

## Quality and Renewal 2017 (Q&R17) at Uppsala University - instructions for self-evaluation

Dear colleague,

Q&R17 brings the preconditions and processes underpinning quality and renewal within the research environments of the Uppsala University to the fore. In other words, Q&R17 is primarily expected to provide the research environments of the university with input to further develop their systematic quality work and research renewal.

Q&R17 will not result in any sort of grading, rewards or penalties. Instead, Q&R17 will culminate in an analysis, which will identify strengths, weaknesses, and areas suitable for development within the research environments. The external experts will also be asked to submit recommendations. The information yielded is to serve as the basis for development measures and improvements. Therefore, a good self-evaluation is truly self-critical and reflective. The ability to reflect upon one's own actions and activities in a nuanced way will provide the best basis for continued quality enhancement.

The Q&R17 process involves a bibliometric analysis, an internet-based survey to all faculty and research staff affiliated with the university, self-evaluations performed within the research environments, and finally external expert evaluations. The survey results, the bibliometric data and the basic data extracted from databases, are meant to form the point of departure for the self-evaluation and spark important discussions on quality and renewal within your unit. I highly recommend that the analysis involve many if not all members of staff that make up your research environment.

Do you want more information about Q&R17? <https://mp.uu.se/web/info/vart-uu/uniovergrprojekt/kof17-forskningsutvardering>

Professor Anders Malmberg  
Deputy Vice Chancellor  
*Project Manager, KoF17*

## Instructions for the self-evaluation

The self-evaluation report will be the most important background material for the expert panels when carrying out their evaluation. It will include your analysis and conclusions with regard to a number of predefined aspects that are important to the research environment. These have been selected based on the literature about factors that influence the quality of research according to research, combined with the experience of academic leaders and researchers at Uppsala University.

You will be provided with three documents that are aimed at supporting the analysis in the self-evaluation – results from the internet-based survey, bibliometric data and certain basic data aggregated for your department/equivalent. You are encouraged to include other relevant sources in addition to these to underpin your self-evaluation. These may include documents describing internal policies, rules and regulations at your department, results from internal and external evaluations, and any kind of systematic data collection that you have carried out yourself – be it qualitative (e.g. interviews with different actors) or quantitative (e.g. information from GLIS, and questionnaires).

In addition to the results for your evaluation unit (and subunits if applicable) you have received detailed results for your faculty/disciplinary domain and Uppsala University overall, serving as points of reference in the analysis. You will also receive a report where all evaluation units within Uppsala University are compared, to facilitate the identification of your *relative* strengths and weaknesses. This university-wide comparison is made for a selection of questions in the online survey. *Please note, in order to preserve the confidentiality of respondents, results from the internet-based survey will not be fed back to units – or included in the overall comparison – if there are less than 10 respondents. If so, please use the results from the next level of aggregation (department, faculty), and reflect upon whether they are likely to be valid for your unit(s).*

The self-evaluation is divided into two parts. The first part is a reflective analysis focusing on a number of predefined themes. Most of these are generic, i.e. they are the same throughout the University, while others are specific to your own scientific domain and/or faculty. You may also add themes at the department level, if important aspects of the preconditions and processes for high quality research, central to your unit, are not covered by the predefined themes.

The self-evaluation document should be brief. The maximum total number of words should typically range between 5000-12000 words depending on the complexity of the evaluation unit (including the number of sub-units). This means that there will be some 250-600 words per question/sub-question on average). If you find that you have to exceed this limit, please contact the project secretary.

Finally, remember to be self-critical and reflective in your analysis and in your writing. It is important to reflect upon the research and the research environment in a nuanced way in order to get a truly useful basis for further development and quality enhancement. The panels will be instructed to evaluate *the evaluation unit's capacity for critical self-reflection*, including the ability to bring deficiencies to the surface. This means that the panels are asked to focus on the evaluation unit's readiness to deal with deficiencies, e.g. by describing already taken or planned actions, rather than the deficiencies per se.

# Template for the self-evaluation

To be completed (in English) by the Department and submitted by the 17<sup>th</sup> of March at the latest to [kof17@uadm.uu.se](mailto:kof17@uadm.uu.se).

The evaluation document will be submitted to the external expert panels, by the KoF17 secretariat immediately after this.

Use this template and submit one aggregated document per evaluation unit (department). When considering the questions, please focus on the level of the evaluation unit (department or equivalent), but also note if there are important specificities and differences between the practices of the predefined subunits within the evaluation unit. If you find it appropriate, please provide answers subunit-wise using subheadings.

---

## The research environment – background and reflective analysis

Name of the department: [Write here]

### 1. Background

a. Describe briefly how the department is organised in terms of:

- Subdivisions/disciplines/sub disciplines/link to hospital etc.
- Formal department leadership (board, head(s), director(s) of study etc.)

[Write here]

b. Describe briefly:

- Research profiles, strategies and plans at the department level
- Current plans on new research initiatives (major new projects etc.)
- Where the department aspires to be in 5-10 years' time with regard to its research, i.e. your vision for the medium-term future.

[Write here]

## 2. Reflective analysis

To identify structures and processes that create good conditions for high quality research is the overall concern in KoF17 and in the self-evaluation. A number of factors of importance have been identified below (2.1-2.12).

For every such key factor, you will be asked to consider the following questions:

- How are you currently working to make the [key factor] contribute to high quality research and renewal?
- What strengths and weakness do you see in your current approach?
- In what way could your current approach be further improved?
- Are there any ongoing or planned new initiatives?
- Are you in need of further support (administrative support, removal of administrative barriers etc.)? If, so what?

*Please, focus primarily on what is within the department's immediate reach and control, i.e. on what can be done - and improved - by the department itself. In addition, you may suggest changes that have to be decided upon - or made - at other levels within the university (e.g. the Faculty or the University level), and/or by external bodies (e.g. changes in government regulations and research council procedures).*

When considering the questions, please refer to the results from the internet-based survey, the bibliometric data, the basic data aggregated for your department/equivalent, and any other evidence, whenever relevant.

### 2.1 Recruitment

*How are you currently working to ensure that recruitment contributes to high quality research and renewal? Strengths and weakness of approach? Suggestions for improvement? Ongoing/planned initiatives? Wish for support? How is equal opportunities ensured?*

[Write here]

## 2.2. Leadership

a. **Department level.** Describe how research leadership is organised (the role of the board, department head, other constellations, individual research leaders etc.). Strengths and weakness? Suggestions for strengthening research leadership? Ongoing/planned initiatives? Wish for support?

[Write here]

b. **Faculty/disciplinary domain/university level.** How do you perceive that the leadership at the faculty/ disciplinary domain/university level work to support high quality research and renewal? Strengths and weakness of approach? Suggestions for improvement? Any ongoing/planned initiatives that you are aware of?

[Write here]

## 2.3. Academic culture

How are you currently working to nurture a culture that is conducive to high quality research and renewal (e.g. with regard to intellectual interaction, internal and external peer review, collegiality, equal opportunity, creativity, ambition, scientific conduct, research integrity etc.?) Strengths and weakness of approach? Suggestions for improvement? Wish for support? Ongoing/planned initiatives? More specifically, how do you ensure that the junior researchers (PhD students and postdocs) in your environment establish a robust sense of good professional conduct?

[Write here]

## 2.4. Infrastructure (including administrative support)

How are you are currently working to maintain and develop the infrastructure in order to support high quality research and renewal? Strengths and weakness of approach? Suggestions for improvement? Ongoing/planned initiatives? Wish for support?

[Write here]

### *2.5. Funding*

*Please describe your current funding situation and strategy. Do you have a funding strategy at the departmental level? Based on what criteria do you allocate the block-grant ("basanslag för forskning och forskarutbildning") within the department? How do you work to secure external funding? Strengths and weakness of approach? Suggestions for improvement? Ongoing/planned initiatives? Wish for support?*

[Write here]

### *2.6 Cross border collaboration including interdisciplinary collaboration*

*a. Collaboration and networks with other universities. Which are your most important collaboration partners? How are you currently working to establish and maintain external collaboration and networks with other universities to support high quality research and renewal? Strengths and weakness of approach? Suggestions for improvement? Ongoing/planned initiatives? Wish for support?*

[Write here]

*b. Collaboration with other parts of Uppsala University. Are you striving for collaboration with other parts of Uppsala University to strengthen research quality and renewal? If not, why? If you are, describe strengths and weaknesses of approach? Suggestions for improvement? Ongoing/planned initiatives? Wish for support?*

[Write here]

c. **External collaboration and outreach.** *Which are your most important types of collaboration partners outside academia? How are you currently working to establish and maintain such collaboration and networks, and to realise wider dissemination of research results to the rest of society? What are our current approach to stimulate outreach/knowledge utilisation/innovation? Strengths and weakness of approaches? Suggestions for improvement? Ongoing/planned initiatives? Wish for support?*

[Write here]

## **2.7 Publication**

a. **Analysis of bibliometric data.** *Comment upon your research output based on bibliometric data with regard to productivity, citations, and publication channels. Noticeable changes over time? Strengths and weaknesses of your output as measured by bibliometric data? Potential for improvement?*

[Write here]

b. **Publication strategy.** *Describe your current publication strategy. How do you follow up on the development of your publication patterns? Strengths and weakness of approach? Suggestions for improvement? Ongoing/planned initiatives? Wish for support?*

[Write here]

## **2.8 Career structure and mobility**

*How are you currently working to support researchers in their career, and to stimulate mobility (researchers in all phases of their career)? How do you ensure that the provision of support attend to equal opportunities for all researchers? Strengths and weakness of approach? Suggestions for improvement? Ongoing/planned initiatives? Wish for support?*

[Write here]

### *2.9 Feedback and evaluation*

*How are you currently conducting follow up/evaluating the research environment, and research outcomes? How do individual researchers receive feedback on their performance? Strengths and weakness of approaches? Suggestions for improvement? Ongoing/planned initiatives? Wish for support?*

[Write here]

### *2.10 Research-teaching linkages*

*How are you currently working to create links between research and teaching in order to improve student learning and research quality? Strengths and weakness of approach? Suggestions for improvement? Ongoing/planned initiatives? Wish for support?*

[Write here]

### *2.11 Internationalisation*

*You have probably described aspects of internationalisation in relation to most, if not all, areas above 2.1-2.9. Please provide a brief summary of how you are working to increase internationalisation of your research. If you are not working to increase internationalisation of your research, please explain why. Strengths and weakness of approach? Suggestions for improvement? Ongoing/planned initiatives? Wish for support?*

[Write here]

### *2.12 Research at Campus Gotland*

*If your department is present at both Campus Uppsala and Campus Gotland, describe how you are working to ensure quality and renewal of research involving both campuses. How are you working to bring the two research environments together? Strengths and weakness of approach? Suggestions for improvement? Ongoing/planned initiatives? Wish for support?*

[Write here]



### 3. Other matters

*Please state below if there are matters of relevance to research quality and renewal that have not been covered above, i.e. themes at the department level that are important aspects of the preconditions and processes for high quality research that are central to your unit.*

[Write here]

### 4. Organisation of work with completing the self-evaluation

*Please, describe briefly how you have organised the work with completing the self-evaluation.*

[Write here]