

**Premier Programme d'Investissements d'Avenir
Projets IDEX du PIA 1
Fin de période probatoire**

**Compte-rendu des travaux du jury
25/04/2016 - 29/04/2016**

1. Participants aux réunions

La liste des membres du jury est donnée en annexe 2.

Frédéric Farina n'a pu participer aux évaluations, auditions et délibérations du jury.

Philippe Gillet, après avoir contribué aux travaux préalables à la session plénière, a eu un empêchement de dernière minute ; il n'a pas pu participer aux auditions et il n'a pas pris part aux votes.

Etaient présents pour l'ANR, dans leur fonction d'assistance au jury : Philippe Cornu, Jérôme Ferrand et Farid Ouabdesselam.

Le CGI était représenté par Jean-Pierre Korolitski (non membre du jury).

2. Documents fournis aux membres du jury

Le jury a disposé des documents suivants :

- les dossiers des 8 IDEX déposés pour leur évaluation ;
- les conventions d'aide des 8 IDEX incluant les annexes 1 et 4 traduites en anglais qui précisent le projet tel qu'il a été contractualisé avec l'Etat ;
- les dossiers remis par les IDEX en vue de leur sélection avec les fiches d'évaluation du jury correspondantes ;

- la note rédigée par le CGI et le MENESR relative aux différentes formes de structuration en place sur les sites universitaires ;
- les statuts (donc les compétences) des COMUE portant les projets d'IDEX ;
- les analyses bibliométriques réalisées par l'OST ;
- les analyses financières conduites par l'IGAENR ;
- l'étude menée par le ministère de l'enseignement supérieur et de la recherche sur les lignes de force des ensembles territoriaux incluant les IDEX.

Les curriculum vitae des personnes constituant chaque délégation devant être auditionnée, tels que transmis par le porteur du projet, ont été fournis aux membres du jury préalablement. Au début de chaque audition, des copies – fournies par le porteur du projet – des diapositives de présentation du projet ont été distribuées aux membres du jury.

3. Processus d'évaluation et son déroulement

a. En préalable à la réunion du jury

Le jury, dans un premier temps, avait défini la mission du Comité de visite (dimensions du projet à examiner, délai et modalités de restitution), puis élaboré une nouvelle grille d'analyse adaptant les critères utilisés jusqu'ici (en présélection et sélection) à la problématique partiellement différente de l'évaluation des résultats.

Chaque membre du jury a étudié les 8 dossiers et en a fait une première évaluation individuelle déposée sur le site informatique mis en place par l'ANR. Cette première évaluation a été réalisée « en aveugle », c'est-à-dire sans possibilité de consulter les évaluations effectuées par les autres membres jusqu'à la remise complète de ses propres évaluations, et sans disposer alors des appréciations du Comité de visite, qui a travaillé en parallèle.

Chacun des trois membres du bureau du jury (constitué du Président et de deux vice-présidents) a piloté une réunion téléphonique avec un sous-ensemble du jury pour une première analyse des évaluations. Les trois réunions se sont tenues début avril, sans interaction entre leurs ensembles de membres respectifs. Elles ont été organisées par l'ANR.

b. Déroulement de la réunion de sélection

Le jury s'est réuni en session plénière pour procéder à l'évaluation de la fin de la période probatoire des projets, sur la base du travail préalable et des auditions.

Cette session a été organisée en trois grandes étapes.

Etape 1 : Organisation générale du travail (25 avril)

Point sur les conflits d'intérêts – Gestion de la procédure (voir ci-dessous)

Signature de l'engagement de confidentialité par tous les participants

Rappel des décisions que doit prendre le jury, avec référence à la note de l'Etat (CGI-MENESR) distribuée au jury le 18 janvier 2016 (« Note sur l'évaluation des Initiatives d'excellence du PIA1 à la fin de la période probatoire » - il convient de noter que ce document a été diffusé aux huit IDEX) :

- trois options : Confirmation, Extension, Arrêt ;
- le choix d'une option peut être accompagné d'avis, d'observations et de recommandations ;
- le choix « Extension » correspond au maintien du label « IDEX », la durée et le niveau de financement étant modulables.

Pour mémoire, l'objectif poursuivi était rappelé dans cette note : *« construire dans la durée une université de recherche intensive de rang international reconnue comme telle et dotée de l'ambition et des compétences lui donnant la capacité d'agir à armes égales avec ses grands concurrents au plan international... sa visibilité internationale dépendra de son degré d'intégration et de l'agilité de sa gouvernance et devra lui permettre de figurer dans les grands classements internationaux ».*

Point sur les propositions provisoires issues des téléconférences des trois sous-jurys

préalables à la session plénière

Les points de divergence et de convergence des évaluations ont été recensés.

Organisation générale du travail de rédaction

A partir des grilles d'évaluation utilisées respectivement pour la phase de sélection de ces IDEX et celle d'évaluation des dossiers de fin de période probatoire, le président a explicité la nécessité de pouvoir transmettre aux candidats des informations expliquant les propositions du jury et d'assurer la cohérence intra et inter rapports. Il est également rappelé que, conformément à la note CGI-MENESR susmentionnée, les propositions, avis et recommandations du jury seront rendus publics.

Aussi, le jury, à l'unanimité, a-t-il opté pour :

- produire, pour chaque projet, une fiche d'évaluation :
 - incluant une note, un commentaire et, en cas de confirmation ou d'extension, un ensemble de pistes d'amélioration pour chacun des 9 critères qui ont constitué la base de l'évaluation des dossiers ;
 - comprenant une section fournissant la décision principale, l'appréciation globale et les recommandations ;
- répartir les membres du jury par critère d'appréciation, en tenant compte des conflits d'intérêts. Cette méthode a été retenue pour assurer la cohérence et l'homogénéité des appréciations, les mêmes membres du jury effectuant l'analyse des 8 dossiers pour un critère donné. Le bureau du jury, quant à lui, a été chargé de la rédaction de l'appréciation globale et des recommandations générales.

Réunion avec les experts ayant effectué les visites des IDEX sur leur site

Le comité de visite au complet, constitué de Pierre de Maret, Jamil Salmi et Andrée Sursock, se joint au jury.

La réunion s'est tenue en deux temps :

- Présentation par les experts de leurs conclusions générales ; questions du jury
- Présentation par les experts des bilans des visites par site, et discussions
 - UNITI (Philippe Le Prestre sort)
 - USPC (John Ludden sort)
 - PSL (Jean-Claude Lehmann sort) ; discussion sur le non respect d'une consigne de rédaction par PSL
 - IPS
 - SUPER (Grace Neville et Andrée Sursock sortent)
 - AMIDEX (Jean-Claude Lehmann sort)
 - UNISTRA (Frieder Meyer-Krahmer sort)
 - BORDEAUX (Suzanne Fortier et Richard Frackowiak sortent)

Organisation des auditions, des délibérations et des votes

Auditions

Pour chaque projet, il a été décidé que l'audition se déroulerait selon les étapes suivantes :

- le cas échéant, le ou les personnes en conflit quittent la salle (comme ci-dessus) ;

- accueil de la délégation ;
- présentation du projet par la délégation (30mn – indication fournie à l’avance) ;
- séances des questions-réponses (1h15mn – indication fournie à l’avance) : questions générales par le président, questions spécifiques d’abord par deux membres désignés (une répartition des membres du jury est établie), puis par tout le jury ;
- remerciements par le président du jury – la délégation quitte la salle
- tour de table et vote indicatif sur la décision principale (30mn) ;
- retour de la ou des personnes en conflit.

Délibérations

Le jury est convenu de mettre en œuvre le processus suivant :

- pour l’examen collectif de chaque projet, les étapes sont :
 - le cas échéant, le ou les personnes en conflit quittent la salle (comme ci-dessus)
 - tour de table et vote informel sur la décision principale (Confirmation, Extension, Arrêt)
 - par critère, proposition argumentée d’une note par la ou les personnes en charge, tour de table (éventuellement proposition(s) alternative(s)), vote formel)
 - vote formel sur la décision principale par projet : majorité requise des 2/3 des membres du jury hors conflit
 - si la décision principale est « Extension », tour de table, vote formel sur les modalités de l’extension (avec ou sans financement et durée)
 - retour de la ou des personnes en conflit
- à l’issue de l’examen des 8 projets, vote sur l’ensemble des décisions : unanimité requise

Finalisation-validation des fiches

Pour chaque projet, pour chaque critère, la ou les personnes en charge finalisent la rédaction de la fiche devant être transmise au porteur. Une fois toutes les fiches rédigées, il est procédé à une relecture, puis à la validation par vote formel.

Validation des modalités

L’ensemble des modalités d’organisation du travail et de vote a été adopté à l’unanimité

Etape 2 : Auditions (26/04 et 27/04) selon l’agenda en annexe 1

Chacune des auditions a été menée dans le strict respect du temps imparti.

A l'issue de l'audition de PSL, le président du jury fait remarquer au président de PSL que le dossier présenté ne respectait pas toutes les consignes de rédaction et que le jury en avait été informé.

Etape 3 : Délibérations, rédaction et finalisation des fiches d'évaluation (28/04 et 29/04)

Un débat approfondi est conduit sur les propositions d'extension de période probatoire et sur les avantages/inconvénients des diverses modalités de modulation. A l'issue de ce débat, le jury décide unanimement que les extensions de périodes probatoires doivent servir à amplifier la dynamique et qu'elles doivent donc être courtes, avec une modulation de leur durée pour tenir compte des évolutions à l'œuvre et des engagements pris par les acteurs en matière de structuration, mais sans recommandation de réduction des moyens financiers.

4. Conclusions

4.1 Résultats

Projets proposés pour être confirmés par le Comité de pilotage (ordre alphabétique) :

- AMIDEX (Marseille)
- UB (Bordeaux)
- UNISTRA (Strasbourg)

Projets pour lesquels le jury recommande une prolongation de la période probatoire (ordre alphabétique) :

- PSL (Paris Sciences et Lettres)
- IPS (Saclay)
- SUPER (Sorbonne University)

Projets pour lesquels le jury recommande un arrêt (ordre alphabétique) :

- UNITI (Toulouse)
- USPC (Sorbonne Paris Cité)

4.2 Commentaires généraux sur les dossiers

La diversité des situations universitaires et la pluralité des solutions institutionnelles permises par la législation française, dont le jury était parfaitement conscient, étaient représentées à travers les huit dossiers qui ont été évalués.

Pour réaliser l'examen approfondi spécifique à cette étape de fin de période probatoire, et pour produire l'analyse précise permettant aux autorités publiques de fonder leurs décisions quant au label IDEX et à la poursuite du financement apporté par le PIA, le jury a disposé d'informations variées et détaillées comme indiqué dans le paragraphe 2. Le jury souligne le haut niveau global de précision des dossiers rédigés selon une trame définie à cet effet, ainsi que les éléments d'appréciation supplémentaires dont il a pu bénéficier avec le compte rendu des auditions conduites par le comité de visite et avec les auditions d'une durée d'une heure et quarante-cinq minutes qu'il a lui-même menées. Le degré de réalisation des actions prévues au projet tel que contractualisé, ainsi que la crédibilité de la trajectoire ont pu être pleinement évalués, formant ainsi deux axes d'analyses complémentaires.

Pour chaque projet, le jury a pu apprécier le caractère intégrateur de la démarche IDEX et l'étendue des compétences exercées au niveau collectif pour déployer l'ambition commune affichée, de sorte que l'analyse menée a finalement permis d'évaluer si la dynamique poursuivie sur cette période rendait objectivement crédible l'ambition de constituer un ensemble suffisamment intégré pour être reconnu à l'international comme une université de recherche (étendue des pouvoirs du président, degré d'autonomie de stratégie et de gestion, niveaux de budget et de ressources humaines, inscription des étudiants et délivrance des diplômes ...). En particulier, le jury a été attentif au fait qu'un processus de fusion (total ou partiel) ne constituait qu'une des réponses possibles, et que d'autres configurations pouvaient permettre d'atteindre l'objectif.

Enfin le jury a constaté des progrès en matière de « benchmarking » pratiqué par les divers porteurs des projets d'IDEX. Cependant, une nouvelle fois, le jury souhaite appeler l'attention sur l'insuffisante mobilisation des divers types de classements qui permettent un positionnement du projet et de son ambition plus complet que le seul classement ARWU (Shanghai). L'inscription dans un ou plusieurs des classements qui se fondent sur des données objectives (et non sur la collecte d'avis subjectifs et non vérifiés sur la réputation), permet de crédibiliser le projet comme un ensemble universitaire reconnu et cela constitue également sous cet angle un élément essentiel. A ces classements, le jury a ajouté également l'inscription comme membre de l'EUA (Association Européenne de l'Université) pour asseoir l'existence de l'université en constitution.

L'évaluation de chaque dossier a donné lieu à une fiche spécifique. Ces huit fiches, établies sur la base du référentiel d'évaluation du jury, sont réunies à la fin du présent compte rendu et en constituent l'annexe 3.

Annexe 1

Horaires des auditions

Mardi 26/04/2016

08h00 – 10h15 PSL

10h30 – 12h45 UNISTRA

14h00 – 16h15 AMIDEX

16h30 – 18h45 SUPER

Mercredi 27/04/2016

08h00 – 10h15 USPC

10h30 – 12h45 UB

14h00 – 16h15 UNITI

16h30 – 18h45 IPS

Annexe 2

JURY IDEX - Fin de période probatoire

Président

Prof Jean-Marc RAPP

Président honoraire, Association Européenne de l'Université
Recteur honoraire de l'Université de Lausanne
Président du jury IDEX 1 et 2 du PIA1

Vice-présidents

Dr Martha CRAWFORD

Faculty, Harvard Business School
Ancienne directrice de la recherche, Air Liquide et Areva

Prof Frieder MEYER-KRAHMER

Ancien secrétaire d'État d'Allemagne à la recherche et à l'éducation

Membres

Prof Yves BAMBERGER

Membre de l'académie des technologies
Ancien directeur d'EDF recherche et développement

Prof Beatriz BARBUY

Professeur, Université de São Paulo

M. Frédéric FARINA

Directeur innovation et partenariats avec les entreprises, California Institute of Technology

Prof Suzanne FORTIER

Principale et vice-chancelière, Université McGill

Prof Richard FRACKOWIAK

Centre hospitalier universitaire vaudois, Université de Lausanne

Président du jury IHU

Prof Philippe GILLET

Vice-président pour les affaires académiques, École polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne

Prof Maria-Theresa LAGO

Professeur honoraire, Université de Porto

Membre fondateur du Conseil Européen de la Recherche (ERC)

Prof Philippe LE PRESTRE

Professeur, Université Laval

Président des jurys Equipex 1 et 2

Prof Jean-Claude LEHMANN

Président honoraire de l'Académie des technologies

Ancien directeur de la recherche de Saint-Gobain

Prof Antonio LOPRIENO

Recteur honoraire, Université de Bâle

Président honoraire, Conférence des recteurs suisses

Président du Conseil de la Science d'Autriche

Prof John LUDDEN

Directeur exécutif, British Geological Survey

Prof Grace NEVILLE

Vice-présidente honoraire, University College of Cork

Présidente des jurys IDEFI et IDEFI-N

Dr Kerstin NIBLAEUS

Présidente du Conseil de l'Institut de l'Environnement de Stockholm

Ancienne secrétaire d'État de Suède à la recherche

Prof Gérard ROUCAIROL

Président honoraire, Académie des Technologies

Ancien directeur de la recherche, Groupe Bull

Annexe 3

Fiches d'évaluation des IDEX

Ces fiches ayant été rédigées en anglais par le jury, elles sont ici insérées dans leur version d'origine qui seule fait foi. Une traduction en est fournie séparément.

<i>Evaluation summary</i>		<i>Grades</i>
Research, education, and innovation	1. Research excellence	A
	2. Teaching excellence	B
	3. Innovation	A
Institutional transformation	4. Target university	A
	5. Campus and student life	A
	6. International visibility	B
Change management	7. HR policy	A
	8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)	B
	9. Governance and project management	A

Proposition of decision for the end of probationary period

Confirm

Global appreciation of the project and area for improvement

AMU has made impressive progress with institution-building (governance, HR, campus and student life), and has boosted innovation substantially. A more strategic and focused approach to international partnerships would be beneficial to raise international visibility, as well as to attract international talent. AMU has taken a number of important steps to reinforce teaching excellence (common policy, Excellence Academy label); results should be measured with KPIs, and the use of existing forums (ESPE, CIPE) to boost teaching capacities in English should be considered. Management and governance of the IDEX project has been proactive and forward-looking, but in the next phase of the IDEX, greater involvement of NROS and other partners in long-term strategies could help leverage IDEX resources.

Evaluation summary

1. Research excellence

Grade justification

The research potential remains strong. AMU's research excellence has improved overall, as reflected in the ARWU rankings, although Leiden rankings in chosen excellence areas are still disappointing. Support for interdisciplinary initiatives and risk-taking, as well as CNRS support, are welcome. However, the efforts resulting from the merger and from AMIDEX have not yet fully materialized, with little significant transformative impact in terms of number of ERCs and IUF, for example.

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

Continued attention to raising the impact of publications and the number of ERCs should be encouraged. The creation of research institutes as recommended by the COS should be implemented.

2. Teaching excellence

Grade justification

Strong focus on pedagogical excellence as a core concern: Excellent structures in place (including the CIPE/ Centre d'Innovation Pédagogique et d'Évaluation), an Excellence Academy, with a clear focus on ongoing evaluation of teaching quality; Teaching and learning enhancement committees set up; innovative reference data base of pedagogical competences established; Innovative science and humanities primary degrees introduced;

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

Greater use could be made of student evaluation tools, to refine not only programmes and modules, but also to recognize and reward excellence in teaching; Further work could be done on the development of IT tools, including MOOCs; Extensive work already carried out on streamlining undergraduate teaching offers should be completed;

3. Innovation

Grade justification

Significant progress in many aspects: number of patents, number of partnering projects, creation of an incubator, creation of one foundation as a merge of two preexisting ones, ranking of AMU among the hundred most innovative in the world.

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

Particular attention must be paid to start up creation as well as to ensuring a wide portfolio of innovation encompassing the various University domains.

4. Target university

Grade justification

Aix-Marseille University had just achieved the status of a single, integrated university when they were awarded the IDEX funding. Their IDEX has helped them solidify their foundation and further bring alignment from their community to the model and reality of a single university. It has also started to build a sense of identity in their community.

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

Continue on the process of bringing alignment to and creating a sense of identity with their single integrated university.

5. Campus and student life

Grade justification

Significant efforts have been made towards creating a dynamic student and campus life. Operation Campus has enabled a complete restructuring overhaul of the sites, libraries have been refurbished. Students associations are encouraged and supported, for example through The Fund for Solidarity and Development of Students Initiatives. Numerous sports actions and cultural events have been staged and an Alumni policy is being implemented. Mobility grants are used internally as well as externally.

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

Develop Key Performance Indicators to assess the quality of campus and student life including the sense of belonging of students.

6. International visibility

Grade justification

The internationalization process has achieved considerable progress especially at the doctoral level, with 70% of international doctoral students and postdocs and a successful policy of student mobility grants and

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

An important area for improvement is "Euromed", i.e. the strategic role of the University within its natural Mediterranean context. Although partnerships with the University of Barcelona, the University of Roma "La

<p>with a 3:1 ratio of incoming to outgoing students within the Excellence academy. Housing for international students has been made available. Also to be commended are the proactive pursuit of international joint masters and the bilateral relationship with the University of Wisconsin at Madison. Establishing 25 overseas labs is also a laudable, if overambitious, goal.</p>	<p>Sapienza” and the University of Tunis have been established, the concrete effects of formal collaborations in teaching and research remain elusive. A more explicit commitment to the global role of Aix-Marseille University could be reached by expanding the now meager instructional offer in English and by stressing in a coherent strategy the leadership vocation of this University for Francophone Africa.</p>
<p>7. HR policy</p>	
<p>Grade justification</p>	<p>Areas of improvement – necessary amendment</p>
<p>AMIDEX/AMU have been proactive in HR management and been successful in translating the IDEX posts to permanent posts, which is difficult in the French system. Tenure track of 2 years is implemented and planned to be for 4-5 years in the future. 25 chairs were created, plus 8 external rising stars, 17 seniors, upcoming talents (67 PhDs, 144 postdocs). Internal recruitment remains an exception</p>	<p>Exploit the full potential of the law in designing and implementing new mechanisms to attract and retain top talent.</p>
<p>8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)</p>	
<p>Grade justification</p>	<p>Areas of improvement – necessary amendment</p>
<p>AMIDEX has created a strategic forward-look committee with 13 business leaders and collaboration with business has grown, as well with the city of Marseille and with the Region.</p>	<p>Define a partnership strategy which clearly reinforces the goals of the IDEX. Give consideration to greater use of common R&D labs with external partners.</p>
<p>9. Governance and project management</p>	
<p>Grade justification</p>	<p>Areas of improvement – necessary amendment</p>
<p>Appropriate structures and processes have been put in place for the governance and management of the IDEX funding. The A*MiDEX administration appears to be efficient, responsive and well run. The AMU administration, on the other hand, having been built from the ground up in the last few years still needs to be simplified, as acknowledged by the AMU leadership themselves.</p>	<p>Continue on the path to build a lean, agile, efficient and accountable administration structure and processes.</p>

<i>Evaluation summary</i>		<i>Grades</i>
Research, education, and innovation	1. Research excellence	A
	2. Teaching excellence	A
	3. Innovation	A
Institutional transformation	4. Target university	A
	5. Campus and student life	B
	6. International visibility	B
Change management	7. HR policy	A
	8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)	A
	9. Governance and project management	A

Proposition of decision for the end of probationary period

Confirm

Global appreciation of the project and area for improvement

UB has made impressive progress in establishing an integrated university, with effective and efficient governance, and innovative HR policies. Concrete and measured progress has been made in research excellence, and innovation. Additional care must be given to campus life, and creating a sense of belonging among students and staff. Greater attention should be given to creating an international identity for the university, in part through strategic partnerships in excellence areas and a publications strategy. In the next phase of the IDEX, priority should be given to talent retention and career management strategies. IDEX project governance and management have been exemplary, and the use of KPIs should be seen as a best practice reference. In the long term, it would be desirable to increase the breadth of the PERIDEX, particularly by reinforcing the involvement of the human and social sciences.

Evaluation summary

1. Research excellence

Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
The merger has led to a substantial improvement in international rankings and scientific production, although room exists for further progress.	The UB perimeter would gain substantially from including the social sciences and humanities into a common research strategy. Enforce the common signature policy and improve PhD training.

2. Teaching excellence

Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>A clear vision for excellence in teaching and learning, underpinned by solid structures and targeted actions; 13% / 10M euro of IDEX funding dedicated to teaching and learning;</p> <p>Excellent support for pedagogical upskilling of teaching staff (uptake by 25% staff to date) via inter alia the University unit for education (MAPI);</p> <p>Support for pedagogical innovation via Imedialab;</p> <p>Commendable focus on on preparation of students for the international environment (for ex. the College of social sciences and humanities has internationalised a masters degree);</p> <p>Clear integration of SHS / 'SHS pour tous';</p> <p>Extensive English-language training for teaching staff;</p>	<p>Elaboration of MOOCs could be intensified – rather few at present;</p> <p>Elaboration of teaching and learning materials in English could be strengthened;</p>

3. Innovation

Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
The University has made significant progresses in its relations with industry. The IDEX partners created SATT Aquitaine in 2012. Its actions includes mapping of research activities, raising researcher awareness about the importance of exploiting their results and obtaining patents. The “UBFriendly” campaign now involves 70 companies and has many activities including fundraising, teaching entrepreneurial culture, internships in SMEs and so on.	<p>Everything seems in place to seriously boost innovation activity in the university. All fields should be considered in terms of potential innovation, the whole range of industries from health to legislative issues.</p> <p>The number of patents and created start-ups, although increasing, remains modest.</p>

4. Target university

Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
Although one of the original university partners left, the target university has been largely put in place, thanks to the merger of three universities, to form University of Bordeaux on January 1, 2014. Since then, Bordeaux INP and IEP have become formal associates (June 2014). Competencies transferred to UB include international relations, communications, research policy, and technology transfer policy. The Strategic Operations Committee of UB includes external stakeholders and partners (NROs, regional authorities).	<p>Going forward, it may be necessary to expand in the human and social sciences areas, to ensure comprehensiveness of research and teaching offer. There is a need to clarify how and when the UB seal appears on diplomas from member institutions.</p>

5. Campus and student life

Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>A number of measures have been taken to promote campus and student life. University premises are undergoing profound renovation under Operation Campus. The Ambassadors' programme promotes international visibility. An innovative and open digital campus is being built. There are programmes for entrepreneurial awareness and for art and sciences as well as numerous sports activities. New students, especially international, are given welcome support.</p> <p>A survey with 450 international students identifies a "dynamic campus environment" as a "watchpoint".</p>	<p>Develop a comprehensive programme on the enhancement of the quality of students' life and the campus with Key Performance Indicators including for students' sense of belonging and identification with UB.</p>

The students' sense of belonging does not seem sufficiently developed.	
6. International visibility	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
The IDEX Bordeaux has strengthened the historically low international visibility of its University through the development of a website and newsletter in English, the successful recruitment of international researchers, and a focus on the internationalization of doctoral programs. This process has also gained momentum through a substantial process of “internationalization at home”, including academic and administrative training programs with international vocation (<i>défi international, international pedagogies</i>) and the establishment of an international office and of a strategic committee.	The University should now on the one hand complement its regional leadership through partnership agreements with universities in the economically strong Basque country, which could also be interesting for innovation and for which European funds could be secured, on the other hand expand it by developing a cohesive strategy founded on a selected number of institutional agreements as well as a more intense offer of English-speaking curricula.
7. HR policy	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
IDEX funds have been used to boost HR: 22% of the IDEX funds were used to attract talent: 29 Chairs of Excellence were created. 58% of new comers are in tenured positions. CNRS has provided 18 additional researchers. HR process is centralised in UB. Flexibility achieved around the pay scales for scientists. Bordeaux is well positioned to develop as an attractive university and will draw people internationally and also researchers out of other top French institutions. However the university need to be provided with the tools needed to build a university with more autonomy.	Exploit the full potential of the law in designing and implementing new mechanisms to attract and retain top talent.
8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
Overall, UB has established excellent collaboration with the NROs, and is leveraging their resources. Strategic collaborations have been established with key universities. The external partners are well represented in governance and advisory bodies and industrial chairs have been created in IDEX domains of excellence. Numerous new economic partners have entered since the launch of IDEX and the private sector share of external resources has increased.	
9. Governance and project management	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
The UB IDEX project management has been done in an effective and focused way. The President of UB heads the project, and is assisted by a professional team of 15 persons. The use of indicators to follow the project’s implementation is to be cited among best practices seen in the IDEX, thus far. An Audit Committee monitors the use of IDEX funds and ROI.	Continuous communication regarding IDEX objectives and achievements is necessary, to keep momentum and focus.

<i>Evaluation summary</i>		<i>Grades</i>
Research, education, and innovation	1. Research excellence	A
	2. Teaching excellence	B
	3. Innovation	A
Institutional transformation	4. Target university	C
	5. Campus and student life	B
	6. International visibility	B
Change management	7. HR policy	C
	8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)	B
	9. Governance and project management	B

<i>Proposition of decision for the end of probationary period</i>
Extend for 1 year

<i>Global appreciation of the project and area for improvement</i>
<p>Overall, the IDEX funds have not served as a catalyst for institutional reform on a significant scale. The original IDEX plan has been largely put aside, with progress slow and piecemeal. Although the potential and the excellence of the individual members is great, the IDEX has not yet managed to capture and sum up that excellence, to create an integrated research university which can become visible internationally. Recent attempts (post-2015) to correct the trajectory have been positive, but are not convincing that the goal of the IDEX will be met.</p> <p>Therefore, the jury recommends extension of the probationary period for one year, by the end of which, the following topics will be clearly documented (if necessary within a modified IDEX perimeter):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An outline proposal for statutes of the targeted “integrated” university that would enable its creation (within existing or suggested future legislation). - A formal agreement of IDEX members, confirmed by signatures of their competent authorities, to build this integrated university. <p>These statutes and agreement need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ensure the adoption of a unified strategy for University core missions, - define the presidential authority and responsibility regarding budget and resource allocation and staff recruitment, - specify which degrees and diplomas will be issued by the target university, - ensure that the target university will fulfil conditions for international recognition (for example by the EUA, the U-multirank, the ARWU and Leiden ranking agencies). <p>These commitments will be evaluated.</p>

Evaluation summary

1. Research excellence	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
IPS research potential and accomplishments in science and engineering remain superb; over 15% of all research undertaken in France is carried out by participating institutions which account for 25% of all French ERCs. IDEX funds have been used to boost and complement existing LABEX projects, in the excellence areas.	It is necessary to further elaborate a common research strategy, and to proceed with the implementation of the transversal research institutes, launched in 2015. Clarify and implement the common signature policy.
2. Teaching excellence	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
Commendable major restructuring and streamlining of doctoral and masters degrees, leading to 48 masters (formerly over 300) in 8 schools, and 29 doctoral programmes in 10 research departments; 80% of masters degrees have the UPSaclay label; IDEFI successes; Excellent initiatives around student orientation towards programmes that enable them to reach their full potential;	A clear, common vision and strategy around teaching and learning for the IDEX period should be developed, to incorporate specific milestones; Further develop the plans that are in place, for instance for the establishment of a Teaching and Learning Centre (planned for 2017), and for the further development of e-learning; Further focus on human and social sciences, encouraging interdisciplinary approaches when appropriate.
3. Innovation	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
Paris Saclay has taken a number of positive initiatives to develop innovation and technology transfer at the level of the proposed new university. The SATT was created in 2014, with the “University of Paris Saclay” as sole university shareholder. A complete set of tools and processes to foster innovation and support transfer has been created. The IDEX has supported a very active student entrepreneurship center, resulting in the creation of 57 startups. The strategy emphasizes pre maturation as a way to accelerate transfer to industry. The IDEX appears to have played an integrating role, providing money to create common instruments and promote contacts with SMEs, which are still limited. The dynamic is good.	Given the size and excellence of the IDEX partners, achievements appear modest, both in terms of patents and start-ups. It is not clear that they surpass the collective output of efforts undertaken by the individual institutions already. Development of contacts with SMEs remains a challenge. Attention must be paid to mutualizing all potential industrial contacts that individual components of the university have so that everyone can benefit.
4. Target university	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
The Target University has not been achieved and its concept remains unclear. This may be due, in part, to the fact that the end goal –bringing together 18 highly diverse institutions- has been set without sufficient time being spent on creating a common vision and goals. Nevertheless, a lot of hard work and effort has gone into building a stronger core of committed partners and creating greater convergence. CNRS appears to be a strong and highly valuable partner in this exercise.	A strategic path towards getting a clear definition of their Target University needs to be embarked on vigorously. Several scenarios could be envisioned and assessed, including starting with a core to which other could join later on.
5. Campus and student life	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
A massive Operation Campus is underway with the objective to provide international standard conditions and facilities. Public transport to Paris is expected from 2024. A Central Learning Center has been set up and IDEX grants support students entrepreneurship training and incubation services. There is a common student card and a common digital strategy is being planned. Selected students come from underprivileged backgrounds.	Develop Key Performance Indicators for the assessment of the quality of student life and the campus, including for the sense of belonging.
6. International visibility	

Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>Many of the partners within IPS already enjoy high international visibility, but the Idex has not yet fully deployed its incremental potential. So far, the internationalisation process has been centered around two aspects: the merit-based mobility of doctoral students and the technical support for applications to European funding agencies. Because of institutional similarities, the choice of UCL as a benchmark is to be particularly commended.</p> <p>However, in order to achieve international visibility corresponding to its scientific strength, IPS has yet to develop a sorely missed institutional strategy that goes well beyond the local interests of the individual partners and focuses on a recognizable IPS-branding both for the purposes of rankings and in order to establish partnerships with international universities of comparable scientific prestige.</p>	<p>Improvement is expected in the area of international projects funded by the Idex, the present mobility numbers (167 incoming and 98 outgoing in 2015) seeming particularly low in view of the scientific reputation of the individual partner institutions.</p>
7. HR policy	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>No jobs have been freed up by IDEX funding. New staff are hired by HEI and not by the IDEX.</p> <p>Only 3 scientists were hired.</p> <p>The COMUE has not taken any significant step towards a common HR policy so far. Recently a human resources policy oriented towards excellence and attractiveness for 2015-2019 was defined.</p> <p>Posdocs were recruited with Labex funds.</p>	<p>The creation of U. Paris Saclay is needed, with a consequent common HR policy.</p>
8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>Most members of IPS already have partnerships with large companies (industrial chairs, research contracts, common labs). The IDEX period was successful in developing new partnerships. The IDEX has also played a strong role in integration and development of contacts with SMEs, by the creation of common instruments.</p> <p>Despite these positive points there is weak representation of the external world in the governing bodies.</p>	<p>Define a global strategy. Substantially increase the representation of the external world in the governing bodies.</p>
9. Governance and project management	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>The governance and management of the IDEX project has generally been effective and has led to some significant achievements, such as the restructuring of the Master's program and the launch of new research institutes.</p> <p>However, a solid governance foundation has not been built yet and is unlikely to be until clarity is gained on the Target University.</p>	<p>While it is perhaps not possible to build a strong governance model until the Target University has been clearly defined, some governance and administration elements should be explored and assessed so that they can achieve their own goal of having an "agile governance".</p>

<i>Evaluation summary</i>		<i>Grades</i>
Research, education, and innovation	1. Research excellence	A
	2. Teaching excellence	A
	3. Innovation	A
Institutional transformation	4. Target university	C
	5. Campus and student life	B
	6. International visibility	A
Change management	7. HR policy	C
	8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)	A
	9. Governance and project management	B

<i>Proposition of decision for the end of probationary period</i>
Extend for 1 year

<i>Global appreciation of the project and area for improvement</i>
<p>Overall, the IDEX funds have not served as a catalyst for institutional reform on a significant scale. The original IDEX plan has been put aside, and progress has been slow and piecemeal. Although the potential and the excellence of the individual members is great, the IDEX has not yet managed to capture and sum up that excellence, to create an integrated research university which can become visible internationally. Recent attempts (post-2015) to correct the trajectory have been positive, but are not convincing that the goal of the IDEX will be met.</p> <p>Therefore, the jury recommends extension of the probationary period for one year, by the end of which, the following topics will be clearly documented (if necessary within a modified IDEX perimeter):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - An outline proposal for statutes of the targeted “integrated” university that would enable its creation (within existing or suggested future legislation). - A formal agreement of IDEX members, confirmed by signatures of their competent authorities, to build this integrated university. <p>These statutes and agreement need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ensure the adoption of a unified strategy for University core missions, - define the presidential authority and responsibility regarding budget and resource allocation and staff recruitment, - specify which degrees and diplomas will be issued by the target university, - ensure that the target university will fulfil conditions for international recognition (for example by the EUA, the U-multirank, the ARWU and Leiden ranking agencies). <p>These commitments will be evaluated.</p>

Evaluation summary

1. Research excellence	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>PSL gathers very good quality institutions with an impressive record of achievements. Yet, the IDEX programme has so far failed to transform PSL into a world recognized research institution.</p>	<p>Partners should work to better define a common research strategy, with an emphasis on inter-institutional and trans-disciplinary work.</p> <p>Proceed with the creation of planned institutes, as well as with the swift implementation of a common signature policy.</p>
2. Teaching excellence	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>Pioneering, innovative undergraduate programmes offer talented/ selected students a rich alternative to 'classes preparatoires';</p> <p>Undergraduates introduced early into research practice;</p> <p>Novel interdisciplinary / multidisciplinary programmes, some of which incorporate research and artistic practice;</p> <p>Appointment of a Dean of Teaching and of a Teaching Council;</p> <p>Extensive on-line availability of lectures/ presentations (16 M hits on members' websites in 2015);</p> <p>Involvement of senior academic staff in teaching;</p> <p>Excellent staff:student ratios, small group teaching.</p>	<p>Strengthen integration of teaching offers across components to avoid current fragmentation;</p> <p>Some proposals could be brought forward: restructuring of undergraduate degree; uploading of 2k hours of AV teaching (planned for uploading in 2016-18);</p> <p>establishment of proposed Centre of Teaching and Research Excellence, major-minor system of options;</p> <p>Develop plans for common student evaluation procedures;</p>
3. Innovation	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>Significant increase in the number of patent filings and start ups created. Mutualisation of the ESPCI patent office, capitalising on ESPCI's acknowledged experience in technology transfer and patent management. Creation of a student entrepreneurship programme. Existence of a valorization committee to advise the president and the board of PSL on technology and knowledge transfer.</p>	<p>It is especially important to develop an innovation spirit and technology transfer competences in every component area of the University.</p>
4. Target university	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>Off to a slow start in defining and implementing its Target University, the initiative has gained momentum in the last 9 months or so, particularly through using a model of leadership where both "bottom up" and "top down" approaches have brought partners together and created a stronger sense of direction and commitment towards a shared future. While momentum has been built, much remains to be done, including more clearly defining the desired model of their Target University. At the moment, the model appears to be still at the level of broad principles.</p>	<p>Defining a clearer model for their Target University and getting support from the different "willing partners".</p>
5. Campus and student life	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>A number of concrete measures have been taken to enhance campus and student life. Student initiatives for culture and sports are supported. A symphonic Orchestra and Choir have been founded. The PSL logo appears on student cards and a single multiservice card is being developed. The PSL Alumni has been set up and common university degree ceremonies are being planned. There is an ambitious Real Estate Plan. Efforts are underway to improve services for international students.</p> <p>The sense of belonging of students has been evaluated and found to be "very satisfactory" but no data are</p>	<p>Develop Key Performance Indicators for the assessment of the quality of Campus and student life including for the sense of belonging of students.</p>

presented. The number of "true PSL students" is still marginal.	
6. International visibility	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>There has been considerable success in managing the difficult compromise between building on the strengths of research institutions with already high international presence and developing a common international strategy based on the new PSL brand: campuses of Paris Dauphine have been established in London and Tunisia, whereas other instruments are already administered under the common brand: partnerships with global academic players such as UCL, Cambridge and the National University of Taiwan have been developed, PSL mobility grants are used to attract international students and scholars, dedicated staff members provide support for applications to European funding agencies, generous funding is available for student and staff mobility, and instruction in French as a foreign language is provided in common. Selection processes are effective and directed by dedicated academic committees.</p>	<p>While many of the institutions composing PSL already enjoy very high international visibility, the branding of the IDEX as a whole, e.g. for the purpose of rankings, is still underdeveloped. Efforts to develop the common PSL brand should be continued, especially by supporting a central administration of international activities and by attracting students at the Masters' level.</p>
7. HR policy	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>PSL does not have a common policy for HR in all of their components. They have not used the recently created Comue to fast track a common HR process as indicated in the original proposal.</p> <p>The Excellence Chairs call for proposals was launched, and the Young Teams action started looking to build teams of doctoral and post-doctoral students. A Structuring Research call for proposals allowed PSL to finance post-doctoral contracts. At the PhD level, the Doctoral College coordinates the allocation of contracts to the doctoral programs, with selection based on call for proposals. IDEX has enabled an ambitious recruitment of world class researchers.</p>	<p>Exploit the full potential of the law in designing and implementing new mechanisms to attract and retain top talent.</p> <p>Accelerate the elaboration and deployment of the Talent Management Strategy, planned for 2017.</p>
8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>The socioeconomic-partners are in key governing bodies with high-level representatives and there are many business partnerships, but still a high potential for new partnerships. There is a positive investment by key partners in the IDEX.</p> <p>PSL has numerous initiatives in the cultural world.</p>	<p>While external partners are included in governing bodies, PSL members still function largely in an autonomous way and the partners mainly interact with the individual institutions.</p> <p>There is a need to better coordinate fund raising priorities, which has already been recognized by the IDEX members.</p>
9. Governance and project management	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>There are clear signs that support for the IDEX has been well used, as demonstrated by concrete and innovative initiatives, particularly in the research and teaching areas. Mechanisms have been put in place for the effective management of the IDEX project and resources. The model used currently of leaving many of the decisions in the member institutions while putting in the IDEX presidency full authority over IDEX funding, to be used as a catalyst for creating greater synergy and a sense of common purpose among the members, has helped them evolve. The unanimity rule for Board decision-making has been relaxed, which is positive.</p>	<p>Achieving greater clarity regarding the Target University should include developing a better articulated governance model and processes. Making explicit the principles and values that form the basis of the governance model would be constructive step to take.</p>

<i>Evaluation summary</i>		<i>Grades</i>
Research, education, and innovation	1. Research excellence	A
	2. Teaching excellence	A
	3. Innovation	A
Institutional transformation	4. Target university	B
	5. Campus and student life	B
	6. International visibility	A
Change management	7. HR policy	C
	8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)	B
	9. Governance and project management	B

Proposition of decision for the end of probationary period

Extend for 2 years

Global appreciation of the project and area for improvement

After a bumpy start, Sorbonne University appears to be getting back on track. Despite Peridex and institutional changes, IDEX initiatives to build a common culture and shared vision among partner institutions, through concrete actions, has begun to pay off. The jury remains impressed by the research excellence of the partners, as well as innovative programs undertaken to improve teaching. The new roadmap, which has been recently developed, appears to be realistic and feasible. However, its realisation is imperative, and should be monitored closely, particularly in light of the failure to implement the initial proposed project. Thus, the jury recommends that the probationary period be extended for an additional two years, to ensure that the target university is truly created as planned in January 2018. Intermediate milestones, such as the development of a common HR policy and budget, should be closely monitored.

Evaluation summary

1. Research excellence	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
The target university has a very strong scientific potential. Paris VI and INSEAD, as well as Paris IV are leading universities and schools in their respective domains. IDEX funding has been used effectively to develop leading – edge transdisciplinary research programmes and projects involving the partner institutions.	Take advantage of the planned merger to further expand interdisciplinary collaborations. Ensure the full implementation of a common signature, as planned.
2. Teaching excellence	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
Real progress has been made in transforming undergraduate education programs, as was announced in the original IDEX proposal. Development of common pedagogical resources has been sponsored by IDEX funds, and the use of flipped –classrooms and digital resources signals a commitment to innovating in teaching. NROS, external experts, and entrepreneurs are involved in undergraduate education, illustrating an openness to new methods and approaches.	Further expand teaching offer in English, especially at the Masters level.
3. Innovation	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
The Idex has launched several initiatives: the SATT Lutech; an incubator Agoranov; a multisectorial fund Quadrivium; and benefits from the knowhow of Compiègne. These advantages are contributing to Idex plans for a second innovation park in Paris. INSEAD and Compiègne have entrepreneurship programs; PEPITE is a program for student entrepreneurship. On the whole, SUPER has facilitated a much greater impact in terms of technology transfer, exploiting complementarities among members, and potentiating synergies between science, medicine and technology.	Everything being in place there is now room for even further improvement in terms of startup creation, licensing and deriving full benefit from an interdisciplinary approach. Support for involvement of students and professors in start-ups should be sustained.
4. Target university	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
There has been a significant delay in creating the Target University due to mixed commitments on the part of members of the original IDEX project. This resulted in a breakup of the original consortium with UPMC and Paris Sorbonne deciding to continue with the process using a new strategy. There appears now to be a strong will to move rapidly towards creating the Target University, as demonstrated by the very recent presidential elections, where both elected Presidents ran on a campaign platform that included the goal of a merged university. As well, the renewed commitment was demonstrated through joint projects and actions. The aim of a « one name and a president of one legal entity » seems attainable, particularly as the partners have little overlap in their academic fields and thus significant opportunities for innovative initiatives that will benefit them both.	Pursue vigorously the process to arrive at the merged university and increase both the breadth and depth of concrete joint initiatives that are the real building blocks of the new university.
5. Campus and student life	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
Several interesting initiatives have been launched towards creating a better campus life. There is a common students card and a common graduation ceremony. Part time student jobs have been created and entrepreneurship and innovation are supported. Student associations are encouraged and buildings dedicated to student life have	Develop Key Performance Indicators to assess the quality of campus and student life, including for the sense of belonging of students.

<p>been remodelled. Student housing is a priority but has been delayed. An international students' house is partially achieved. Merit grants for needy students are being deployed. The sense of belonging is, however, unclear.</p>	
<p>6. International visibility</p>	
<p>Grade justification</p>	<p>Areas of improvement – necessary amendment</p>
<p>SUPER has been very successful in capitalizing on the internationally recognizable brand “Sorbonne” in order to effectively merge the international activities of two universities. It has established both a Europe office, which has boosted success in obtaining European grants, and a common offshore presence in Abu Dhabi; has developed several new axes, especially in the direction of Singapore and Brazil; as well as strategic partnerships on the one hand with comparable Francophone institutions such as the universities of Montreal, Geneva and Brussels and on the other with top-ranked Chinese and Mexican universities. A strategic committee meets monthly to plan and coordinate international activities.</p>	<p>Further efforts should concentrate on developing a more cohesive international strategy focusing on priority targets and on securing a richer English-speaking offer</p>
<p>7. HR policy</p>	
<p>Grade justification</p>	<p>Areas of improvement – necessary amendment</p>
<p>SUPER failed to achieve the institutional reforms that would have led to a single employer, but they have reaffirmed their intention to do this in 2018. They announce their intention to place all HR functions under the President, and to define a shared HR policy. They have already used IDEX funds in creative ways and have attracted high-level researchers, the challenge now is to secure these and future staff.</p>	<p>Define an HR strategy for SUPER, post-merger (2018), which will leverage existing human resources. Exploit the full potential of the law in designing and implementing new mechanisms to attract and retain top talent.</p>
<p>8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)</p>	
<p>Grade justification</p>	<p>Areas of improvement – necessary amendment</p>
<p>Industrial Chairs connected with LABEX and EQUIPEX have been used to engage socio-economic partners and some joint labs with companies have been established. More specifically IDEX funds have been used to establish three industry partnerships programs. External partners are represented in only one advisory committee. Strong support from CNRS is an asset.</p>	<p>The representation of external partners in advisory committees needs to be increased.</p>
<p>9. Governance and project management</p>	
<p>Grade justification</p>	<p>Areas of improvement – necessary amendment</p>
<p>The governance structure of SUPER has not yet been fully established due to the slow start and change in direction. However, IDEX resources pooled between Paris Sorbonne and UPMC have been well managed to create communities through research and inter-disciplinarity and innovation in teaching. The new university will be a tool for further change. The governance structure of the Target University appears reasonable, with a separation of decisional and strategic powers from operational ones, the former resting in the presidency and the latter in the faculties and institutes.</p>	<p>Move quickly to put in place the governance structure and processes of the Target University. Continue efforts to increase performance assessment capacity and accountability</p>

<i>Evaluation summary</i>		<i>Grades</i>
Research, education, and innovation	1. Research excellence	A
	2. Teaching excellence	A
	3. Innovation	B
Institutional transformation	4. Target university	A
	5. Campus and student life	A
	6. International visibility	A
Change management	7. HR policy	A
	8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)	A
	9. Governance and project management	A

Proposition of decision for the end of probationary period

Confirm

Global appreciation of the project and area for improvement

University of Strasbourg had a head-start on most of the IDEXes that were chosen in 2012, as it was already a single university, the fruit of a recent merger of three universities. In addition, the project leaders have shown wisdom and deft use of international bench-marking and best practice sharing, to create and use IDEX tools (USAIS, IDEP, etc.) and leverage partners (INSERM, CNRS), in ways that other IDEXes can learn from. Planned efforts to harmonise and internationalise the teaching offer, particularly at the undergraduate and masters level, should be encouraged. Although University Strasbourg has established several tools to stimulate innovation (NextMed, KSILINK, etc.), start-up creation is still relatively low. In this next phase of the IDEX, administrative capacities and skills will become critical and may require reinforcement. Devising and implementing a top-notch global quality assurance scheme and the culture that will sustain it, are recommended. The jury congratulates the leadership team for its vision and effectiveness, in creating an institution which is well on its way to international recognition for excellence.

Evaluation summary

1. Research excellence	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>The IDEX has had a strong transforming effect; it has stimulated collaborations among laboratories, and allowed for the development of interdisciplinary initiatives. The University has made significant investments in research and developed distinct areas of research excellence, leading to clear positive trends in ranking.</p>	<p>Continue pursuing excellence in the social sciences and humanities as well as better integration of the various PIA projects. Devise appropriate means of retaining young talent.</p>
2. Teaching excellence	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>Extremely impressive record of achievement in evidence here: Strong focus on teaching excellence (as one of the University's 5 stated priority areas), underpinned by solid structures and actions; 20% of IDEX funding (12.8 M euro) dedicated to teaching and learning; Excellent, exemplary teaching and learning centre (IDIP) (individualised support for c. 200 lecturers/ 900 hours of coaching, 50 themes workshops in 2015 alone); Research on pedagogical practice being carried out; Teaching awards introduced; Demonstrable impact of teaching and learning initiatives on 15k students; Development of MOOCs; Rich development of SHS area; Mobility fellowships introduced for students; Skills coaching for athletes and artists among students; Impressive life long learning initiatives;</p>	<p>Could UNISTRA further push out the boundaries in teaching and learning by considering the development of integrated post-bac prepa and UG programmes? The work of the IDIP should be more widely known internationally in order to enrich the international scholarship of teaching and learning (publications, conference participation, website in English?);</p>
3. Innovation	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>Connectus Alsace is clearly a success. Reuter ranks the University of Strasbourg 88th in the rankings of “most innovative universities”. Entrepreneurship is promoted and collaborations between the university and industry have increased in recent years. However the number of patents and created startups remains modest by international standards and the potential for improvement is not negligible considering the quality of the research in all fields.</p>	<p>It should be remembered that the capacity for innovation is not so much related to the kind of research conducted, whether fundamental or applied, but to its quality and to the openness of researchers to the needs of society and the potential for practical application of their results. Therefore more effort could be made to increase researcher awareness about the possibilities offered to exploit their results.</p>
4. Target university	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>They had achieved their Target University before securing the IDEX label and funding. IDEX has helped consolidated their merged University.</p>	
5. Campus and student life	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>Considerable efforts have been made to promote the quality of campus and student life including extensive work on campus regeneration with upgraded services, alumni network, artistic and cultural events and top level sports. The International House has been created for international researchers and students. Scholarship programmes to attract the best foreign students are planned. The "Creative Thinkers" programme encourages extra-curricular experiences. The feeling of belonging has been reinforced but not really measured.</p>	<p>Develop Key Performance Indicators to assess the quality of campus and student life, including for the sense of belonging of students.</p>
6. International visibility	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>UNISTRA is one of the most active French universities on</p>	<p>Within the frame of a still missing institutional strategy for</p>

<p>the international scene. Founding its strategy on its natural strong ties with the international universities of the Upper Rhine region and on its membership in the selective LERU-network, UNISTRA has been able to quickly ascend to recognition as a comprehensive university with a highly visible international brand. Establishing USAIS has further increased the presence of top researchers of global reputation, securing the reputation of UNISTRA as international scientific and scholarly hub. The presence of an International University House adds to the University's recognition among international students and researchers.</p>	<p>internationalization, further progress on the way to becoming a truly global institution could be reached by focusing on selective contacts with peers and universities beyond the Franco-German context and on expanding the English-speaking offer.</p>
<p>7. HR policy</p>	
<p>Grade justification</p> <p>HR management planned with creative use of IDEX funds, and engaging leverage within the University and Research Foundations. Professors are to be recruited by USAIS. Most junior recruitments in two institutes (engineering and molecular biology). Strasbourg are in a very strong position to apply HR innovative tools, but in terms of ensuring stability of high-level scientific staff and to be able to compete with the Top 50 level of international universities, they are hampered by arcane processes of HR management in Universities.</p>	<p>Areas of improvement – necessary amendment</p> <p>We strongly encourage the French ministry to address this which will help all IDEX.</p>
<p>8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)</p>	
<p>Grade justification</p> <p>UNISTRA have created extensive collaborative ventures with the business world, with 784 new economic partners during the 2011-2015 period, creation of joint labs, etc. There are numerous cultural actions in the city and the region and external representation on the Steering Committee is good. NROS and academic partners are very engaged and treated as strategic partners.</p>	<p>Areas of improvement – necessary amendment</p>
<p>9. Governance and project management</p>	
<p>Grade justification</p> <p>The governance of Strasbourg University has had the most time to mature, given that the merger was achieved in 2007. The University benefits from advisory and decisional bodies and a strategic committee that includes local players and the main national research organizations, all of which provide a suitable set of checks and balances. This well-established governance structure gives confidence that there will be a considerable degree of strategic stability over the coming years. The leadership team is sophisticated, outward looking, innovative and effective. The IDEX is well embedded in the University and is used strategically to start initiatives and projects that will shape the future of the University. In addition, the use of the IDEX monies has been done in a transparent way and has been well accepted by the University community</p>	<p>Areas of improvement – necessary amendment</p> <p>They are already well equipped to stay on a course of continuous improvement.</p>

<i>Evaluation summary</i>		<i>Grades</i>
Research, education, and innovation	1. Research excellence	B
	2. Teaching excellence	B
	3. Innovation	B
Institutional transformation	4. Target university	C
	5. Campus and student life	B
	6. International visibility	C
Change management	7. HR policy	C
	8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)	B
	9. Governance and project management	C

Proposition of decision for the end of probationary period

Stop

Global appreciation of the project and area for improvement

UNITI has morphed since it was selected as an IDEX by the jury. It no longer resembles an IDEX, in particular because it refuses to define a perimeter of excellence, instead insisting that all institutions in the region be included. Some of the original project's most attractive features (eg, "Toulouse Tech" combined engineering college) have been abandoned outright. The COMUE, fully operational in 2016, has been used to establish a loose confederation of independent members, with no wish nor plan to evolve towards an integrated research university which would be recognized internationally. In the absence of a track record of success and a credible future, the jury recommends that the UNITI IDEX project be stopped.

Evaluation summary

1. Research excellence

Grade justification

Research excellence appears in a few selected areas but is not widespread and has not significantly benefited from IDEX funding. Compared to the initial proposal, the transformative impact of the IDEX programme appears extremely limited since it has been diluted into a much wider research perimeter.

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

2. Teaching excellence

Grade justification

Excellent resources such as the Plateforme d'Innovation Pédagogique and the Service Inter-universitaire de Pédagogie; A network of 13 educational advisors in place; Rich upskilling resources for staff available on-line; Strong impact of 2 IDEFI programmes in evidence (for instance on reducing student failure rates); PACES: a welcome initiative established to create a bridge between medical studies and engineering school for students who do not qualify for medical school; Clear interdisciplinary / cross-disciplinary focus in evidence; 3k days of training given to doctoral students; Need to strengthen and diversify functions of new doctoral school; Plans for evaluation by students should be clarified and strengthened;

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

3. Innovation

Grade justification

Toulouse is a major technological area in France, specialising in biotechnology and aerospace. The SATT Toulouse TechTransfer has become a key actor in developing relations between its universities and economic partners. The increase in number of patents is significant. However, considering the number of potential partners, especially SMEs, one would expect a greater implication of the university in the field of innovation. More emphasis could be put on teaching entrepreneurship to students; and maybe also to professors.

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

4. Target university

Grade justification

There has been a complete change in the definition of their Target University, from the original definition of a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary, research intensive, merged university to a “federal university”, which is in fact, today, a loose confederation of universities under the ComUE status. The rationale given is that the initial vision did not have broad support from the academic community. While the rationale is understandable, particularly given the size and complexity of the project, it remains that little has been achieved so far. Furthermore, it is still highly unclear what the partners aim to create together. The current proposed Target University, while comprehensive and inclusive, is unlikely to meet the goal of a world class, research-intensive university.

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

5. Campus and student life

Grade justification

The Welcome desk and the Toul'box are positive

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

<p>developments; There is an active programme around culture, science and society with impact on a wider community. Mobility grants have increased. Student cards have bi-appartenance.</p> <p>Students are recruited by each institution separately and there is no common student association.</p> <p>There does not seem to be any sense of belonging to the UFT.</p>	
6. International visibility	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>The international strategy of UNITI has created international outreach offices in China, Indonesia and Brazil, establishing formal partnerships with global universities and providing a support package for international students and researchers (<i>Toul'Box</i>). It is doubtful whether such a generalized approach can improve the international visibility of UNITI in the absence of a common policy and strategic vision.</p>	
7. HR policy	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>The federal university proposal proposes a decentralised approach to HR management with different units in control of the resource management (staff and funds) but with sharing of best practices. It is hard to understand how such an approach could be effective in achieving systemic improvements in research and teaching excellence, given that the IDEX budget is relatively small.</p>	
8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>Some continuous education projects in coordination with Airbus and others have been implemented. In some cases the funding by the IDEX for equipment has been completed by external funding. The enlargement of the perimeter of the target university will make it harder to develop effective and focused partnerships. Strong support from INRA is a positive.</p>	
9. Governance and project management	
Grade justification	Areas of improvement – necessary amendment
<p>Much of the decision making in allocating the IDEX funds has been delegated to an international arbitration committee (CAR) composed exclusively of external members. While this is described as a good model to ensure that excellence is the main criterion used for investing IDEX resources, it is symptomatic of a weak foundation in the current governance model, particularly as it pertains to achieving trust among members and a shared vision and objectives. It is not clear at this point how this will improve, given the size and complexity of their configuration.</p>	

<i>Evaluation summary</i>		<i>Grades</i>
Research, education, and innovation	1. Research excellence	A
	2. Teaching excellence	B
	3. Innovation	B
Institutional transformation	4. Target university	C
	5. Campus and student life	B
	6. International visibility	C
Change management	7. HR policy	B
	8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)	C
	9. Governance and project management	C

<i>Proposition of decision for the end of probationary period</i>
Stop

<i>Global appreciation of the project and area for improvement</i>
<p>Instead of completing the merger of universities that was planned in the selected proposal, the partners chose to form a loose confederation of universities, tied together by shared services and several interdisciplinary clusters. Today, USPC has no clear objective, target, or path that would lead to an integrated research university which would be recognized internationally. Furthermore, the consortium of members has clearly stated their intention to introduce no institutional change in the coming six years. In the absence of a track record of success and a credible future, the jury recommends that the USPC IDEX project be stopped.</p>

Evaluation summary

1. Research excellence

Grade justification

The scientific excellence of the USPC members is beyond doubt. Although the IDEX has successfully attracted a few top-level researchers and PhD students, evidence of significant impact as a result of the IDEX funding remains elusive.

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

2. Teaching excellence

Grade justification

High ambition and impressive work in evidence here: strong focus on pedagogy across range of activities (including research and internationalisation); Institut Innovant de Formation par la Recherche offers an interesting example of research/teaching/learning interface. Interesting initiatives in the health area (Alter-PACES, iLumens); However, a shared vision and strategy around teaching excellence across the various components is still lacking, which could lead to fragmentation; Work on harmonisation of practices in the 31 doctoral schools should be prioritised; Some interesting proposals especially at UG level have been postponed.

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

3. Innovation

Grade justification

SATT and IDEX were created independently but are now converging. IDF Technology transfer office also includes the university of Paris Est and Cergy Pontoise. Joint training and an inventory of competencies provide an overview of available talent and help create a unified information system common to all partner institutions. However global activity in terms of innovation remains modest, compared to the potential of the universities concerned.

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

4. Target university

Grade justification

The model of the Target University as a merged university, presented in their initial IDEX proposal, has been abandoned in favor of a new model of a “comprehensive unified” university. However, this alternate model does not appear to conform to an IDEX. In practice, USPC has taken form as a weak confederation of universities under a ComUE. The end goal of this confederation is not clear. Given that the initial goal required a significant cultural change within a highly complex environment, it may not be surprising that little progress has been achieved. It remains, however, that the initial goal has not been achieved and that a new ambitious goal has not been presented.

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

5. Campus and student life

Grade justification

Extensive efforts have been made to invest in "student experience" through the Office for Campus life and based on student surveys. Student engagement is fostered through the Student Initiative Fund and the University Incubator funds projects proposed by students. A variety of sporting and cultural activities are available. There is a

Areas of improvement – necessary amendment

<p>common student card and common graduation ceremonies are planned. Disadvantaged students get special support. However, the students are still registered at the HEI:s and there does not seem to be any really cohesive campus culture and sense of belonging.</p>	
<p>6. International visibility</p>	
<p>Grade justification</p>	<p>Areas of improvement – necessary amendment</p>
<p>While the attention devoted to global issues should be commended, USPC still lacks a cohesive strategy for internationalization and thus remains at a lower level of global visibility than could be expected from a group of research-intensive institutions. The criteria underlying the choice and the role of the three international offices (Singapore, Sao Paulo and Buenos Aires) remains elusive and the slow progress in establishing an institutional strategy is disappointing.</p>	
<p>7. HR policy</p>	
<p>Grade justification</p>	<p>Areas of improvement – necessary amendment</p>
<p>Chairs of excellence were created, and tenure track was implemented. However, hiring is carried out by individual HEI. Other posts such as support staff are defined at USPC level. In last years 20% of professors were recruited in direct connexion with IDEX. No common HR policy was established.</p>	
<p>8. Partnerships (academic, NROs, business)</p>	
<p>Grade justification</p>	<p>Areas of improvement – necessary amendment</p>
<p>The development of new partnerships at USPC level was not a priority as identified in their documents. Although income from private contracts has significantly increased, the potential of the huge reservoir of competencies of USPC members remains largely unexploited. The LABEX have shown the potential to engage socio-economic nd NRO partners is big; the IDEX has so far failed to harness this potential.</p>	
<p>9. Governance and project management</p>	
<p>Grade justification</p>	<p>Areas of improvement – necessary amendment</p>
<p>USPC has adopted a model of governance that is based on the principles of solidarity, subsidiarity and transparency. These are sound principles to embed in the governance foundation. However, there does not appear to be significant achievements to date in implementing concrete processes and structures to be used for joint decision making, management and accountability beyond some fairly modest initiatives such as shared services centres, IT infrastructure and a limited common HR policy. The aim to build lean governance that is efficient and robust is laudable. However, it is not apparent that it has been achieved given several reported delays, operational obstacles and generally slow progress.</p>	