centre:

- The Centre's self-evaluation of the first funding period
- The centre plan for the second funding period
- The Centre's annual report for 2019
- The call for proposals from 2016, the Centre's original application for centre status and the feedback on this application
- The report from the site visit in 2018
- Statement from host and partner institutions about added value of the Centre
- Information gathered through meetings with institutional leadership, Centre management, students, and teachers
- Statement from stakeholders

The expert panel

The mid-term evaluation was carried out by an expert panel consisting of professionals with expertise in the field of teaching and education in higher education; education management; student involvement; as well as expertise in the respective centres' subject areas. The members of the 2020 panel were:

- Professor Richard Reece, University of Kent, UK; Panel Chair
- Professor Emeritus Ann-Marie Pendrill, University of Gothenburg and Lund University

- Professor Siri Terjesen, Florida Atlantic University, USA and Norwegian School of Economics
- Professor Rolf Hughes, KU Leuven, Belgium
- Associate Professor Tina Bering Keiding, Aarhus University, Denmark
- Professor Michael Kölling, King's College London, UK
- Caroline Erviksæter, student representative, appointed by The National Union of Students in Norway
- Terje-André Kvinlaug, student representative appointed by The National Union of Students in Norway

The report which follows, summarises the key findings from the preparatory work and site visits, with a particular focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the different approaches presented across the four centres being evaluated.

Ways of working

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic, the “typical” site visit protocol as described in the panel’s mandate needed to be substantially revised. All physical panel meetings needed to be postponed or reformatted, and in-person site visits themselves had to be reimagined. In addition, the deadline for the submission of the centre self-evaluation report was pushed back from April to the end of June to enable the centres, and their host university, to concentrate on their response to the pandemic.

The ongoing nature of the pandemic meant that the only realistic option to complete the mid-term evaluations by the end of 2020, was to do the site visits, as well as all of the panel’s work leading up to the site visits, virtually.

Under ordinary circumstances the panel would have met for an intensive two-day workshop during which most of the groundwork for the site visits would take place. It was early on decided that the workshop would be difficult to appropriately replicate in an online environment. Instead the panel divided into subgroups which met on a number of occasions spread over several weeks to do a “deep dive” into the evidence provided by each of the centres. The panel then reassembled (online) to ensure consistency across each of the subgroups, agree on main points for the initial evaluation report and formulate strategy for each of the site visits. The initial evaluation report was sent to the centres in advance of the site visit for information and comments.

The pandemic forced Diku and the panel to reformulate the evaluation process, but it also gave the opportunity to be innovative and explore new ways of working together across countries using digital tools. Going forward Diku will use the experience garnered through this evaluation process to further develop the administration of the SFU-programme. The following feedback from the panel chair is particularly relevant to take into account in the development:

The Chair noted that the revised assessment process was far more labour intensive (and was certainly spread out over a longer period of time) than would have occurred if the panel has been able to meet in person. However, he also noted that the process generated an excellent understanding among all panel members of the strengths of each Centre and the areas where additional information of work might be needed.

As described in the panel’s mandate, the second part of the mid-term evaluation entails an on-campus site visit where the panel meet with management, Centre team

members, students and external stakeholders to gain further insights about the Centre. As the site visits had to be organised virtually, some adjustments were made. The centres were asked to send in a 20 minute video presentation for the panel to view before the meetings, and the external stakeholders were asked to send in written reports regarding their involvement in the Centre's work and the importance on the Centre. The site visits themselves were composed of the following:

- A 45 minute video conference discussion with the Centre leaders
- A 30 minute video conference discussion with the teaching staff
- A 45 minute video conference discussion with students
- A 30 minute wrap-up session with, in general, Centre leaders to give initial feedback and resolve any outstanding issues.

The site visit was the most difficult part of the evaluation process to replicate virtually. A physical visit to the Centre will in itself give an impression of the institution, the academic community and the working environment for the students. Several of the centres used the pre-made video presentation to not only give an introduction of the Centre, but also to give the panel an impression of the physical environments. They also gave feedback on the initial evaluation report and in that way anticipated and accelerated the site visit meetings. As indicated by the Chair of the panel, a virtual process can be thorough, but the intangible benefits of a physical site visit are difficult to replicate:

The Chair noted that while the meeting schedule was comparatively short, it was very intensive. In comparison to previous mid-terms evaluations, he felt that the process was at least as rigorous as it had been previously. While he felt that the evaluation process had been successfully completed using this approach, a number of the more intangible benefits of having an international panel of experts scrutinise the work of the Centre could not be undertaken. For example, the 'over coffee' or 'over lunch' conversations to informally explore other areas, or to seek the panels views on potential speculative initiatives were difficult/impossible to replicate using relatively high-stakes online meetings.

2 Key findings across the site visits

At the mid-term evaluation point, a number of the centres have established themselves as thought-leaders in their respective subject areas in their own institutions and have created effective communities of practice in their respective fields. Moreover, most are making a very significant difference to the students associated with the centres and have taken a reasonably rigorous approach to ensure that research is embedded into their activities in order to be able to assess the relative success of their initiatives. The panel felt that a number of the centres had the potential to become world-leading during the second round of funding, but that ambitions need to be raised, both within the Centre and the host institution, to enable a strategic plan to be drawn up for this to happen. Centres should be more confident in their achievements to date and feel enabled to use these as a springboard for further success in the future.

What worked well

The panel were impressed by how most of the centres not only provided a clearly articulated vision, purpose and goals for the next round of funding, but additionally provided a clear sense of purpose as to why the different work strands (and accompanying projects) were being proposed. In a number of cases, these were altered or modified from the original SFU application. However, the rationale for these changes was clear (sometime because the initial targets had already been achieved) and the revised targets were considered appropriate. The panel did, however, feel as though the centres could be more ambitious for the second round of funding. A number have the potential to be world leading and the panel would have liked to have seen the centre plans reflect this and map out the approach that would need to be undertaken to achieve this.

It was clear that a number of the centres had already made a significant difference to their students and the wider community of practice that they represent. The commitment of the Centre staff - leaders, teachers and stakeholders - to improving the education and opportunities for students was very strong.

What worked less well

Centres struggled to implement effective evaluation and impact frameworks and to instigate effective dissemination plans. Throughout the mid-term evaluation process and the site visits it was clear that the applicants struggled to formulate a clear framework for the evaluation and assessment of their impact and outcomes as an embedded entity, rather than an 'add on'. Dissemination plans tended to have an over-reliance on the methods used for the dissemination of research – *i.e.*, journal publications was typically the norm.

Adopting a systems-based approach to measure key performance indicators and their impact should assist with the development of a meaningful dissemination plan. To disseminate findings and spread best practice across the institution, the nation, and ultimately, globally, the centres need to determine the means by which they will assess the impact of their interventions on the student learner journey – both throughout higher education, and beyond, into employment.

Both evaluation and impact, and dissemination, need to focus on the new pedagogical approaches being proposed to better deliver student outcomes – that is, an emphasis on ‘what works’. Grounding the ‘what works’ in the broader literature will ensure that centres are able to benchmark globally the extent and impact of their innovation.

Issues relating to equality, diversity and inclusion were raised during all of the site visits. All of the centres recognised that gender issues need to be addressed and most had made strides to achieve this. One (female) student framed this very well by stating that, “*It used to be that boys did the experiments, and the girls did the write up - but now we all are involved.*”) However, very little attempts appear to have been made to address other areas of diversity and inclusion. For example, protected characteristics beyond gender (age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, and sexual orientation) seldom appear in the centre plans nor do issues relating to disparities in socio-economic background or status. Centres should strive to be leaders in inclusivity and overtly recognise the strengths and benefits of diversity.

Points to consider

Further to consideration of all mid-term self-evaluation documents and subsequent site visits, certain factors were identified as being key to the future success of the centres. These are listed, and expanded on, below:

Leadership

Effective site leaders ensured connected leadership throughout the full range of stakeholders (both external and internal), with a particular focus on work-strand leaders (both staff and students). Clear accountabilities and responsibilities were the hallmark of the successful centres and the centre plans for the second round of funding require a clear exposition of how leadership would be continued (or altered) following the first period of funding.

Governance

Clear governance arrangements (including transparency) are essential to the effective roll-out of any change management process. In the case of the SFUs, thinking through appropriate representation on the various boards and advisory groups requires careful consideration. Being mindful of the SFU requirements, to include ‘relate to international developments in Higher Education, centres must ensure that the hierarchy of their governance infrastructure includes global representation at the top level. In addition, Centre governance structures should be independent of, although linked to, the host institution.

Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity

With their strong emphasis on student engagement, centres must be mindful of the diversity both of the student body and their teaching staff. Plans must include descriptions of how best to ensure an inclusive approach to enable student success is adopted.

Going from good to great

The panel were enormously impressed with the progress made by a number of the centres during the first round of funding and felt that some had the potential to become truly world leading. This ambition was not necessarily reflected in the centre plans for the second funding round. It should be. Linking with other Centres for Excellence - both in Norway and internationally - will help in this regard, as will a

focus on defining the areas that the Centre could become world-leading in and a detailed plan as to how this ambition will be realised.

Overall summary

This third round of the mid-term evaluation process highlighted the superb success of a number of the centres. By learning from each call for SFU applications and joining this to the mid-term evaluation process, both capacity and capability have been built on solid foundations. The theory of change is based around identifying what has worked well, building on successes and fostering 'communities of practice'. Becoming world-leading is far from straightforward to achieve, but the potential is there. Confidence in past achievements, and a clear vision and plan to move to the next level need to combine with skilled and determined leadership. It will be interesting to see which Centre leader (or leaders) step up to this challenge.

3 Centre for Computing in Science Education – CCSE

Overview

The aims of Centre for Computing in Science Education (CCSE) are both clear and ambitious and the achievements so far seem well aligned with the vision to:

- Develop a research-based foundation for the integration of computing into basic education and to become an international hub for this activity;
- Lead research-based development of new learning materials, methods and practices, study their effects and how they transform student learning and teaching culture;
- Involve students deeply in the development of new practices and methods; and
- Disseminate and adapt the practices and results across disciplines in collaboration with key partners.

These points formed the basis for the site visit which demonstrated that the Centre's activities are progressing well, with the positive impact reaching both new disciplines and other universities.

The Centre's management structure is well thought out. The Centre is integrated well into the wider organisation and is strongly supported, both at the university and through substantial additional funding for research and development through highly competitive grants from the Norwegian Research Council and the EU, which have enabled higher activity than originally planned. The leadership demonstrated an approach utilizing strong synergies across different subprojects.

Evaluation of achievements of the first round of funding

The development of new, research-based approaches, integration into subjects and co-development with students seems to be achieved. The introduction of computing as part of the introductory physics courses seems to really unleash student creativity. Supported by computing, students ask questions and explore real-life situations, beyond the limitations of traditional mathematics, thus discovering the power of physics. The students' high level of engagement in problem-solving was particularly well demonstrated in the video and during our site visit.

Research projects involving students have so far resulted in three publications and six conference presentations. The systemic aspect of the work is impressive, with a conscious progression from introductory university courses to advanced courses, as well as adaptation to new cohorts of students with backgrounds reflecting the work of the project, as well as support for school curriculum.

The work at CCSE is characterised by an unusually strong sharing culture among teachers, including a platform, DocOnce, for depositing different types of documents, lecture notes, and other texts to be reused by others in different contexts. The introduction of "Excellent Teaching Practitioner programme" was seen as a factor

ensuring that the sharing, including book writing, is also recognised as academic contributions, in addition to more traditional academic publications.

Several win-win strategies were described both in the documentation and during our site visit meetings. For example, the teachers expressed an appreciation of working together with educational researchers, as well as with older students for development and teacher students for follow-up - a collaborative, science-based, research-based effort to give the best possible education to their students. Students were empowered to contribute to course development in collaboration with teachers, often in the form of paid summer internships. Their work included support for teachers in other disciplines with less computational traditions, as well as series of seminars or workshops for other students.

The discussions also showed that students were clearly immersed in the field of science education and conscious about building research into the development of the courses and educational programme. Being included as co-authors of scientific publications is further evidence of the students' research mindset.

The students we met described how being part of CCSE has supported their personal development through experiences and boosted their self-confidence. They were clearly enthusiastic about their education.

CCSE has found a good balance between bottom-up and top-down initiatives for educational development.

Results are disseminated through many different pathways. The ProFag project with schools aimed to support introducing programming as part of the STEM teaching has been one way to support the teachers in this curriculum reform - and the switch to on-line for professional development was used to reach even more teachers. Centre leadership also discussed how to increase gender and other types of diversity by ensuring that all students encounter computing in schools.

Bringing the expertise gained to go beyond science, beyond the Bachelor programme and beyond the UiO is part of the dissemination plan.

The CCSE physics textbook integrating computing has become an international bestseller, selling 300 000 copies in 2020. This is one indication of the international impact already achieved by CCSE.

Evaluation of centre plan for the second round of funding

CCSE is well underway with dissemination into other courses and disciplines. An important question for the site visit was to learn more about CCSE ambitions for the second round of funding, including the challenges of dissemination and scaling up.

The four main areas for the next period, summarised below, were outlined in the video presentation by CCSE and further discussed during the virtual site visit. CCSE plans for educational development are exciting and convincing. CCSE consciously takes context into account, e.g. the changing background of students in view of curriculum reform, as well as different traditions and needs in different disciplines.

Following the successful integration of computational science into the undergraduate physics curriculum, as well as in schools, CCSE now plans a major educational

development to cater for students who have been trained in these aspects already before entering university, starting in 2023. Using easily available data acquisition tools, the future students will be trained in a data-driven scientific workflow where they gather data, model the situation and compare the results with experiments. To support the curriculum development, the student evaluations are redesigned in collaboration with researchers to focus more on student learning.

Other development involves AI, where a few honours students have planned and led a series of seminars for other students, and the incorporation of computational essays as part of the curriculum.

The development of digital material and textbooks with integrated computing will continue, building on CCSE's unique competence. The discussions during the site visit demonstrated an increased collaboration with research, and the use of a wide variety of tools to assess the work and its impact, to ensure the optimization of continued development. During the next few years, the education research will include a focus on learning in mathematics, chemistry, and bioscience.

A new PhD programme with (16+16) PhD students, who will all have a 6 months intense introductory training in computational science, has been made possible through a Marie Curie Cofund programme.

CCSE found that successful embedding of computing in the curriculum required teachers to have a computational science research background. However, it was found that teacher training could enable discipline specialists to include computational aspects in the context of their discipline - if the tasks had been developed by others. Involving honours students in the curriculum development was found to lead to successful partnerships and a model for reaching out to other disciplines.

The development of physics education including computational aspects have led to a model used for the introduction in other areas, including an introductory computing course. The model will now be used to increase components of statistical thinking and artificial intelligence, also into other disciplines. CCSE has developed a dissemination playbook to reach other universities. After an initial event involving presentations and demonstration, an important task is to find key personnel for early adaptation and development before embarking on a wider adaptation and integration in the work in the department. The Bioscience programme at UiO is in the integration phase and are now important partners in reaching out to humanities at UiO. The physics programme at UiT is adapting the methods, as is the engineering programme at USN and the science programme at NUDT (National University of Defence Technology).

The international collaboration involves partnerships with a few US universities, in addition to the European university alliance Circle U.

The panel's recommendations

In view of the excellent results reaching out to schools as well as to other disciplines and universities, the panel unanimously recommends continued funding.

4 Centre for Excellence in Film and Interactive Media Arts – CEFIMA

Overview

There is a sense that the Centre is yet to find an identity and purpose beyond project funding linked to curriculum development and quality enhancement. The leadership appears to lack a compelling vision or coherent account of the role, achievements, and future trajectory of the centre. New appointments have been made, recently, and while these are promising developments, it is a shame they were not implemented several years ago so CEFIMA would now be seeing the fruits of their efforts.

Evaluation of achievements of the first round of funding

CEFIMA's achievements in the first round are strongly related to artistic research initiatives exploring how new technologies might transform the art of film making and storytelling. While these initiatives involve both staff and students, they do not seem to be systematically linked to the curriculum. In line with these observations, staff, students and stakeholders repeatedly describe CEFIMA and NFS as very similar entities, with CEFIMA providing funding for miscellaneous NFS projects and initiatives. While seminars, workshops and the Artistic Research Café were clearly appreciated initiatives, desires were expressed for easier access to documentation of earlier projects and more visibility of the lessons learned from this work. The panel felt that the BFA and MFA programmes were the main beneficiaries of the Centre's focus and resources. Despite this, evidence of systematic influence of CEFIMA on the BFA and MFA programmes was lacking, appearing mostly at the level of individual projects. Third cycle (PhD) students seemed something of an afterthought, although a newly appointed head of PhD education suggested to the panel that this may soon change.

The self-evaluation report stated the need for curriculum development, while also describing curriculum development as a difficult task since space must be created within the existing curriculum for new topics. During the site visit, the panel was told that the outcomes of research from the Centre had been implemented in the Master's programme, and there was also the possibility to significantly revise the Bachelor's programmes using the same approach. The panel felt, however, that curriculum review/reform should be an established part of the quality assurance processes within the Norwegian Film School and had difficulty in seeing the value of using CEFIMA research in this way. The panel appreciated the notion of capturing knowledge from CEFIMA and the European (Erasmus+) partners that use CEFIMA as a platform, that could be tested and integrated first in Masters courses, then in Bachelor courses. However, routine curriculum development and quality control are expected to be established within the host institution and should not constitute the core justification for a Centre for Excellence in Education.

The panel repeatedly questioned the relationship between the Norwegian Film School and CEFIMA. It appeared to the panel that the boundaries between the two were blurred and somewhat vague. The panel could appreciate that the more experimental nature of CEFIMA allowed NFS to test and develop methods that may not be ready for implementation in the standard curriculum, and that this provided a clear benefit for NFS education. However, the panel was able to find scant evidence to indicate that CEFIMA is making fundamental, long-term and lasting contributions to the discipline(s) more widely. Whilst the Centre does have ambitions to have an

impact on this level, the panel was unconvinced as to how this would be operationalised.

The panel was left with the impression that CEFIMA sees its primary role as providing funding and inspiration to existing students - i.e., identifying and supporting outstanding individuals. CEFIMA's role in lifting educational quality and providing traces of excellence that would support future students, was less evident.

It was clear to the panel that CEFIMA, and the artistic research it supports, adds value to NFS, but the panel was far less convinced as to how such merits warrant a Centre for Excellence in Education. Funding clearly supports the work of the students but wider impact or influence beyond the NFS was difficult to discern. The NFS has strong collaborations with partners in the film industry, but the panel felt that these did not depend on the presence or activities of CEFIMA. Academic, or other forms of, dissemination of the outputs of CEFIMA was largely lacking. The panel was therefore struggling to identify the added value that CEFIMA provides.

The benefit of the Centre for the wider student body was difficult to identify for the panel. There is a concern that students do not necessarily learn the 'craft' of research, such as grant application writing for competitive national/international funding, when they have access to a ready source of 'in-house' funding. The panel felt that the Centre would benefit greatly from interacting with other SFUs where artistic endeavours and research were being undertaken.

In short, the panel felt that 'potential' rather than achievements, results or existing impact summarised the current position of CEFIMA.

Evaluation of centre plan for the second round of funding

The panel's concern about how widely the benefit of the funding investment is spread were not allayed by the site visit. While it was evident that NFS students are carrying out novel and exciting projects, it is less evident how any of the work would benefit students not directly involved in the projects or teachers at other film schools. The panel could not be confident that a lasting positive impact is being constructed, or that insights are taken outside of the Norwegian Film School in a meaningful, conscious, or systematic manner.

The proposal appeared weaker after the site visit, with the panel sharing the impression that the set of people involved with the Centre is drawn from a rather small pool. This underlines the importance for the Centre to work on dissemination and thereby have a greater impact outside the academic community of the NFS (dissemination of results and evaluation of their impact being an important part of being a SFU, as is itemised in the criteria).

In its subsequent discussion, the panel unanimously agreed that an overall strategic vision, and plan for its implementation, is lacking. Some of the new recruits are very promising, but these are recent appointments, and there is a sense of 'too little too late'.

The panel's recommendations

The evaluation of the written submission left the panel uncertain of what CEFIMA adds to the Norwegian Film School that could not have been achieved without the existence of the Centre. The site visit meetings did not help to clarify this issue, but instead left an impression that CEFIMA, to a large extent, is used as an internal

funding agency for student projects that support the curriculum development work of the Norwegian Film School. Both of these areas the panel considers to be part of the normal quality enhancement work for which the institutions and the Film School are responsible. The overall impression of the site visit made the Centre seem weaker than the documentation.

There is an expectation that organisational and managerial structures within CEFIMA will promote excellence in educational development. The panel is of the view that the Centre does not yet have such structures in place, nor the evaluation framework that will ensure that the lessons learned from individual projects are analysed and shared with other students and staff. The panel also indicated that the projects funded to date have a relatively limited scope beyond being interesting case studies in themselves. It was difficult to see how student projects could be used as the Centre's core evidence for being a Centre for Excellence in Education, significantly influencing practitioners outside the organisation, as well as researchers in the field five years from now in a rapidly changing discipline/constellation of disciplines. The panel judged that the Centre did not meet the criteria of dissemination and impact as would be expected from a Centre for Excellence in Education. It is of great concern to the panel that a second period may simply continue and complete what should have been accomplished in the Centre's first period.

Through evaluation of written documentation from the Centre and the information from the site visit meetings, it is the panel's judgment that the achievements of the Centre for the first period of funding do not satisfy the criteria for a Centre for Excellence in Education.

It is also the panel's judgment that the centre plan for the second period does not meet the expectations of a Centre for Excellence in Education, as expressed in the criteria, with regards to overall ambition, as well as organisation and management of the Centre's role as a model for the dissemination of excellence in education, pioneering practices and impact.

The panel was unanimous in its recommendation that the Centre should not be funded for a second period.

5 Centre for Engaged Education through Entrepreneurship – Engage

Overview

Centre for Engaged Education through Entrepreneurship (Engage)'s vision is to develop and broaden entrepreneurial higher education in Norway and around the world, thereby encouraging its staff and students to become change agents and innovate for the better.

Engage's process involves: (i) developing, testing and documenting new learning approaches in existing programmes, courses and initiatives, and (ii) enhancing momentum in engaging all types of students and faculty in the development and dissemination of new learning initiatives, while helping these students to adopt a more engaged and entrepreneurial mindset.

Our panel's review of the extensive written materials, videos, virtual site visit, and assessment of Engage's many activities on social media led us to the conclusion that Engage has become a world-leading centre for entrepreneurship education. Our panel's unanimous evaluation is that Engage has achieved the stated goals for its first five years, and exceeded expectations by pivoting and creating new activities to address the challenges of the Covid-19 era over the last ten months, for example by initiating entrepreneurship training for furloughed individuals and moving events into an online environment. Engage is a role model for other current and future Centres for Excellence in Education in Norway and around the world which seek to blend teaching, research, and practice, and through a multi-disciplinary set of stakeholders across faculty, students, staff, industry, and other partners.

Although located in Bodø (Nord U) and Trondheim (NTNU, TrollLABS, SparkNTNU, NTNU School of Entrepreneurship and Experts in Teamwork) – a considerable distance of 454 km by plane – Engage's leaders, teachers, staff, students, and other stakeholders appear to bridge the distance and collaborate as a cohesive unit, together with other members of their respective ecosystems. The panel, during our site visit interactions, was struck by a strong sense of Engage community, and a shared vision to develop through entrepreneurship. Moreover, despite the very different types of activities (e.g., research, lectures, new venture incubator, mentoring, etc.), Engage colleagues seemed to value one another's distinct skillsets and activities. The panel also sensed a very high level of support for Engage from the leadership of the two universities, an ongoing commitment to develop an entrepreneurial mindset and to place entrepreneurship education as a central pillar for the universities. The panel was very impressed by the last five years of results, and felt confident about Engage's plans over the next five years. Moreover, the panel felt that Engage also has a very bright future beyond 2026, and that the commitment to develop entrepreneurial education will live on in these institutions with younger members (especially the PhD students) going on to establish and lead their own well-run centres.

Engage is a dynamic, multi-disciplinary, and multi-stakeholder centre that follows a Challenge, Act, Reflect, Interact, and Embrace framework for embedding entrepreneurship in the uncertainty of the real world, and by working closely with others. It has developed many layers of learning environments, and an excellent culture for sharing these ideas across stakeholders. While all parties who participate

in Engage activities have a shared vision, they are able to develop and participate in unique programmes.

Evaluation of achievements of the first round of funding

The first round of funding has generated many successful projects that clearly meet the goals of the various stakeholders. We agree with an Engage stakeholder who suggested that an entrepreneurship education centre's success can be measured by the 'activity level and number of student/industry collaborations for instance. But also, story-telling.' Using these criteria, the panel were impressed by, for example, the involvement of over 2,800 participants in activities in 2019 alone. Our site visit unearthed many stories, for example that leading politicians on the national level have stated that "one can be depressed about the economic situation, and then you visit Engage [as an example of an entrepreneurial programme], and you become optimistic about the future again.' Moreover, these activities represent truly multi-disciplinary perspectives—for example, by including entrepreneurial activities in nursing, musical, and agricultural contexts, and across research, teaching, and practice.

Despite a significant level of success, the Centre leaders appear somewhat modest about their achievements, and willing to take on more challenges. One illustration of implementation of new activities is how Engage handled the high levels of uncertainty of the Covid-19 era over the last 10 months. Although outside the original Centre mandate, Engage created new programmes such as entrepreneurship training for individuals who were made redundant, and placed numerous activities online with new formats.

From conversations with the teachers, staff, and students, the panel concluded that Engage has a very high level of contact with all participants, most especially the students. Our panel was impressed by the ethic of care and mentorship, as illustrated by the comment that, 'We meet the students and we talk about how it's okay to also run into troubles in terms of facing challenges that they are not ready to solve... The other dilemma is how the students will use their knowledge in society when they finish their studies.' Our site visit with the students confirmed this perspective, with students describing Engage as a 'safety net' where one is 'never afraid to ask these people what I don't know' and another as a 'place where I could be creative, and is just very uplifting where I can get the support system to further develop my venture.' The students all described how they were able to play key roles in established programmes such as Spark* and Slush'D, but also how Engage enabled them to pursue bottom-up projects ranging from new research on female entrepreneurs to trying to set up a new 'Spark' in a different city. We were especially impressed with how Engage students had many great ideas about how to sustain Engage and broaden the ecosystems beyond Bodø and Trondheim. Engage's many pathways to recruiting students (including offering help to prospective student entrepreneurs, hallway signs, guest lectures in business and non-business classes, and advertised work positions) bring a diverse set of students who seek Engage. Our site visit conversations covered a variety of ethical issues of entrepreneurship education and revealed that all of Engage's stakeholders are actively thinking and acting on the best outcomes for the students and other stakeholders. Based on our review of the stakeholders' answers to our questions, we sensed a very high level of stakeholder involvement which also takes many forms, from book chapter co-authorship to visiting delegations.

Both the documentation and our visit confirm that during these first five years, Engage implemented a broad range of activities, and built an entrepreneurial culture that enables students, faculty, staff, and other stakeholders to work collaboratively. These activities do not appear to “compete” with one another, but rather address the multi-faceted pedagogical approach of engaging with doing (act), others (interact), challenge (real world), uncertainty (embrace), and learning (reflect). That is, there is something at Engage for everyone who is interested in entrepreneurship — from the high school student who joins a university hoping to start a new company, to the PhD student who is interested in breaking truly new ground on a research topic, and to community members interested in improving innovation in their organizations.

Evaluation of centre plan for the second round of funding

Engage has provided extensively detailed plans for the next five years of this project, and we are confident that their outcomes will be achieved. The Covid-19 era has necessitated some pivots (for example, less international travel), but Engage is well-positioned to continue to solve such complex challenges. Engage is already very familiar with the digital tools likely necessary in the coming months, but at a deeper level, the panel sensed a very strong commitment to building community.

While this second period will continue the many events, programmes, and other activities, a key piece is the dissemination of Engage’s experiences and tacit knowledge to help others around the world to develop similar centres. This dissemination is likely to involve research and practice publications, as well as videos and other means. We sincerely hope that Engage will dedicate time to disseminating the many innovations in entrepreneurship education to universities and other organizations around the world, for example by publishing the pedagogy and engagement in journals and books, and by applying for recognition, for example from USASBE, for its world-leading entrepreneurship education. As one of Engage stakeholder shared; 'A successful entrepreneurship education centre can demonstrate attractiveness both towards students and industrial partners. It should be a catalyst for entrepreneurship, by developing new methods and tools and by connecting actors to develop new ideas that can be turned into industrial innovations.' One measure of Engage’s impact will be the new ventures that emerge. The panel also highlights a recommendation from one of Engage’s stakeholders; “I would prioritize initiatives that trigger more entrepreneurial activity and accelerate sustainability and digital transition within the industry.” Engage has developed effective technical tools, and from the site visit the panel learned about new efforts to work with fisheries and biotechnology faculty.

The panel encourage Engage to develop best practices to scale their many 1-to-1 meetings with students, and to extend their ongoing conversations with Norwegian and European governments to build the 'Engage brand', and provide thought leadership on entrepreneurship policy, especially with respect to education. The panel encourages Engage to reflect on the entrepreneurial mindset, and value creation beyond economic manifestations in ways that include wider benefits for society.

The panel is confident that Engage will meet these aims. As one Engage leader shared in our closing conversation about the site visit, 'We also thank you for the positive feedback, but even better is that challenge where you point out where we can improve. We have big expectations for our students, and for ourselves. We need to figure out how to become even better.' That is, just as Engage teaches its students how to problem solve, Engage leadership is actively looking at the universe of

complex problems that require entrepreneurial approaches, and designing and delivering solutions.

The panels' recommendations

The panel is unanimous in recommending that Engage receive the second round of funding.

6 Centre for Excellent IT Education – Excited

Overview

Centre for Excellent IT Education (Excited) aims at enhancing the quality of education in their study programmes through increased motivation, engagement and collaboration across campuses. The Centre’s vision is to “put Norway at the forefront of innovative IT education and make IT an increasingly more attractive study choice for young people.”

More widely, the Centre aims at attracting a diverse audience to the study and profession of IT and increase employability through collaboration with employers at various stages of the education delivery.

To aid in the mid-term evaluation, Excited submitted annual reports that summarised the Centre’s activities to date. These were supplemented by a detailed self-evaluation and a forward-looking plan laying out intended activities over the next five years.

The evaluation panel had the opportunity, via a virtual “site visit”, to speak with Centre leaders, teaching staff members and students of the programmes. In each case, these conversations added depth and detail to the understanding of the Centre’s achievements. Statements from stakeholders were received and included in the evaluation.

All these opportunities of communication provided valuable information and contributed to the conclusions in this final report.

Evaluation of achievements of the first round of funding

The material provided for the mid-term evaluation (primarily the Centre’s Self-evaluation and Plan and the Annual Report 2019) was well presented, clear and comprehensive. The documents gave a good overview of past and planned activities. The reports were at an appropriate level of detail, and mostly well evidenced. The panel noted that some statements within these documents lacked foundational data and/or evidence. This, however, did not present a major shortcoming, and the panel was able to address the resulting questions in the follow-up meetings.

A limitation of the framing and context in the initial documentation was an absence of a clear definition of “IT education” as interpreted by the Centre. Following questions by the panel, the Centre addressed this question satisfactorily in its video presentation and the site visit discussions. The video presentation also added useful information concerning some concrete illustrations of one of the workstream projects as an example.

The written material documented an impressive list of achievements over the past few years. Most of the intended targets and milestones set out in the original plan and proposal have been achieved. In the written presentation, the use of a formal evaluation framework (Theory of Change) was very useful, and the associated diagrammatic representation provided a helpful overview of progress and dependencies.

Excited's five projects were well chosen, with appropriate topics and scope. Each project can point to a number of individual successes. It seems, however, that many activities consist of the application of techniques or material, participation in activities, or dissemination of material developed elsewhere. Clear and outstanding leadership in developing or delivering new initiatives is less obvious.

The interconnectedness of the five projects and their relationships was raised by the panel as a question after reviewing the first round of documentation. This was addressed in the discussions during the site visit, and the panel is satisfied that the Centre has clear and realistic plans concerning this topic.

Overall, the site visit discussions reinforced the impression of a very well-established, effective and well supported Centre. It is clear that the Centre leadership is closely involved and engaged, that the team possesses the competencies needed to run a successful centre, and that the activities are very well managed.

It was also apparent, importantly, that the Centre is well supported by the host institutions.

The report included examples of meaningful and very successful student involvement at a number of stages in the project; this is a clear strength of the activities to date. This was reinforced in the meetings with staff and students; both groups spoke persuasively about opportunities for students to shape and influence their education and their study experience.

The students involved in the meetings were very articulate and motivated. They described their experiences well and were exclusively positive about these. Most students could point to an aspect where the Centre has influenced their interests or study choices and described positive life choices influenced by their experience. The students were able to discuss their education at a meta-level and could constructively suggest additions to the programme. They presented interesting suggestion to broaden diversity, in various dimensions. The students were also able to give a good lay-person's description of the Centre and its role. All this bears witness to a successful integration of students into the vision and the life of the centre.

Staff members provided insightful descriptions and discussions about a variety of aspects, including diversity, dissemination and problems and opportunities provided by Covid-19. All these conversations point to a very well-established programme in which staff are actively engaged and motivated, with a clear insight into goals and strategies of the Centre.

Overall, the panel found evidence of excellent achievements fully in line with expectations and objectives set out in the original application and plans. The panel commends the Centre for a well-run project and impressive progress to date.

Evaluation of centre plan for the second round of funding

The plan for the next phase of the Centre, as laid out in the written documentation, appears reasonable, well thought-out, and was presented in an appropriate level of detail. The information provided showed evidence of a well-run project with appropriate staffing of engaged and competent contributors.

It is evident that much thought and planning has gone into the next phase of the project and the indicated transition from the five projects to three clusters. This shift

is well described, with an impressive level of planning in activities, outcomes and impact.

It is particularly commendable that the plan includes a section on the 'exit strategy', discussing dissemination, sustained impact and sustainability of results. This is an important aspect of the project and seeing this considered early in the project is excellent. There is opportunity, however, to improve on this aspect of the plan (see below).

Despite being impressed with the level of detailed planning for the next phase, the panel recognised some areas in which the Centre could improve its successes and its impact.

It is the panel's view that the Centre has the potential to increase its reach, reputation and impact if Excited were to undertake carefully planned activities to explicitly address these areas.

When asked, for example, about areas in which the Centre is world-leading, the Centre's leadership presented a realistic and honest assessment of the current situation: There is currently no clear area of the discipline where this is the case. The panel has, however, the impression that the Centre has clear potential to develop in a way to become world leading in specific areas of expertise, and would very much encourage the centre to increase its ambition, and to aim – with conscious strategic planning and dedicated effort – to become so.

It was felt that it would be beneficial for the Centre to set its sights higher than what is apparent at the moment, since expertise exists that clearly makes such ambitions realistic.

This recommendation leads directly into a second suggestion, which is closely linked: It would be good to see a more varied and consciously designed plan for dissemination, impact and influence activities.

Disseminating expertise should take on various forms, especially in channels that complement academic dissemination. Publication of outputs in academic conferences and journals are one important avenue, but this should be complemented by activities to disseminate practice and expertise outside the academic domain, and to aim at adoption of practice and at shaping education beyond producing publications.

It would be helpful to address this area systematically, including formulating clear measures of success, agreeing on metrics to monitor impact and influence, and assigning responsibility for this to clearly identified individuals or groups.

If addressed in a systematic way, we believe the Centre can increase its visibility and influence, especially outside its host institution, nationally across Norway and internationally. With appropriate planning, it is well within the reach of the Centre to become recognised as world-leading in selected sub-fields of practice and research.

Overall, the panel is confident that the Centre is able to achieve its current plans, and even to exceed them. We would like to encourage the Centre to aim high.

The panels' recommendations

Excited has performed admirably well in its project so far, has managed to build a very well set up and functioning Centre with good infrastructure, leadership and staff, and has realistic and worthwhile plans to move forward.

The panel unanimously supports continued funding for Excited in the next phase.

Appendix

Mandate for midterm evaluation 2020 Centres for Excellence in Education (SFU)

1 PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

The Ministry of Education and Research (KD) has delegated the administration of the Centres for Excellence in Education (SFU) to The Norwegian Agency for International Cooperation and Quality Enhancement in Higher Education (Diku). Through this initiative, leading academic communities in Norway are awarded resources to further develop their teaching and education.

Four Norwegian Centres for Excellence in Education (SFU) were established after the 2016 Call for proposals, with a funding period from December 2016-2021. These centres are due for midterm evaluation in 2020, in order to decide whether the centres shall be awarded funding for a second five-year period. Reference is made to 2016 Call for proposals and the contract between Diku and the centres.¹ The four centres, labelled by their acronym, are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Centres for Excellence in Education to be evaluated in 2020

Centre	University	Field
CCSE	University of Oslo	Computational science/natural sciences
CEFIMA	Inland University of Applied Sciences	Film
Engage	NTNU/Nord University	Entrepreneurship
Excited	NTNU/Nord University	Computer science

This mandate regulates the procedure for midterm evaluation of SFU centres, and rendering decisions with regard to continuation of the centres' funding. Such decisions constitute «individual decisions» under the Act relating to procedure in cases concerning public administration of 10 February 1967 (the Public Administration Act, PAA).

2 ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

2.1 Appointment, composition and mandate for the Expert Panel

Diku appoints members with relevant academic expertise and experience to form part of the programme's Expert Panel. Diku appoints the Chair of the panel.

The panel shall evaluate the four centres named above in item 1. The panel's evaluation shall result in an evaluation report with a recommendation to Diku's Board of Directors on whether continued funding for a second five-year period shall be awarded or not.

¹ The contracts in question were entered into between the centres and NOKUT in 2016. The contracts were novated to Diku with effect from 1 January 2019.

2.2 Decisions regarding continuation of funding

Based on the recommendation received from the Expert Panel, the Board of Directors shall render final decisions on continued funding of the centres for a second five-year period.

3 THE EXPERT PANEL'S EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION

3.1 Impartiality

Prior to commencing evaluation of centres, each member of the Expert Panel shall assess their own impartiality in accordance with Section 6 of the Public Administration Act. If a member is in doubt with regard to his/her own impartiality, Diku shall be notified without undue delay. The same applies if a member subsequently becomes aware of (new) aspects which may have a bearing on his/her impartiality.

3.2 Evaluation criteria

The Expert Panel's evaluation of the centres and recommendations set forth in its reports shall be exclusively based on the following criteria.

I. The degree to which the centre so far has delivered results, compared to the original plans, aims and visions of the centre.

Under this criterion, regard shall particularly be had to the following:

- The correspondence between achieved results and the centre's aims and visions; the quality and volume of activities contributing to excellent R&D-based education; the level of quality of the centre's work on educational development (excellence); the level of innovation in the centre's work with R&D-based education; the centre's ability to encourage student engagement and ownership of learning; and the presence of positive synergies attributable to the centre's status as an SFU (if any).
- The ability of the organisational and managerial structure of the centre to promote excellence in educational development; the level of support by the host institution management; the level and quality of cooperation with and contribution from partner institutions (if any); and the quality of systems for evaluating success and implementing necessary change.
- The quality, width and depth of the centre's dissemination of results (outputs/good practices etc.); the centre's role as a model for other educational communities; the centre's impact on development of education within other educational communities (within/across disciplines); the centre's impact on students' learning (whether at the host institution or elsewhere); and, the centre's impact on the wider society.

II. The quality of the centre plan for the second five-year period and the strategy for the continuation of centre results after centre funding ends.

Under this criterion, particular regard shall be had to the following:

- The consistency between the aims/results and the centre's planned activities; the quality of the centre's plan for responding to identified need for change from the first period; the level of ambition, innovation and feasibility of the proposed centre plan; the clarity, comprehensibility, ambition and potential of the centre's plan for increasing its role as a model, and for dissemination of outputs/good practices and an increased impact on other relevant stakeholders and educational communities/higher education institutions/the society at large; and, the quality of the centre's plan for ensuring sustainability of its results beyond the second period.

3.3 Factual basis for the evaluation

The Expert Panel's independent and collective assessments, and their evaluation reports, shall be exclusively based on information relevant for assessing the evaluation criteria set out above. The primary sources of information shall be:

- The Call for proposals from 2016, the centre's respective applications (with attachments), the evaluation of their applications and relevant contractual documents
- Site visit reports from 2018
- The centres' annual reports for 2019
- The centres' self-evaluation reports
- The centres' plan of activities and results for the second period (2021-2026)
- Statement about added value of the SFU from host and partner institutions
- Information gained through site visits
- Other relevant information available on the centre's web pages (e.g. publications issued by the centres), or as received from the centres or Diku.

Diku is responsible for informing the centre's of the requirements with regard to the centres' annual reports for 2019, self-evaluation reports, centre plans and site visits. Diku is also responsible for making the above materials available to the members of the Expert Panel. Unless otherwise notified, the material will be distributed via Diku's electronic system «Espresso».

3.4 Initial meeting for the Expert Panel

An initial 1-2 day(s) meeting for the Expert Panel shall be held shortly after Diku's receipt of the centres' annual reports for 2019 and self-evaluation reports. The Chair of the panel directs the meeting.

Prior to the meeting, the Expert Panel are expected to familiarise themselves with such material made available by Diku in preparation of the meeting, cf. above item 3.3. Diku shall make the material available latest 3 weeks prior to the meeting.

Within such deadlines set by Diku, the Expert Panel shall **(a)** prepare a draft evaluation report for each centre in such format as decided by Diku; and **(b)** a list of topics to be sent to the centres' in advance of the site visits. The draft evaluation report shall point out perceived needs for revision of the centre's plan (if any).

Diku is responsible for arranging and recording the panel's discussions in the meeting, and for communicating the draft evaluation reports and the question lists to the respective centres.

3.5 Preparation for and execution of site visits

The Expert Panel shall visit each centre. Each visit will last one day. Through interviews of centre team members and other important stakeholders such as students, staff, top management and partners, the visit shall ensure further insights about the centre's operation and results. The Expert Panel may request supplemental information about the centre prior to the visit.

Diku is responsible for scheduling and arranging the site visit in cooperation with the respective centres, for communicating the Expert Panel's requests for supplemental information to the centres and for recording the panel's discussions during site visits.

Diku is also responsible to collect final/revised centre plans from the respective centres (if any), as well as any comments that the centres' may have to the draft evaluation reports. Additional material prepared/collected by Diku during and after the site visits shall be distributed to the Expert Panel without delay.

3.6 Finalisation of the evaluation reports

A final evaluation meeting for the Expert Panel will be arranged at first convenience after all site visits has been finalised. The Chair of the panel directs the meeting.

Prior to the meeting, the Expert Panel are expected to familiarise themselves with such additional material as made available by Diku in preparation of the meeting, cf. above item 3.5. Diku shall make the material available latest 2 weeks prior to the meeting, and is responsible for recording the panel's discussions in the meeting.

Within such deadlines set by Diku, the Expert Panel shall deliver a final draft evaluation report for each centre to Diku.

The final draft evaluation report shall contain a clear and grounded recommendation as to whether the centre's funding ought to be continued for a second five-year period or not. The primary grounds in support of the recommendation shall be highlighted. If continued funding is recommended, the Expert Panel may also recommend that the funding is subjected to one or more particular requirements that the centre should adhere to (e.g. risk control, dissemination of particular results or other).

If the Expert Panel fail to agree, a vote shall be held on the issue in question. The Chair's vote shall be decisive in case the vote is tied.

The final draft of the reports shall be made available by Diku to the respective centres with a short deadline for providing comments. Upon receipt of the comments, the Expert Panel shall within approximately 14 calendar days make any necessary revisions of the report via circulation and deliver its final report to Diku.

4 DECISIONS AND CONCLUSION OF CONTRACTS

4.1 Decision

Upon receipt of the final report from the Expert Panel, the Board of Directors shall at first convenience convene to render final decisions on whether the centres shall be awarded continued funding or not.

Prior to the meeting, each Board member shall assess their own impartiality in accordance with Section 8, third paragraph of the Public Administration Act. In the event a concern regarding conflicts of interest is raised, the board shall collectively decide on the matter in accordance with Sections 8 and 6 of the said Act. Board members found to have conflicts of interest shall be excused from the rest of the meeting.

Decisions regarding impartiality shall be recorded by Diku.

4.2 Deliberations, voting and records from the meeting

The Chair of the board shall ensure that the discussions and decisions are exclusively based on the evaluation criteria set out above item 3.2, and that the grounds in support of its decisions are adequate.

A protocol of the board's deliberations and decisions shall be made by Diku. Diku shall ensure that the record aptly reflect any deviations from the panel's recommendations. The protocol from the meeting shall record the Board's decisions and the grounds for each individual decision. The protocol may be approved via circulation to the board members, in accordance with the Board of Directors' own Rules of Procedure.

4.3 Notification of decisions and conclusion of grant award agreements

After the Board of Directors have approved the protocol from the meeting, Diku shall without undue delay notify the centres of the decisions.

For centres awarded continued funding, Diku will prepare and issue grant award agreements for their signature as soon as adherence to particular requirements (if any) have been approved.

Review and follow up of grant award agreements and handling of appeals and questions concerning reversal of decisions, if any, will be handled by Diku in accordance with the applicable rules and regulations.

5 TIME SCHEDULE FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The following schedule covers the evaluation process. The schedule is tentative. Diku is responsible for informing all involved parties of any changes to the schedule.

Schedule	Event
15 January 2020	Information to the centres about the evaluation process.
1 March 2020	Deadline for the centres' submission of their annual reports.
2 April 2020 at 12.00 Noon	Deadline for the centres' submission of their self-evaluation reports and centre plans for the second period.
28-30 April	Expert Panel: Initial meeting
8 May	Distribution of draft evaluation report and topics for the site visit to the centres
15 May	Deadline for the centres' comments on the draft evaluation report
Between 3-8 June	Site visits
9 June	Committee meeting
1 September	Distribution of final draft of evaluation report to the centres for comments
22 September	Deadline for centres' comments on the final draft of the evaluation report
End of September	Expert panel: Videoconference meeting
6 October	Final evaluation report from Expert Panel
October	Decision by Diku's Board of Directors and conclusion of contract negotiations.



Norwegian Agency for
International Cooperation
and Quality Enhancement
in Higher Education



+47 55 30 38 00 | post@diku.no | diku.no