

Quality and Renewal 2017 (Q&R17) at Uppsala University – instructions for evaluation panel

1. Terms of reference for expert panels

The present document describes the *Terms of Reference* to be used by the expert panels engaged in the research evaluation Q&R17 (in Swedish KoF17).

1.1 Background

The University is divided into three broad disciplinary domains, comprising nine faculties and about 60 departments located in a number of research and education campus areas.

A few facts (as of 2016) are the following:

- Three disciplinary domains: Humanities and Social Sciences, Medicine and Pharmacy, and Science and Technology
- Education and research across about 50 departments divided into nine faculties; theology, law, arts, languages, social sciences, educational sciences, medicine, pharmacy, and science and technology
- 70 study programs at Bachelors' level, 70 at Master's level and approximately 2000 freestanding courses. Of these 50 international master programs and nearly 800 freestanding courses taught in English.
- 43 519 registered students, corresponding to 23 734 full-time students (5 743 at Master's level, 23%)
- Student exchange agreements with nearly 500 universities in 50 countries
- Postgraduate education includes 2 289 doctoral students, and 389 doctoral degrees are conferred each year
- 5600 peer-reviewed scientific publications per year
- 3 607 teachers and researchers
- 584 full professors
- Turnover 2016 of 6,6 billion SEK (€698 million); 70% of which for PhD studies

The present research evaluation is initiated by the Vice-chancellor and includes 54 evaluation units (mostly departments and centers) engaged in research.

1.2 Objectives of the evaluation

Q&R17 is the third comprehensive research evaluation of Uppsala University as a whole, following Q&R07 (conducted in 2006-2007) and Q&R11 (conducted in 2010-2011).

The overall purpose of Q&R17 is to enhance the quality of the University's research by creating a foundation for development measures.

The purpose of this evaluation is not to grade research quality/research output per se, but to analyse *preconditions and processes for good quality and strategic renewal of research*. Q&R17 is expected to generate an increased awareness of aspects of the research environment that should be actively

maintained and aspects that should be further developed or changed. *Do the University's research environments function so as to provide good preconditions for high-quality research? Are they characterised by processes that drive quality and renewal?* In contrast, both Q&R07 and Q&R11 primarily - if not exclusively - focused on research results. Q&R17 does primarily - if not exclusively - focus on prerequisites and processes.

The research evaluation is expected to give the University's research environments an opportunity to further develop their systematic work on quality assurance and enhancement and their capacity for renewal. This design means that the evaluation is *more enhancement-led than control-oriented*. It is also intended to serve as decision-making support by providing data for use in strategic development work at different organizational levels within the University.

Hence, it is expected that Q&R17 will result in increased knowledge about the strengths and weaknesses of the University's research environments, derived in part from the analysis and reflection involved in the self-evaluation, and in part from feedback and recommendations from external peers.

The insights gained from the evaluation is believed to lead to a further development of the quality culture in the local research environments. For example, individual researchers in the environment might decide to increase their involvement in and contribution to seminars, or become better at supporting young researchers in their day-to-day activities.

The evaluation is also expected to lead to systematic action – and this will make demands on the academic leadership. The impact of the evaluation will largely be determined by the ability and the willingness of the leadership to follow up on the results actively and use them as a starting point for further development, and as support in their decision-making. This applies to collegial bodies at all levels, and to individuals ranging from research group leaders to heads of department, deans, vice-rectors and the Vice-Chancellor.

The impact of the evaluation will be visible in the disciplinary domains' and faculties' response to the evaluation results. Concrete measures will be presented in operational plans for 2018, and will be subsequently be followed up in annual operational reports (including Uppsala University's annual report), and in disciplinary domain dialogues until they have been implemented. Discussion of joint challenges, and sharing of good practice across the university will also be facilitated. The Vice-Chancellor's instructions call for collegial exchanges between the disciplinary domains/faculties after Q&R17 has been carried out, and the report has been submitted to the Vice-Chancellor. The precise arrangements for these post-evaluation activities will be determined in dialogue with the disciplinary domains and faculties.

1.3 Method of evaluation

For the purpose of the evaluation, 54 evaluation units (in most cases departments) have been identified and grouped into 19 clusters, each evaluated by one panel. A cluster may consist of one large department (sometimes divided into sub-units) or several smaller departments. Each of the 19 panels consist of 6-8 highly regarded international experts that evaluate and elucidate the research environments based on a five-day site visit. Each panel has an international Chair and a group of experts including a 'researcher on research' panelist. It also has a representative from another Swedish university who can assist in matters that require context specific knowledge and insight (see more about the role of the expert panel in section 1.5). A local "panel guide" will support the panel in practical matters during the visit.

The panel members will receive background material in advance consisting of:

- Results from an *online survey* focusing on the research environment, addressed to research active staff (incl. PhD students)
- Results from a *bibliometric analysis*
- A *sheet with basic data* (facts and figures regarding each evaluation units personnel, economy etc)
- A *self-evaluation* provided by the evaluation unit (a description of academic culture, networks and collaborations, recruitment, leadership, infrastructure, funding, publication etc)

The survey results, bibliometric data and sheet with basic data have served as a basis for the self-evaluation, which aim for constructive, critical self-reflection. Please note that research results in the form of bibliometrics are included in the evaluation as a point of reference, not as a basis for 'grading'.

The chair of the panel can make requests for complementary information. This information is given if possible according to time and availability. If you want additional information, please contact the member of the KoF17-working group that relates to the scientific domain in question:

- Humanities and Social Science: Katarina Westerlund (katarina.westerlund@uadm.uu.se) phone: +46 70 425 00 19
- Science and Technology: Per Andersson (per.andersson@uadm.uu.se) phone: +46 70 167 91 96
- Medicine and Pharmacy: Martin Wahlén (martin.wahlen@uadm.uu.se) phone: +46 70 167 95 66

1.4 Evaluation criteria

The basic unit for *collection* of background material is a department or a centre, and this is also the basic unit for *evaluation*. Departments are grouped together to represent a research area that can be evaluated by one expert panel.

Unlike earlier research evaluations at Uppsala University (Q&R07 and Q&R11) there will be no grading of research quality in Q&R17. The Q&R17 evaluation is enhancement-led and aims at development of the University's research environments. The panels are asked to identify, observe and reflect upon strengths and weaknesses in the research environments and make recommendations for positive development to strengthen research environments and renewal of research (see section '2Instructions for panel report').

In the instructions for the self-evaluation (directed to the evaluation units), it is stated that "a good self-evaluation is truly self-critical and reflective". It is furthermore stated that "the ability to reflect upon one's own actions and activities in a nuanced way will provide the best basis for continued quality enhancement". Since the evaluation units are encouraged to be open, and to address both their strengths and weaknesses, it is important that doing so will not backlash. The panels are therefore asked to also evaluate *the evaluation unit's capacity for critical self-reflection*, including the ability to bring deficiencies to the surface. This means that self-identified deficiencies should not be regarded as weaknesses unless there is no – or unsatisfactory – note on the evaluation unit's readiness to deal with them, e.g. by describing already taken or planned actions.

1.5 The role of the panel

The panel should work as a group to attain collective assessments, at the same time making use of the complementary expertise among the members. In each panel you will find a chair, a 'researcher on research' expert together with a number of field experts. The panel also has one representative from another Swedish university who can assist in matters that require knowledge and insight in e. g. the Swedish university sector and research funding practices.

All panelists have to strive for a well-adjusted contribution to the work of the panel (see section 1.6 Characteristics of a good panelist). The panel members are to serve as panel experts and as such you will:

- Serve on the panel and thereby contribute in the enhancement-led evaluation on research environments at Uppsala University
- Contribute to the writing of the panel report
- Provide preliminary feedback to the research environments on the last day of the site visit

In addition to serving as an expert, *the Chair* will be coordinating the work of the panel and take the responsibility for the final report. The chair will also provide preliminary feedback to the management of disciplinary domains and faculties as well as to the University management and the Q&R17 project team. The Chair of the panel have a responsibility to ensure that the work of the panel is carried out professionally.

Given that Q&R17 focuses on the conditions and the processes that contribute to the creation of high quality research environments, we have invited '*researchers on research*' experts to serve on the panels in addition to experts within the respective field. The purpose is to complement the panels' experience-based knowledge about research environments with research-based knowledge about the preconditions and processes that influence research quality. The main idea is that the 'research on research' experts will contribute to the panels' discussions with their expertise, and thereby facilitate both meta-reflections on and in depth analysis of the conditions and processes that make up the evaluation unit's research environment. In addition to serving as a panel expert, the

'researchers on research' expert will, together with the panel chairs, provide preliminary feedback to vice rectors and deans of the disciplinary domains and faculties on the last day of the visit.

As all panelists, the 'researcher on research' have to strive for a well-adjusted contribution to the work of the panel (see section 1.6 about characteristics of a good panelist).

1.6 Characteristics of a good panelist

We have reason to believe that our carefully selected panelists will contribute to a constructive climate in their respective panels, meaning that you will all share the characteristics of a good panelist according to Lamont in her research on grant panels (Lamont 2009). A good panelist shows up fully prepared, demonstrates intellectual breadth and expertise, is succinct, speaks across disciplinary boundaries, and respects the other panelists' expertise and sentiments. Sound panel deliberations also follow the rule of deferring to expertise and observing disciplinary sovereignty. Good panelists defer to the expertise of others if they are not competent themselves, and follow the rule of cognitive contextualization, i.e. they recognize that different standards should be applied to different disciplines. In particular, multidisciplinary panels may have to make explicit their shared perspectives as well as their differences. Finally, a well-functioning panel maintains collegiality. They may occasionally engage in dynamic discussions, but they always keep a respectful tone.

Most of what Lamont have identified as important for a panel to be well-functioning is applicable to Q&R17, but there is one major difference. Since KoF17 focuses on the quality of research environments rather than quality of research itself, it is reasonable to believe that there will be more commonalities between disciplines, and easier to share experiences and knowledge across them. Aspects on research environments are prone to be more generic than aspects of research within different disciplines. This means that an openness for learning across disciplines should be the hallmark of Q&R17. Cognitive contextualization will still be of importance, but less so than in a traditional research assessment exercise focusing on research per se.

1.7 Working arrangements of expert panels

During the first day of the visit an introduction will be given and time will be allocated to plan the work during the visit. The panel chair coordinates the work of the panel and is also responsible for coordinating the writing of the panel report. A template for the panel report is provided and time will be given to work on the report during the visit. The report should primarily focus on identifying strengths and weaknesses of the research environment in question, as well as on providing recommendations for future development.

The site visits will take place in one of two consecutive weeks, depending on panel. The first visit is on May 8-12 2017; the second on May 15-19 2017.

One panel are free to communicate with other panels during the KoF17-work. In the table below you find contact information to each panel's chair and researcher on research. You also find the e-mail address to your local panel guide.

Humanities and Social Sciences				
Panel 1				

Chair	Joseph Salmons	Univ of Wisconsin	USA	jsalmons@wisc.edu
Researcher on research	Jürgen Enders	Univ of Bath School of Management	UK	j.enders@bath.ac.uk
Panel guide	Birgitta Hellqvist	Uppsala University	Sweden	birgitta.hellqvist@uadm.uu.se
Panel 2				
Chair	Helge Jordheim	Oslo universitet	Norway	helge.jordheim@ikos.uio.no
Researcher on research	Mats Benner	Lunds univ	Sweden	mats.benner@fek.lu.se
Panel guide	Sara Lilja Visén	Uppsala University	Sweden	sara.lilja_visen@uadm.uu.se
Panel 3				
Chair	Ray Hudson	Durham univ	UK	ray.hudson@durham.ac.uk
Researcher on research	Gili Drori	Hebrew univ of Jerusalem	Israel	gili.drori@mail.huji.ac.il
Panel guide	Linda Stafbom	Uppsala University	Sweden	linda.stafbom@uadm.uu.se
Panel 4				
Chair	Martin Caraher	City univ London	UK	m.caraher@city.ac.uk
Researcher on research	Lisa Husu	Örebro University	Sweden	Lisa.husu@oru.se
Panel guide	Anna-Sofia Hedberg	Uppsala University	Sweden	anna_sofia.hedberg@uadm.uu.se
Panel 5				
Chair	Peter Munk Christiansen	Aarhus univ	Denmark	PMC@ps.au.dk
Researcher on research	Karin Widerberg	Oslo univ	Norway	karin.widerberg@sosgeo.uio.no
Panel guide	Fredrik Andersson	Uppsala University	Sweden	fredrik.andersson@uadm.uu.se
Panel 6				
Chair	Margot Finn	Univ college London	UK	m.finn@ucl.ac.uk
Researcher on research	Sven-Eric Liedman	Göteborgs univ	Sweden	sven-eric.liedman@idehist.gu.se
Panel guide	Katarina Westerlund	Uppsala University	Sweden	katarina.westerlund@uadm.uu.se
Panel 7				
Chair	Hans Petter Graver	Oslo univ	Norway	h.p.graver@jus.uio.no
Researcher on research	Rickard Danell	Umeå universitet	Sweden	rickard.danell@umu.se
Panel guide	Ulrika Wallenquist	Uppsala University	Sweden	ulrika.wallenquist@uadm.uu.se
Science and Technologies				
Panel 8				
Chair	Helge Holden	Norwegian University of Science and Technology	Norge	holden@math.ntnu.no
Researcher on research	Duncan Lawson	Newman univ	UK	d.lawson@newman.ac.uk
Panel guide	Eva Pålsgård	Uppsala University	Sweden	eva.palsgard@uadm.uu.se
Panel 9				

Chair	Chi-Chang Kao	Stanford University/SLAC	USA	CKao@slac.stanford.edu; andrear@slac.stanford.edu
Researcher on research	Pat O'connor	University of Limerick	Ireland	Pat.Oconnor@ul.ie
Panel guide	Björn Gålnander	Uppsala University	Sweden	bjorn.galnander@uadm.uu.se
Panel 10				
Chair	Torbjörn Digernes	Norwegian University of Science and Technology	Norway	torbjorn.digernes@ntnu.no
Researcher on research	Per Eriksson	Lunds universitet	Sweden	per.eriksson@eit.lth.se
Panel guide	Ylva Bäcklund	Uppsala University	Sweden	ylva.backlund@uadm.uu.se
Panel 11				
Chair	Thomas Bjørnholm	University of Copenhagen	Denmark	prorector-research@adm.ku.dk; lbro@adm.ku.dk
Researcher on research	Thomas Heinze	Bergische Universität	Germany	theinze@uni-wuppertal.de
Panel guide	Carmen Medina	Uppsala University	Sweden	carmen.medina@uadm.uu.se
Panel 12				
Chair	Klement Tockner	Leibniz-Institute of Freshwater Ecology and Inland Fisheries (IGB), President of the Austrian Science Fund – FWF	Germany	tockner@igb-berlin.de; klement.tockner@fwf.ac.at; himali.pathirana@fwf.ac.at
Researcher on research	Sverker Sörlin	KTH Royal Institute of Technology	Sweden	sorlin@kth.se
Panel guide	Sofia Wretblad	Uppsala University		sofia.wretblad@uadm.uu.se
Panel 13				
Chair	Kathy Whaler	University of Edinburgh	UK	kathy.whaler@ed.ac.uk
Researcher on research	Terttu Luukkonen	Research Institute of the Finnish Economy	Finland	teluukkonen@gmail.com
Panel guide	Reinhaneh Dehghani	Uppsala University	Sweden	reihaneh.dehghani@uadm.uu.se
Medicine and Pharmacy				
Panel 14				
Chair	Sven Frøkjaer	Köpenhamn	Denmark	sven.frokjaer@sund.ku.dk
Researcher on research	Linda Pololi	Brandeis	USA	lpololi@brandeis.edu
Panel guide	Ulrika Huss Melin	Uppsala University	Sweden	ulrika.huss.melin@uadm.uu.se
Panel 15				
Chair	Helle Praetorius	Aarhus	Denmark	hp@biomed.au.dk
Researcher on research	Lars Geschwind	KTH	Sweden	larsges@kth.se
Panel guide	Erik Ullerås	Uppsala University		erik.ulleras@uadm.uu.se
Panel 16				

Chair	Peter Tyrer	Imperial	UK	p.tyrer@imperial.ac.uk
Researcher on research	Norma Morris	University College London	UK	norma.morris@ucl.ac.uk
Panel guide	Krister Halldin	Uppsala University	Sweden	krister.halldin@uadm.uu.se
Panel 17				
Chair	Mary K Crow	Weill Cornell Medical College	USA	crowm@hss.edu
Researcher on research	Ivar Bleiklie	Bergen	Norway	Ivar.Bleiklie@uib.no
Panel guide	Anna Lobell	Uppsala University	Sweden	anna.lobell@uadm.uu.se
Panel 18				
Funktion	Namn	Universitet	Land	E-post
Chair	Kristian Helin	Köpenhamn	Denmark	Kristian.Helin@bric.ku.dk
Researcher on research	Pauline Mattsson	Karolinska Institutet	Sweden	Pauline.mattsson@ki.se
Panel guide	Carolina Rydin	Uppsala University	Sweden	carolina.rydin@uadm.uu.se
Panel 19				
Chair	Dame Tina Lavender	Manchester	UK	Tina.Lavender@manchester.ac.uk
Researcher on research	Christer Sandahl	KI	Sweden	Christer.Sandahl@ki.se
Panel guide	Titti Ekegren	Uppsala University	Sweden	titti.ekegren@uadm.uu.se

1.8 Final Q&R17-report

A final evaluation report will be edited by the project management. It will describe the procedure for the evaluation, and present an overview of the knowledge gained by the panel reports. It will present the results of the survey and the bibliometric analysis, and give recommendations concerning the use of the report in the continued work on quality development at the University. Individual panel reports will be published in the final Q&R report.

1.9 Confidentiality and trust

The panel members accept not to misuse non-public information that is disclosed to him/her through the evaluation. In accordance with Swedish legislation, the panel reports will be public once they are submitted in their final form. The panel members are required to declare any conflict of interest with respect the subjects of the evaluation.

2. Instructions for the panel report

According to the instructions given in the *Terms of reference* the panels are asked to identify strengths and weaknesses in the research environments that constitute the evaluation units. In addition, the panels will also provide recommendations for future development and renewal. In the following panel report template headlines are given under which the panels are asked to provide comments and recommendations.

In the panel report, the panel is suggested to give an account of the impressions of the research environment at the evaluation unit as well as comment on aspects that relate to the themes in the self-evaluation and in the background material (the results from survey, bibliometric analysis, and the sheet with basic data).

The panel is also encouraged to comment on other issues of choice, aspects or themes observed and considered important even if not highlighted in the self-evaluation or in the background material as long as it relates to the research environment's efforts to create good conditions for high quality research.

The maximum total number of words in the panel report should typically range between 6000-12000 words depending on the number of evaluation units in the cluster and the complexity of the evaluation units. Deadline for the panel report is the *15th of June 2017*. Thereafter the evaluation units will have the opportunity to comment on factual errors.

2.1 Writing guidelines

Remember that you are writing primarily for international readers, most of whom are likely to be non-native speakers of English. This means that you need to write your report in clear English without compromising its content.

Avoid long and complex sentences. Split complex sentences into two simpler sentences. Write in a formal, professional style, adhering to the report template. Statements should be precise and convey content as concisely as possible, particularly where a term or circumstance has complex or culture-specific meaning.

Please use Calibri 11, and the same formatting of headings as in this instruction, and in the template for the panel report.

Panel report template

Evaluation unit:

Panel number:

1. Introductory remarks

Introductory remarks about the cluster of evaluation units that you are reviewing and possibly the work of the expert panel, for example comments on your method of evaluation (this section may be the same for all evaluation units being evaluated by the same panel).

Write your text here

2. Observations and analysis

Observations, reflections and analysis pertaining to the evaluation unit in question and if applicable, subdivisions within this unit. Please relate to the themes in the self-evaluation (see below), in the background material (results from survey and bibliometric analysis, as well as sheet with basic data) that you find relevant in relation to the evaluation unit and any additional theme-/s as identified by the panel.

Themes in the self-evaluation: the evaluation unit's aims, strategies and vision, recruitment strategies, research leadership, academic culture, infrastructure, research funding, cross border collaboration and outreach, publication, career structure and mobility, feedback and evaluation, research-teaching linkages, and internationalisation. In some cases, there are additional themes: research involving Campus Gotland, faculty/domain specific question(s) and/or other matters raised by the evaluation unit. Please, refer to the self-evaluation for further operationalisation of the themes.

Write your text here

3. Summary

Based on your observations and analysis of the evaluation unit above, please summarise in brief the evaluation unit's main strengths and weaknesses and your recommendations for further development (using bullet points).

3.1 Strengths

-
-
-

3.2 Weaknesses

-
-
-

3.3 ...Recommendations

-
-
-

4. Reflections on the similarities and differences between evaluation units within the panel – what to learn from each other?

Most panels are made up from several evaluation units. Please, give a concluding remark on similarities and differences between the different evaluation units in the cluster. Is there something to learn from the comparison, and can the evaluation units learn something from each another? (This section may be the same for all evaluation units evaluated by the same panel)

Write your text here