

UEF RESEARCH ASSESSMENT 2019

EVALUATION REPORT

Assessment instructions and criteria for the evaluation panel

The research community (RC) under evaluation is assessed as one, single entity. The research activities of the RC are assessed from an international perspective. The research should be compared to top international research within the same field of science, while paying attention to scientific characteristics of the disciplines.

The panel is requested to assess and give a numeric evaluation of i) the current research performance and ii) future potential and renewal and a written feedback and on the following aspects:

- A. Research excellence and scientific quality
- B. Research collaboration
- C. Novelty, societal relevance and impact of research activities
- D. Operational conditions
- E. Strategic visions
- F. Implementation plan

NAME OF THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

PART 1. EVALUATION REPORT ON RESEARCH ACTIVITIES AND PERFORMANCE IN 2015-2018

A. RESEARCH EXCELLENCE AND SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

Guiding questions:

Evaluate the RC's scientific quality, previous research and research outputs by international comparison:

- How does the research relate to leading international research in the field?
- Specify the current key areas of research excellence.

Indicate

- Current strengths, areas of development and recommendations.

B. RESEARCH COLLABORATION

Guiding questions:

Evaluate multidisciplinary collaboration of the RC:

- How does multidisciplinary collaboration within the RC support the quality of its research?



Evaluate the national and international research collaboration of the RC:

- Do members of the RC participate actively in national/international research collaboration with relevant and different types of partners (academic, industry, private and public sector)?
- To what extent has national/international collaboration produced joint publications and significant scientific findings?

Indicate

- Current strengths, areas of development and recommendations.

C. NOVELTY, SOCIETAL RELEVANCE AND IMPACT OF RESEARCH ACTIVITIES

Guiding questions:

Evaluate research focuses and their novelty and relevance:

- Scientific significance of the research focuses.
- Societal relevance.

Evaluate the impact of research:

- Has the RC's research produced significant new knowledge/innovations/solutions/patents for a) culture and society, b) economy, c) the environment, d) politics and administration, e) technology or f) welfare and health?
- Have the RC's researchers collaborated actively with the private and public sectors?

Indicate

- Current strengths, areas of development and recommendations.

D. OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS

Guiding questions:

Evaluate how the operational conditions promote a high quality in research in terms of:

- External research funding: To what extent has the RC succeed in obtaining national/international research funding and projects?
- Research personnel: is there a critical mass of researchers (including doctoral students and post doctoral researchers) and adequate expertise?
- Research infrastructure and facilities.

Indicate

- Current strengths, areas of development and recommendations.

PART 2. EVALUATION REPORT ON STRATEGIC VISIONS

E. STRATEGIC VISIONS

Guiding questions:

Evaluate strategic visions of the RC:

- Does the RC have ambitious scientific objectives and goals and innovative ideas for the future?
- How significant are the expected scientific outcomes from research in the future?

Evaluate future potential of the research:

- Is the research likely to produce new significant outcomes, scientific breakthroughs and impact?
- Does the research have potential to move beyond the state of the art?

Recommendations relating to future goals and visions.

F. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Guiding questions:

Evaluate feasibility of the implementation plan and measures:

- Are the strategic visions of the RC feasible e.g. in terms of the operational conditions (personnel, expertise, financial resources and research infrastructure)?
- How are the renewal of research personnel and the development of new expertise ensured?
- How viable is the implementation plan to reach the aspired level of research?
- Are the actions planned relevant and likely to improve high quality in research?
- Is the proposed schedule appropriate and well-planned?
- How does future collaboration or partners contribute to future success in research?

Recommendations relating to the implementation plan.

PART 3: NUMERIC EVALUATION

The panel is requested to give a numeric evaluation of i) Current research performance and ii) Future potential and renewal, and one overall assessment.

| CRITERIA | NUMERIC EVALUATION SCALE 1-6 |
|--|---------------------------------|
| 1. Current research performance | |
| 2. Future potential and renewal | |
| OVERALL ASSESSMENT | |

6 Outstanding

The core of research is of an outstanding quality, especially from an international perspective. The research and research environment attracts great international attention with a wide impact, including publications in leading journals and/or monographs published by leading international publishing houses. The research has world-leading qualities in the field. The research focuses, key research questions, scientific significance, novelty and relevance, impact and innovativeness are of an outstanding quality. No significant elements to be improved. The ambition to develop the research activities is of an outstanding quality and they possess huge future potential. NB! In cases where the research is of a national character and, in the judgment of the evaluators, should remain so, the concepts of "international attention" and "international impact", etc. in the grading criteria above may be replaced by "international comparability".

5 Excellent

The core of research is of an excellent quality, typically published with great impact, also internationally. Without doubt, the research has a leading position in the field in Finland. The research has world-leading qualities in the field. The research focuses, key research questions, scientific significance, novelty and relevance, impact and innovativeness are of an excellent quality.



No significant elements to be improved. The ambition to develop the research activities is of an excellent quality and they possess great future potential. NB! In cases where the unit's research is of a national character and, in the judgment of the evaluators, should remain so, the concepts of "international attention" and "international impact", etc. in the grading criteria above may be replaced by "international comparability".

4 Very good

The core of research is of a very good quality, such that it attracts wide national and/or international attention. The research has world-leading qualities in the field. The research focuses, key research questions, scientific significance, novelty and relevance, impact and innovativeness are of a very good quality. Current/future research activities contain some elements that could be improved. The ambition to develop the research activities is of a very good quality and they possess very good future potential.

3 Good

The core of research is of a good quality, attracting mainly national attention but possessing international potential. The research focuses, key research questions, scientific significance, novelty and relevance, impact and innovativeness are of a good quality. Current/future research activities contain some elements that could be improved. The ambition to develop the research activities is of a good quality and they possess some future potential.

2 Fair

The core of research is of a fair quality, attracting some national attention without gaining a wide national or international circulation. There is a need for improvement and research activities should be revised. The ambition to develop the research activities is of a fair quality and unrealistic.

1 Poor

The quality of research is poor and its results and publications do not gain wide circulation or attract national or international attention. There are severe flaws and a need for substantial modification. The research activities should be revised. There is no ambition to develop the research activities and implementation is unrealistic.