KoF/ÖB 2024
Faculty of Science and Technology
Research Program Self-Evaluation

Research Program:	
Department:	
Section:	
Program Responsible Professor:	

Goals:
- Maintain and strengthen our **research quality**
  - Through program and department self-reflection on strengths and weaknesses
  - Through developing program and department priorities for the next 5 years
  - Through internal and external feedback on our performance and plans
- Strengthen our **collegial culture**
  - By involving all research staff in the process and ensuring everyone is aware of the results
  - By being respectful of everyone's time at the faculty, department, and program levels
  - By communicating clearly as to why we are doing this and how we expect everyone to contribute
- Improve our **internal understanding**
  - By collecting information on the different ways programs and departments are funded and operate
  - By collecting explanations of why we work that way and how it supports our research
- Improve our **resource usage**
  - By generating bottom-up prioritized research plans at the program, department, section, and faculty-levels
  - By allocating and re-allocating resources based our priorities and the potential to significantly improve research
  - By identifying opportunities for intra- and inter-program/department/section collaboration and re-organization

Introduction
Be sure to regularly check the faculty KoF24 and ÖB page on the employee portal for updates, clarifications, details, timelines, and answers to common questions.

Background on KoF and ÖB
This evaluation combines two processes: the university-wide Quality and Renewal (KoF) process and the faculty-level Review of Base Financing (ÖB). These are being combined to avoid significant duplication of effort. However, they have different goals which makes combining them a challenge. For example, the first three goals above are KoF-focused while the last is ÖB-focused. Most importantly, KoF is a reflective process where we strive to identify both our strengths and weaknesses, while ÖB is an evaluative process where we strive to identify the best opportunities for using our resources.

This causes an inherent concern: will admitting to weaknesses in KoF make us less likely to get resources from ÖB? While there is no way to completely eliminate this concern, this evaluation has been designed with the ÖB portion focusing on identifying Priorities to improve/strengthen/broaden research while the KoF portion focuses primarily on reflecting on our processes.

This provides the ability to be open about weaknesses while ensuring prioritization of high-quality ideas, as

1. Using Priorities allows us to identify concrete opportunities to improve our research, thereby allowing reflection on not just where we are currently excellent but where we can become better
2. By using an internal, bottom-up prioritization process at the program, department, section, and faculty-levels to identify the most promising and high-quality proposal for potential funding at each level.

Expectations

There is understandably a strong focus on the "new" funds that will be allocated as part of the ÖB process. However, these funds are small in comparison to the yearly budget, and the Faculty strongly encourages everyone to look to the four goals listed on the first page for the main value of this process. Please be aware that this report will be a public document and will be placed on the faculty website for all employees to access.

Time period

This evaluation pertains to the period since the last evaluation: 2019-2023 inclusive. Descriptions provided by the programs should cover the full evaluation period. However, centrally provided statistics on bibliometrics (2017-2021/2022) and financial data (2022-2023) cover slightly different time periods.

Responsibility

The Head of Department (HoD) has the overall responsibility for the department self-evaluations and the Program Responsible Professor (PAP) has the overall responsibility for program self-evaluations. This includes ensuring that the information provided is both sufficiently accurate and not misleading. It is important to be open, even about activities that are not as successful as we may wish.

The HoD/PAP is responsible for coordinating meetings with the appropriate people, collecting input, leading appropriately broad and inclusive discussions, prioritizing among suggestions, and summarizing and producing the final text. Most economic and HR data will be provided centrally, but for the information that needs to be collected locally, the HoD/PAP is responsible for coordinating with the appropriate people. The HoD is responsible for ensuring that the programs provide drafts to the department early enough that the department can use them as input to the department's self-evaluation.

Panels

The panels will provide input on how programs and departments can improve, provide new perspectives on potential organizational changes across programs and departments, help in identifying good examples that can be shared across the faculty, and place our research quality in the international context. While this input is extremely helpful for identifying directions, decisions and prioritization will be done within the faculty using the panel's feedback as one input.

Instructions

Base data

Base data such as bibliometrics, HR and financial data will be provided to you centrally.

Bibliometrics
Micro-field normalized citation counts require publications to be at least 2 years old to have stable citation statistics, that there are a sufficient number of publications to provide valid statistics, and that there is a sufficient coverage of the publications from the evaluated unit to be representative.

However, total publication volume and percent of publications in the Norwegian Model's Level 2 channels will be provided for 2017-2022. Please note that bibliometrics are based on the department-provided lists of people who were in each program at the end of 2023. This means that people who moved between programs or departments during the evaluation period will have their publications counted only in their program and department as of 2023. If this is of particular importance, it should be noted in the form.

Financial Data
Initial financial data is provided for 2022, with a later update for 2023. The data is extracted based the standard practice of each program having its own project group in the financial system. This means that employment figures may be incorrect if staff are paid from project groups in other departments or programs. Similarly, financial (income and expenses) are based on project groups. This means that if staff have moved between departments/programs or if departments/programs have split or merged, and the paying projects have not been moved accordingly, those income and expenses will be accounted to the previous department/program. To address this, departments will be been given draft data which they can correct.

Please note that there are accuracy and practicality tradeoffs in both bibliometrics and financial data and that our goal is to achieve about 90% accuracy. If there are particular inaccuracies that meaningfully affect the evaluation, these should be described in the form.

Note

While it is understandable that every program and department will want to look as good as possible, this process is most valuable when everyone is open and honest. In particular, please try to avoid the following:

1. Activities (funding, projects, publications, hires etc.) that ended before the evaluation period or started after it should not be included. If it is extremely important to include activities that fall outside of the evaluated period (e.g., very recent recruitments that significantly affect future plans), the text must clearly indicate that the activity falls outside the evaluation period and why it is being included.
2. Cramming in more text by changing the font size, layout, margins, text box sizes, etc. will not be accepted. It is understood that the space limitations will lead to the need for careful prioritization.

The four answer sizes used are:

- Very short – 1.4cm tall box, approximately 250 characters
- Short – 3cm tall box, approximately 600 characters
- Medium – 4.7cm tall box, approximately 950 characters
- Long – 10cm tall box, approximately 2000 characters

Before submission

[Check the KoF/ÖB webpage on the employee portal for any important updates].

Hide instructions
Modify the "Instructions" style so all colored text is hidden in the submitted document. First, check that you have the "Show/Hide Formatting Marks" turned off then right-click on the style "Instructions". First select "Modify" and then "Format" at the bottom left. Choose "Font" and turn on the "Hidden" option and click the OK button.

Navigation panel
To quickly navigate through the document, you can use the Navigation panel. To see the Navigation panel, click the "View" tab in the ribbon and then check the "Navigation Panel" checkbox in the "Show" button group. Or press ctrl+b and choose "Headings". At the Navigation Panel you can also search for specific words or phrases.

Submission

Send this document as a word file to your Head of Department latest April 15, 2024.

1 General information

Responsibility: PAP to communicate with all program members, discuss, prioritize, and collate. All program members to report and discuss.

1.1 Process for creating this self-evaluation

Instructions: Describe the process to generate this self-assessment, how it was collegial, and list which categories of employees (e.g., Professors, ULs, BULs, postdocs, PhDs, researchers, etc.) were significantly involved.

Motivation: To emphasize that this is to be a collegial process and that all members of the program should be included.

(approximately 250 characters)

1.2 Core of the research program

Instructions: Describe what makes the program a coherent research program. For example, shared methods, areas, questions, facilities, etc..

Motivation: To understand the essence of the program so that its plans and activities can be better understood in that context.

(approximately 250 characters)

1.3 Personnel (data provided centrally)

Instructions: Data will be provided centrally either pre-filled in the form or in an external document. The data will include the number of personnel (FTEs) in each category at the end of 2023. Associate=UL, Assistant=BUL. Postdocs who are on stipend should be listed separately in parentheses. (Example: if there are 4 postdocs on salary and 3 on stipend, please enter "4 (+3)".) Other Research includes senior and guest professors, adjuncts, research engineers, etc. Other includes communications, direct research support administrators (not general or shared HR/financial support), project leaders, etc. MSc and BSc thesis students are not included.

Motivation: To understand the program's personnel distribution by career stage and gender.

Responsibility: Data provided centrally; PAP to review to ensure no significant mistakes are made. Note that stipend postdocs are not present in the university salary system and will need to be manually accounted for if they are to be included. If this table is changed to add stipend postdocs, please note the changes in the "other important program-specific comments" section below as well.

	Faculty FTEs					Non-Faculty FTEs				
	Professor	Associate (UL)	Assistant (BUL)	Total	PhD	Postdoc	Researcher	Other Research	Other	Total
Female										
Male										

1.4 Finances

1.4.1 Overall research funding (data provided centrally)

Instructions: Data will be provided centrally either pre-filled in the form or in an external document. The data will include the amounts taken in million SEK rounded to one decimal place during 2022, with 2023 to be provided later. Total internal research funding is all government base research funding, including funds used for co-funding. Total external research funding is all external grant funding. FFF+SFO is the amount of FFF and SFO resources allocated. Other internal research funding is the difference between the total internal research funding and the FFF and SFO, which indicates approximately how much other internal research funding (e.g., co-funding, startbidrag, studiestöd, special funds from the vice rector, etc.) was taken in.

Motivation: To understand how a program is funded across the main sources of income.

Responsibility: Data provided centrally; PAP to review to ensure no significant mistakes are made.

	FFF+SFO Internal Research	Other Internal Research	Total Internal Research	External Research	Total Research	External Research %
2023						
2022						
Average						

1.4.2 Other internal research funding

Instructions: If the other internal resources category above is significant, describe where it comes from: e.g., co-funding for various grants, starting packages for Assistant professors, studiestöd, department resources given, special funds from the vice rector, etc.

(approximately 250 characters)

1.4.3 Basic funding expectations and policy for using internal resources

Instructions: Explain the standard funding distribution between internal research funding (FFFs), external grants, and teaching that faculty (Assistant, Associate, Professor) and non-tenure staff (researchers, adjuncts) receive. Describe the policy for distributing internal resources (FFFs and other 210 funds, including studiestöd, startbidrags, and co-funding). Include a description of how faculty members at each level (Assistant, Associate, Professor) receive research support and are funded. Explain any implicit or explicit policies regarding holding external grants and allocation of internal resources. Include a brief overview of other uses of internal resources, for example: extra support for particular roles (e.g., PAP, FUAP), startup packages (for new faculty), allocation of studiestöd, department policies for FFFs or institution resources, funding of joint facilities/infrastructure, co-funding for grants, paying for PhDs/postdocs, etc.

Motivation: To understand how programs use their internal resources to support members and activities.

(approximately 600 characters)

1.4.4 Use of internal research funds (data provided centrally)

Instructions: Data will be provided centrally either pre-filled in the form or in an external document. The data will include the breakdown (in %) of how internal money (all 210, e.g., FFF, SFO, co-funding, startbidrag, studiestöd, etc.) is used.

Motivation: To understand how the program is using internal research funding.

Responsibility: Data provided centrally; PAP to review to ensure no significant mistakes are made.

	Faculty Salary	Non-Faculty Salary	Other Personnel Costs	Premises	Equipment Depreciation	Overhead	Running Costs	Total
2023								
2022								
Average								

1.4.5 Personnel funding (data provided centrally)

Instructions: Data will be provided centrally either pre-filled in the form or in an external document. The data will include the average % funding for each employee category for each financial category for 2023. Internal includes FFFs, SFOs and other 210. External includes both 220 and 230. Stipend funded postdocs should not be included unless the salaries are paid through Uppsala. If there are no personnel in a particular category, leave the cell blank.

Motivation: To understand how funding is used across different employment categories and genders.

Responsibility: Data provided centrally; PAP to review to ensure no significant mistakes are made.

	Female			Male		
	Internal	**External**	**Teaching**	**Internal**	**External**	**Teaching**
Professor	%	%	%	%	%	%
Associate (UL)	%	%	%	%	%	%
Assistant (BUL)	%	%	%	%	%	%
PhD	%	%	%	%	%	%
Postdoc	%	%	%	%	%	%
Researcher	%	%	%	%	%	%
Other Research	%	%	%	%	%	%
Other	%	%	%	%	%	%

1.4.6 Major infrastructure usage

Instructions: Identify the five most significant research infrastructures used by the program. For this purpose, infrastructures are resources that are too expensive for an individual PI to afford and are therefore organized and funded as shared resources. Specify the level of sharing (program, department, university, national, or international) and whether it is located at Uppsala or elsewhere. Provide the approximate amount spent to pay for development of or access to the infrastructure each year, including both program funds and PI grant expenditures. Infrastructure costs should not include travel to the infrastructure (as travel for research is not infrastructure-specific) nor salary time while using the infrastructure (as research time is not infrastructure-specific), but can include salary costs of engineering staff and explicitly agreed upon in-kind salary contributions. If infrastructure is paid for outside of the program, specify who pays for it instead of the cost. (E.g., write “Faculty” or “VR”.) Note that it is not necessary to provide exact values, but please make an effort to be within ~10%.

Motivation: To understand what important infrastructure is being used and how much it costs.

Responsibility: PAP in discussion with program members, economic administrator for costs.

Infrastructure	Sharing	Location	Approximate Yearly Cost (x.xM SEK)

1.5 Other important comments

Instructions: Explain any important issues not addressed above or misrepresented by the above data that need to be clarified for the panel to give valuable feedback. If the program has an important role in supporting the university or department, such as a mandate from the government or university, please describe it here. Please keep these precise and relevant.

Motivation: To bring important and special issues to the view of the panel and department.

(approximately 250 characters)

2 Follow up on goals set in the last evaluation

Responsibility: PAP to communicate with all program members, discuss, prioritize, and collate. All program members to report and discuss.

2.1 Reflections on accomplishments and setting goals this time

Instructions: Reflect on whether the goals from the last evaluation (ÖB Section D1 for programs and KoF17 Section 1b for departments) were appropriate in retrospect, what has been accomplished towards them since the evaluation, and what we can learn from them about setting effective goals this time. The previous evaluations will be made available on online to support this reflection for the programs, departments, and panels.

Motivation: Try to learn from what we did last time to be able to set more effective goals this time.

(approximately 600 characters)

3 Area 1: Research Quality (evaluation of outcomes and processes)

Responsibility: PAP to communicate with all program members, discuss, prioritize, and collate. All program members to report and discuss.

3.1 Main research areas

Instructions: List the largest research areas in the program, including approximately what percent of the program's total research they cover, the approximate number of FTE faculty (Assistant/Associate/Professor, split according to their approximate activities and not double-counted), and whether the research is mostly Applied, Basic Science, or Mixed. These four areas combined should be broad enough to cover at least 75% of the program's research activities.

Motivation: To understand the program's research heterogeneity and how the program sees its own research profile.

Main Research Areas		% of program	FTE Faculty	Type
1				
2				
3				
4				

3.2 Research Activities

Instructions: Describe the key research activities in the program. This should focus on the types of research done, with the important results described later in the Research Results section. Briefly describe how the research is important for science and society. Describe how the program balances incremental (e.g., safe, easy-to-publish) research with higher-risk projects with more potential for breakthroughs. Note that the limited space will require prioritizing the text based on the main research activities listed above.

Motivation: Provide a more detailed view of the key research directions in the program.

(approximately 2000 characters)

3.3 Research Results

3.3.1 Contributions to the field

Instructions: Describe the research results that the program is particularly proud of that indicate the quality and breadth of the research. Explain the importance of the program's contribution to the field in the international context.

Motivation: Identify the results we are most proud of and provide our perspective on how important they are. This allows the panel to see how we see ourselves and provide feedback to help us better understand how we are viewed internationally.

(approximately 950 characters)

3.3.2 Bibliometrics for 2017-2021/2022 (data provided centrally)

Instructions: Data will be provided centrally either pre-filled in the form or in an external document. The data will include:

- PP(top10%): Percent of publications in the top 10% most cited. For comparing across fields, we use the Leiden Ranking CWTS database to first compute similarity clusters (micro-fields) for all included publications. For each Uppsala publication, the citations for that paper are then compared to the other papers in the same micro-field from the same year. These mean-normalized citation statistics are then used to identify the subset of top 10% cited publications. This means that each publication is compared against similar publication in its own micro-field of similar topics, which does a good job of adjusting for differences across and within fields.
- Coverage percent: The Leiden Ranking CWTS database does not include all publications, and is based on data from the Web of Science database. In particular, conference publications are not included. The coverage in Web of Science will be included and departments or programs with low coverage should specifically reflect on the relevance of coverage when discussing the bibliometrics.
- Note: for the micro-field statistics to be reliable, we need at least two years of citations and a sufficient number of publications. This limits our statistics to providing aggregates over 2017-2021.
- Norwegian Model: The Norwegian Model provides a ranking of publication channels of high prestige generated by expert review. In this model, roughly 20% of publication channels are included in the highest category, Level 2. For this model, we report the percent of publications from the program/department that are in Level 2.
- Total publications: All articles, articles in anthologies, monographs, and conference papers are included in total statistics, with the number fractionalized to the number of Uppsala authors. (E.g., a publication with 1 of 4 authors from Uppsala will count as 0.25.)

Motivation: Provide an overview of how the program is performing that is reasonably comparable to other programs and departments.

	2017-2021	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
CWTS Leiden (Web of Science) coverage percent							
Micro-field normalized citation score							
Level 2 in the Norwegian model (up to year 2022)							
Total publications (up to year 2022)							

3.3.3 Most frequent publishing channels (raw data provided centrally)

Instructions: Using the provided raw data of publication frequency per channel for each program, list the most frequent publishing channels with more than two publications during the evaluation period. (Note: While an effort has been made to collate this data from the raw publication list, inaccuracies in the bibliometric data mean that the programs will have to review the provided publication counts to collate channels that may be listed under multiple names. For example if publications have listed both “Conference on Ground Water Quality in Europe” and “European Conference on Ground Water Quality”, the program will need to combine their publication counts manually.)

Motivation: To see where the program is most frequently publishing.

Channel	Number	% of Total Publications

3.3.4 Most important publishing channels

Instructions: Provide the most important publishing channels according to the program, the number of publications in each channel during the evaluation period, and the % of the total publications based on the centrally provided bibliometrics. For each channel, specify both the total number of publication and the number where a program member was the lead-author. (The lead-author is the primary driver of the particular publication, which is often denoted as the “corresponding” author or the first author in the publication list, and is typically the originator of the core idea of the work and/or the person who wrote the majority of the text in the publication.)

Motivation: Enable the program to indicate what publishing channels they see as most important and how much they publish in them for panel feedback.

Channel	Number	% of Total Publications	Lead-author	Lead-author % of Total

3.3.5 Publishing impact on the field

Instructions: Describe the impact of the program’s publishing on the field by elaborating on the provided bibliometrics, the most frequent publishing channels, and the self-identified most important publishing channels. Explain the importance of the program’s contribution to the field in the international context.

(approximately 600 characters)

3.3.6 Participation, recognition, and leadership in the field

Instructions: Describe how the program interacts with the larger field in terms of its participation (e.g., through collaborations, professional organizations, positions of trust, etc.), recognition (e.g., through awards, keynote presentations, etc.), and leadership (e.g., through steering positions in international organizations, professional bodies, etc.) in the field. Explain the importance of the program's contribution to the field in the international context.

(approximately 600 characters)

3.4 Synergies within the research program

Instructions: List up to three examples of synergies (interactions that provide more value than the individual contributions alone) within the research program itself that can be seen through specific on-going collaborations. Synergies can include using similar or complementary methods, facilities, partners, goals, etc. Briefly describe the synergy and extent of the current collaboration. By providing space for listing only four, programs will need to work internally to identify the collaborations that are most important to the program.

Motivation: Identify how the program's diversity supports its research.

1	**Type of synergy**	
	Specific collaboration	
2	**Type of synergy**	
	Specific collaboration	
3	**Type of synergy**	
	Specific collaboration	

3.5 Synergies across research fields

Instructions: List up to three examples of synergies (interactions that provide more value than the individual contributions) the research program has with research fields other than those of the program itself. Synergies can include using similar or complementary methods, facilities, partners, goals, working across theory/experimental, grants together with people in different fields, etc. These synergies can be here in Uppsala or at other universities. Provide the university (cross-field synergies within Uppsala are fine) and the different field, and briefly describe what the synergy is and the extent of the specific current collaboration. By providing space for listing only three, programs will need to work internally to identify the collaborations that are most important to the program.

Motivation: Identify current activities that are broader than the research programs to promote broader research initiatives and understand what is done across Uppsala vs. externally.

1	**University and Field**	
	Type of synergy	
	Specific collaboration	
2	**University and Field**	
	Type of synergy	
	Specific collaboration	

3	**University and Field**	
	Type of synergy	
	Specific collaboration	

3.5.1 Reflections on synergies across research fields

Instructions: Reflect on the program's initiatives and challenges with regards establishing research activities that cross between the program's field and other fields. Are there particular benefits to such collaborations or particular costs? Describe the formal and informal initiatives the program takes to encourage these and the pros and cons of working within and outside of Uppsala.

Motivation: Understand how the program views its synergies across research fields.

(approximately 600 characters)

3.6 Reflections on teaching and promoting good research ethics

Instructions: Reflect on the program's initiatives and challenges with regards to teaching and promoting good research ethics. Describe how the formal and informal initiatives the program takes to teach and promote good research ethics across all staff are working, and what particular challenges the program faces in these regards.

Motivation: Understand how the university's priority for ensuring good research ethics is addressed.

(approximately 250 characters)

3.7 Reflections on creating and ensuring research freedom

Instructions: Reflect on the program's initiatives and challenges with creating and ensuring opportunities for research freedom. Describe how the formal and informal initiatives the program takes to create opportunities for research freedom across all staff are working, and what particular challenges the program faces in these regards.

Motivation: Understand how the university's priority for ensuring research freedom is addressed.

(approximately 250 characters)

3.8 Reflections on research program size

Instructions: If the research program has 4 or fewer faculty (Assistant, Associate, Professor), describe the program's process for ensuring a sufficient critical mass of faculty long-term, current and planned activities in this direction, and discuss whether there are other programs where collaboration could be of assistance. Similarly, if the research program has 10 or more faculty members, describe how the program works to develop a coherent research agenda and collaborations. If the program has between 5 and 9 faculty, describe if increasing or decreasing the size could be beneficial.

Motivation: A reasonable number of faculty members is required for research programs to achieve their purpose of providing a collegial environment that can develop and support diverse ideas and knowledge around a shared core research direction. For research programs with very few faculty, or very many, it is important to reflect on how this can be achieved.

(approximately 250 characters)

3.9 Top external funding sources (data provided centrally)

Motivation: To see the amount of external funding brought in and where it comes from.

Funding Agency	2022	2023

3.10 External funding sources

Instructions: List the source and number of significant research grants to the program during the evaluation period. Include only grants that awarded at least 3M SEK to a program member and started during the evaluation period (2019-2023, inclusive). If a program member was awarded at least 3M SEK, but was not the PI on the grant, list the grant on a separate line and state "Co-PI".

Motivation: This list complements the top external funding sources by providing consistent data for significant (>3M SEK) basic science grants available to all programs and by identifying the number of PIs vs. the total amount of funding. This is important as the absolute amount of money available to different fields varies enormously.

Grant	Number of awards to PIs in the program
Basic science grants (available to all fields in the faculty)	
ERC-StG, ERC-CoG, ERC-AdG, ERC-SyG	
KAW Project	
KAW Scholar	
WAF/WAFx	
VR Project	
VR Starting	
Other grants (may include field-specific grants and Co-PIs)	

3.11 Reflections on external funding

Instructions: Reflect on what the program expects from its staff (Assistant, Associate, Professor, postdoc, and researcher levels) in regards to applying for and receiving external funding, how the program communicates those expectations, how the program supports staff in applying for funding through feedback and mentoring, and what opportunities and challenges the program sees in the future for continued and new external funding. Describe initiatives the program takes to form consortia to apply for larger grants.

Motivation: Connect how the program works with external funding to the achieved funding results.

(approximately 600 characters)

3.12 Reflections on what is working well

Instructions: From the above, reflect on what is working well and should be continued over the next 5 years.

Motivation: Require programs to identify where current activities are successful. This will provide the panel with insights into our own self-assessment.

(approximately 950 characters)

3.13 Reflections on what needs to be improved

Instructions: From the above, reflect on what needs to be improved over the next 5 years. Please focus on areas that need improvement and do not list areas that could be improved but where it is not needed.

Motivation: Require programs to identify where they feel that they need to invest. This will both provide the panels with insights into our own self-assessment as well as help us improve.

(approximately 950 characters)

4 Area 2: Career Paths (evaluation of processes)

Responsibility: PAP to communicate with all program members, discuss, prioritize, and collate. All program members to report and discuss.

4.1 Career stage distribution implications and plans for the next 5 years

Instructions: Describe the implications of the current distribution of faculty across career stages (e.g., Assistant, Associate, Professor from Section 1) for the program currently and in the next 5 years. In particular, identify up-coming faculty retirements and/or recruitments and discuss and how the program plans to work with those changes to maintain the program's core strengths as well as evolve in new directions.

Motivation: Provide perspective on the current status and future changes in personnel in the program.

(approximately 600 characters)

4.2 Reflections on the process for identifying recruitment needs and focusing areas

Instructions: Pick a specific faculty-level recruitment during the evaluation period reflect on how the process of identifying the need for recruitment and focusing the research area worked. First describe the recruitment, e.g., Assistant/Associate/Professor-level and research area. Then discuss how the program worked to identify the need for a recruitment in this area, including discussing how the need was identified, how was it discussed and revised in the program, who was involved in the discussions, etc. For focusing the research area, describe how the balance between continuing existing areas vs. choosing new ones was discussed, who was involved in the discussions, what criteria were discussed to ensure that this direction would strengthen the program, etc. If the program has not done any faculty recruitments during the evaluation period, please reflect on how they would be undertaken.

Motivation: Explain how recruitments are currently motivated and decided

(approximately 600 characters)

4.2.1 Initiatives to recruit and retain top researchers/teachers

Instructions: Describe:

- How the program defines what a top researcher/teacher is and how that is used in recruiting (criteria, descriptions, search groups, subject representative, addressing younger recruits who have the potential to become top, etc.),
- How the program balances recruiting external talent vs. promoting internal staff, and who is involved in these discussions and decisions,
- How gender and career stage balance is considered in program planning and recruitment decisions, and,
- What the program does to identify and encourage strong external recruits to join.

Motivation: Provide details as to what efforts are made to recruit and retain the best staff.

(approximately 600 characters)

4.3 Career support

4.3.1 Career support activities for non-tenure-track staff (beyond standard employee dialogs)

Instructions: Describe the activities for supporting non-tenure-track (PhDs, postdocs, researchers, adjuncts, etc.) staff in their careers and development. For example: financial support for personal development, mentoring, grant assistance, feedback, career planning, help with job searches, etc.. Explicitly address what support is provided for obtaining the docent and distinguished teacher qualifications for post-PhD staff. Specify if activities are informal (e.g., expected as part of advising/mentoring) or formal (e.g., part of a regular process).

Motivation: Provide details as to how the program works with career development for non-tenured staff and encourage the program to reflect on whether it is providing the right type and amount of support.

(approximately 600 characters)

4.3.2 Career support activities for tenure-track staff (beyond standard employee dialogs)

Instructions: Describe the activities for supporting tenure-track staff (Assistant Professors/BULs) in their careers and development. For example: financial support for personal development, startup packages, mentoring, grant assistance, feedback, career planning, co-advising, etc. Include discussions of support for promotion (Assistant to Associate) as well as docent and distinguished teacher qualifications. Specify if activities are informal (e.g., expected as part of advising/mentoring) or formal (e.g., part of a regular process). If the department has very few staff in this category, please reflect on why that is and if that is something the department wishes to address.

Motivation: Provide details as to how the program works with career development for tenure-track staff and encourage the program to reflect on whether it is providing the right type and amount of support.

(approximately 600 characters)

4.3.3 Career support activities for tenured staff (beyond standard employee dialogs)

Instructions: Describe the activities for supporting tenured staff (Associate and Professor) in their careers and development. For example: financial support for personal development, mentoring, grant assistance, feedback, career planning. Include discussions of support for promotion (Associate to Professor) as well as docent and distinguished teacher qualifications. Specify if activities are informal (e.g., expected as part of advising/mentoring) or formal (e.g., part of a regular process).

Motivation: Provide details as to how the program works with career development for tenured staff and encourage the program to reflect on whether it is providing the right type and amount of support.

(approximately 600 characters)

4.4 Reflections on what is working well

Instructions: From the above, reflect on what is working well and should be continued over the next 5 years.

Motivation: Require programs to identify where current activities are successful. This will provide the panel with insights into our own self-assessment.

(approximately 950 characters)

4.5 Reflections on what needs to be improved

Instructions: From the above, reflect on what needs to be improved over the next 5 years. Please focus on areas that need improvement and do not list areas that could be improved but where it is not needed.

Motivation: Require programs to identify where they feel that they need to invest. This will both provide the panels with insights into our own self-assessment as well as help us improve.

(approximately 950 characters)

5 Area 3: Collaboration and Outreach (evaluation of processes)

Responsibility: PAP to communicate with all program members, discuss, prioritize, and collate. All program members to report and discuss.

Collaboration and outreach ("samverkan" in Swedish) should be interpreted to mean activities that reach outside of the university to non-academic partners. Specifically, academic collaborations with other research organizations within academia should be considered part of our research and not collaboration and outreach for this evaluation. To help with this section, here is a partial list of the types of collaboration and outreach that we are striving to achieve:

- Joint research projects, student/PhD/postdoc/researcher/faculty exchanges/sabbaticals, etc.
- Advising/consulting, spreading research results/insights, popular science outreach and publications, press interviews, expert panels, etc.
- Interactions with industry, government, schools, society, media, etc.
- Academic entrepreneurship, including creating, joining, and advising startups and companies, etc.
- Feedback of external ideas, challenges, relevant questions, etc., into program(s) or departments.

5.1 Specific collaboration and outreach examples

Instructions: Provide up to three specific examples of collaboration and outreach activities connected to the program's research. Under "Example and connection" describe the activity and person or organization with whom the collaboration or outreach took place. (e.g., "Expert advice on SUBJECT for COMPANY", "Popular science book on SUBJECT aimed at AUDENICE", or "Interview on PROGRAM about SUBJECT".) Specify the value to the program (e.g., "exposure to new challenges and issues that COMPANY experience on a practical level" or "making the SUBJECT expertise of our researchers visible to the nation") and the value to the partner (e.g., "insight into how COMPANY can model the physical properties from the chemical composition" or "addressing public concern over the impact of SUBJECT on the environment"). Keep in mind the broad range of collaboration and outreach listed above.

Motivation: Provide a list of specific examples of collaboration and outreach activities to motivate the self-reflection below and to serve as a source of examples for others.

1	**Example and connection**	
	Value to the program	
	Value to the partner	
2	**Example and connection**	
	Value to the program	
	Value to the partner	
3	**Example and connection**	
	Value to the program	
	Value to the partner	

5.1.1 Reflections on overall aims and strategies for collaboration and outreach

Instructions: Use the above examples, as appropriate, to reflect on the program's overall aims and strategies for collaboration and outreach and discuss what enabled the above examples (e.g., how were they first identified and initiated? How did they fit into the overall aims and strategies? etc.) and what it takes to keep them functioning well (e.g., staff, networking, meetings, equipment/labs/supplies, etc.).

Motivation: Understand what we need to create and maintain collaboration and outreach

(approximately 600 characters)

5.2 Support for outreach and collaboration

Instructions: Describe the specific support resources and processes available to program members for outreach and collaboration towards non-academic actors, such as collegial discussions, meetings with external actors, etc. Describe whether the activities are formal or informal and whether they are managed by the research program, department, or faculty.

Motivation: Understand what support the program has for outreach and collaboration.

(approximately 600 characters)

5.3 Reflections on what is working well

Instructions: From the above, reflect on what is working well and should be continued over the next 5 years.

Motivation: Require programs to identify where current activities are successful. This will provide the panel with insights into our own self-assessment.

(approximately 950 characters)

5.4 Reflections on what needs to be improved

Instructions: From the above, reflect on what needs to be improved over the next 5 years. Please focus on areas that need improvement and do not list areas that could be improved but where it is not needed.

Motivation: Require programs to identify where they feel that they need to invest. This will both provide the panels with insights into our own self-assessment as well as help us improve.

(approximately 950 characters)

6 Area 4: Connection between Research and Teaching (evaluation of processes)

Responsibility: PAP to communicate with all program members and the director of studies, discuss, prioritize, and collate. All program members to report and discuss.

The types of connections between research and teaching that we are striving to achieve include, but are not limited to:

- Activities that lead to a scientific approach and student progression in learning how to apply the scientific method within courses and throughout education programs
- Teachers who are active researchers take opportunities to develop their pedagogical skills
- Researchers who are active teachers and take opportunities to develop their pedagogical skills
- Students being trained to find, use, and evaluate research results
- Students being active in on-going research projects
- Integration of research results, methods, and facilities in teaching

6.1 Main teaching areas

Instructions: List up to four teaching programs, course packages, or contract/continuing education that the research program's members contribute to. Specify the level (e.g., bachelor's or master's), how much the members of the research program contribute to the teaching program based on the number of full courses taught and whether the teaching program is managed (e.g., the program coordinator/director is in the research program) by members of the research program (yes/no). For the number of courses taught, exact values are not needed. Instead estimate the teachers' contribution in terms of full courses taught (e.g., 1.0 means the teacher taught the equivalent of one full course) and use the ranges of: <1, 1-5, >6 to simplify accounting.

Motivation: To show what subjects the program primarily teaches in.

Teaching program, course package, or contract/continuing education	Level	Courses Taught	Managed

6.2 Infrastructure use in teaching

Instructions: Please list any major research infrastructures that are used in teaching, the courses that use it, the education level, and the approximate number of students who use it each year.

Motivation: To understand what infrastructure is being used in teaching.

Infrastructure	Courses	Level	Students

6.3 Specific teaching/research connections

Instructions: Provide up to five specific examples of how the program's research has been incorporated into teaching activities or strengthened courses, and/or how teaching activities have been incorporated into the program's research activities or strengthened the program's research. Under "Example" describe the connection (e.g., "lab exercise using the facility X that exposes students to research technique Y"). Under "Course Info" specify the course name, program, level (introduction/advanced), and the approximate number of students taking it each year. Describe the value to the teaching experience from the research connection (or vice versa).

Motivation: Provide a list of specific examples of teaching/research connections to motivate the self-reflection below and to serve as a source of examples for others.

1	Example	

	Course Info	
	Value to teaching/ research	
2	**Example**	
	Course Info	
	Value to teaching/ research	
3	**Example**	
	Course Info	
	Value to teaching/ research	
4	**Example**	
	Course Info	
	Value to teaching/ research	

6.3.1 Reflections on overall aims and strategies for connections

Instructions: Use the above examples, as appropriate, to reflect on the program's overall aims and strategies for teaching and research connections and discuss what enabled the above examples (e.g., How were they first identified and initiated? How did they fit into the overall aims and strategies? etc.) and what it takes to keep them functioning well (e.g., staff, networking, meetings, equipment/labs/supplies, etc.).

Motivation: Understand what we need to create and maintain connections

(approximately 600 characters)

6.4 Support for integrating teaching and research

Instructions: Describe the support resources and processes for integrating teaching and research available to program members such as collegial discussions, meetings with students, course reviews, teaching follow-up, etc. Describe whether the activities are formal or informal and whether they are managed by the research program, department, faculty, or teaching program. If there are no such resources or processes in the research program, then please reflect on whether that is something the research program or department should address under reflections below.

Motivation: Explain what support there is for improving the research and teaching connection.

(approximately 600 characters)

6.5 Reflections on what is working well

Instructions: From the above, reflect on what is working well and should be continued over the next 5 years.

Motivation: Require programs to identify where current activities are successful. This will provide the panel with insights into our own self-assessment.

(approximately 950 characters)

6.6 Reflections on what needs to be improved

Instructions: From the above, reflect on what needs to be improved over the next 5 years. Please focus on areas that need improvement and do not list areas that could be improved but where it is not needed.

Motivation: Require programs to identify where they feel that they need to invest. This will both provide the panels with insights into our own self-assessment as well as help us improve.

(approximately 950 characters)

7 5-year Priorities

Instructions: Identify, describe, and motivate specific Priorities that have a high likelihood of meaningfully strengthening or meaningfully broadening research over the next 5 years. The Priorities should be well-motivated and have sufficiently developed plans that it is clear what needs to be done to accomplish them and how to evaluate if they are successful. The Priorities can cover a wide range of activities with the overall goal of strengthen research, and do not need to require additional expenses. These can include, but are not limited to:

- Strengthening existing areas (e.g., to adapt to future challenges in the field or are necessary to maintain high quality, including by investing in new equipment, facilities, or staff, etc.)
- Investing in new areas (e.g., to adapt to changes in the field or new developments, by including investing in new equipment, facilities, or staff, etc.)
- Changing research organization by splitting, merging, closing, or moving research programs/departments (e.g., to improve collaboration or use of facilities or resources, etc.)
- Changing research policies (e.g., to address funding/co-funding, multi-disciplinary work, or recruiting, etc.)
- Changing research support (e.g., to improve grant success rates, recruiting, management, adoption of new techniques/technologies, etc.)

Building upon existing strategic plans is encouraged and co-funding/support from the program or department is expected to demonstrate commitment to the plan. There will be a yearly lightweight follow up process to see what progress has been made for each Priority with an opportunity to revise/change them as needed. The goals are to both ensure that we follow up on our stated Priorities and that we always have clear Priorities at each level in the faculty.

Each program is allowed to propose 3 Priorities: one that can be fully accomplished within the program, one that may require support at the department level, and one that may require support at the faculty level. This done to ensure that all programs will have at least one Priority they can work on as the very limited faculty funding available means only a few programs will receive additional resources.

Prioritization at the department level: Each department will review the Priorities from all of its programs and consider which to include in the department's own list of Priorities, along with department's own Priorities.

Motivation: Identifying Priorities encourages strategic analysis and medium-term planning within the program, and makes it easier for the department and panel to understand the programs' own assessments of their needs and opportunities. Requiring two of the Priorities to be able to be accomplished within the program and the department emphasizes the need to work locally as well as at the faculty level.

Responsibility: PAP in discussion with program members.

8 Priority 1 of 3: An activity that can be accomplished within the program

8.1 Description of the Priority

Instructions: Provide the department name (since these will be collected at the section/faculty level) and the program name (if this is a program Priority), the title of the Priority, and whether it may require department support (Yes/No) and/or faculty support (Yes/No).

Department:				
Program:				
Title:				
Support:	**May require department support:**	[Yes/No]	**May require faculty support:**	[Yes/No]

8.1.1 Goal

Instructions: Specify the goal of the Priority, for example, to strengthen a specific existing activity or start a new one.

8.1.2 Expected meaningful research improvement

Instructions: Provide a description of the research that investing in this Priority will accomplish over the next 5 years. Explain how it has the potential to significantly strengthen or broaden the program for program proposals or department for department proposals. Specifically, this should go beyond continuing or slightly enlarging current activities by having a clear description of what change it will accomplish.

Motivation: The overall goal is to strengthen our research. As a result, the Priority should deliver meaningful improvements in research quality and/or breadth.

(approximately 950 characters)

8.1.3 Implementation plan

Instructions: Provide a brief description of specifically what is planned to be done over the next 5 years to realize the potential of this Priority. For example: new hires, investments in equipment, starting collaborations, closing down existing activities, moving resources from existing activities, etc. Use the limited space provided here to discuss the most important aspects of how this activity will be carried out.

Motivation: For a Priority to be credible, there must be a plausible plan and what needs to be accomplished must have been thought through. It is understood that these plans will change over the next 5 years, however.

(approximately 950 characters)

8.1.4 What previous accomplishments indicate a high likelihood of success?

Instructions: Describe what recent (last 5 years) accomplishments make it clear that the there is a good chance of success in this project. Use specific examples (e.g., grant X, collaboration Y, paper Z) and explain how those recent accomplishments are evidence of having the competencies needed to be successful in this project.

Motivation: For a Priority to be credible, the expertise and track record needed to support it must be present.

(approximately 600 characters)

8.2 Current status of the area at Uppsala University

Instruction: Describe the current status of the area at Uppsala University as a whole. Include any existing funding, support, staff, and success in this area. Explicitly identify any overlap with other existing activities at the program(s), department, section, faculty, and/or university levels.

Motivation: To avoid duplicating efforts, it is important to understand the local Uppsala context when enhancing existing activities or starting new efforts. As part of the evaluation process, the panel will try to identify synergies between proposed Priorities.

(approximately 250 characters)

8.2.1 Current and planned contributions to support the initiative

Instructions: Describe the current (already in-place and on-going) and planned contributions to this goal from the local level (from the program for program proposals, from the department for department proposals, and from both the program(s) and department, as appropriate, for program proposals selected by the department). For example, co-funding, in-kind support, shared funding of facilities, transfers of FFFs, etc.

Motivation: Evidence of financial commitment from the local environment strongly supports the proposal as being important. Conversely, if the local environment is unable or unwilling to support it, the importance to the environment as a whole is much weaker.

(approximately 250 characters)

8.3 Strategic value

8.3.1 Strategic value of the area in the global context

Instruction: Describe the importance of the area in the global context. For example: fundamental challenges in research; new developments in research; societal challenges and priorities; global impact and importance.

Motivation: To ensure consideration of the larger context.

(approximately 250 characters)

8.3.2 Strategic value of the area at the next level

Instruction: Describe the importance of the area to the department (for program proposals) and for the section and faculty (for department proposals). For example: synergies with other activities, connections to teaching and collaboration, both currently and potential for new ones, etc. Explain the value of this activity beyond any overlapping ones identified above.

Motivation: To ensure that there is awareness of where this activity fits in at the next level up in the organization. This is particularly important if support is to be requested at that level.

(approximately 250 characters)

8.4 Contributions needed for success

Instructions: Identify what contributions are needed for success in terms of time, expertise, resources, facilities, staff, etc. Explicitly include estimates of financial resources needed and where they will come from.

Motivation: To ensure the costs and resources required have been thought through, and that they are reasonable given the scope of the benefit.

(approximately 250 characters)

8.4.1 Success indicators

Instructions: Describe specific results that will indicate success in 5 years. For example: increases in publications in top venues X and Y, publications in new field Z, strengthened or new collaborations with university A, new hires in B, new grants from C, etc.

Motivation: To ensure that the local- and faculty-levels will be able to assess whether this Priority was successful at the next evaluation so that we develop a positive cycle of following up on our strategic planning.

(approximately 250 characters)

8.4.2 First steps that can be taken today

Instructions: Describe the first concrete steps needed to move in this direction that can be taken today. These should be clear enough that they can be followed up on in a year to see what progress has been made. Identify initial activities that can be started locally to enable progress to help motivate further support for the larger goal. In the exceptional case where no steps can be taken today, explain why a Priority has been chosen that cannot be started.

Motivation: To ensure that there is a clear idea of how to get started and enable easy follow-up of how the Priority is progressing.

(approximately 250 characters)

9 Priority 2 of 3: An activity that <u>may require department support</u>

9.1 Description of the Priority

Instructions: Provide the department name (since these will be collected at the section/faculty level) and the program name (if this is a program Priority), the title of the Priority, and whether it may require department support (Yes/No) and/or faculty support (Yes/No).

Department:				
Program:				
Title:				
Support:	**May require department support:**	[Yes/No]	**May require faculty support:**	[Yes/No]

9.1.1 Goal

Instructions: Specify the goal of the Priority, for example, to <u>strengthen</u> a specific existing activity or start a <u>new</u> one.

9.1.2 Expected meaningful research improvement

Instructions: Provide a description of the research that investing in this Priority will accomplish over the next 5 years. Explain how it has the potential to significantly strengthen or broaden the program for program proposals or department for department proposals. Specifically, this should go beyond continuing or slightly enlarging current activities by having a clear description of what change it will accomplish.

Motivation: The overall goal is to strengthen our research. As a result, the Priority should deliver meaningful improvements in research quality and/or breadth.

(approximately 950 characters)

9.1.3 Implementation plan

Instructions: Provide a brief description of specifically what is planned to be done over the next 5 years to realize the potential of this Priority. For example: new hires, investments in equipment, starting collaborations, closing down existing activities, moving resources from existing activities, etc. Use the limited space provided here to discuss the most important aspects of how this activity will be carried out.

Motivation: For a Priority to be credible, there must be a plausible plan and what needs to be accomplished must have been thought through. It is understood that these plans will change over the next 5 years, however.

(approximately 950 characters)

9.1.4 What previous accomplishments indicate a high likelihood of success?

Instructions: Describe what recent (last 5 years) accomplishments make it clear that the there is a good chance of success in this project. Use specific examples (e.g., grant X, collaboration Y, paper Z) and explain how those recent accomplishments are evidence of having the competencies needed to be successful in this project.

Motivation: For a Priority to be credible, the expertise and track record needed to support it must be present.

(approximately 600 characters)

9.2 Current status of the area at Uppsala University

Instruction: Describe the current status of the area at Uppsala University as a whole. Include any existing funding, support, staff, and success in this area. Explicitly identify any overlap with other existing activities at the program(s), department, section, faculty, and/or university levels.

Motivation: To avoid duplicating efforts, it is important to understand the local Uppsala context when enhancing existing activities or starting new efforts. As part of the evaluation process, the panel will try to identify synergies between proposed Priorities.

(approximately 250 characters)

9.2.1 Current and planned contributions to support the initiative

Instructions: Describe the current (already in-place and on-going) and planned contributions to this goal from the local level (from the program for program proposals, from the department for department proposals, and from both the program(s) and department, as appropriate, for program proposals selected by the department). For example, co-funding, in-kind support, shared funding of facilities, transfers of FFFs, etc.

Motivation: Evidence of financial commitment from the local environment strongly supports the proposal as being important. Conversely, if the local environment is unable or unwilling to support it, the importance to the environment as a whole is much weaker.

(approximately 250 characters)

9.3 Strategic value

9.3.1 Strategic value of the area in the global context

Instruction: Describe the importance of the area in the global context. For example: fundamental challenges in research; new developments in research; societal challenges and priorities; global impact and importance.

Motivation: To ensure consideration of the larger context.

(approximately 250 characters)

9.3.2 Strategic value of the area at the next level

Instruction: Describe the importance of the area to the department (for program proposals) and for the section and faculty (for department proposals). For example: synergies with other activities, connections to teaching and collaboration, both currently and potential for new ones, etc. Explain the value of this activity beyond any overlapping ones identified above.

Motivation: To ensure that there is awareness of where this activity fits in at the next level up in the organization. This is particularly important if support is to be requested at that level.

(approximately 250 characters)

9.4 Contributions needed for success

Instructions: Identify what contributions are needed for success in terms of time, expertise, resources, facilities, staff, etc. Explicitly include estimates of financial resources needed and where they will come from.

Motivation: To ensure the costs and resources required have been thought through, and that they are reasonable given the scope of the benefit.

(approximately 250 characters)

9.4.1 Success indicators

Instructions: Describe specific results that will indicate success in 5 years. For example: increases in publications in top venues X and Y, publications in new field Z, strengthened or new collaborations with university A, new hires in B, new grants from C, etc.

Motivation: To ensure that the local- and faculty-levels will be able to assess whether this Priority was successful at the next evaluation so that we develop a positive cycle of following up on our strategic planning.

(approximately 250 characters)

9.4.2 First steps that can be taken today

Instructions: Describe the first concrete steps needed to move in this direction that can be taken today. These should be clear enough that they can be followed up on in a year to see what progress has been made. Identify initial activities that can be started locally to enable progress to help motivate further support for the larger goal. In the exceptional case where no steps can be taken today, explain why a Priority has been chosen that cannot be started.

Motivation: To ensure that there is a clear idea of how to get started and enable easy follow-up of how the Priority is progressing.

(approximately 250 characters)

10 Priority 3 of 3: An activity that <u>may require faculty support</u>

10.1 Description of the Priority

Instructions: Provide the department name (since these will be collected at the section/faculty level) and the program name (if this is a program Priority), the title of the Priority, and whether it may require department support (Yes/No) and/or faculty support (Yes/No).

Department:				
Program:				
Title:				
Support:	**May require department support:**	[Yes/No]	**May require faculty support:**	[Yes/No]

10.1.1 Goal

Instructions: Specify the goal of the Priority, for example, to <u>strengthen</u> a specific existing activity or start a <u>new</u> one.

10.1.2 Expected meaningful research improvement

Instructions: Provide a description of the research that investing in this Priority will accomplish over the next 5 years. Explain how it has the potential to significantly strengthen or broaden the program for program proposals or department for department proposals. Specifically, this should go beyond continuing or slightly enlarging current activities by having a clear description of what change it will accomplish.

Motivation: The overall goal is to strengthen our research. As a result, the Priority should deliver meaningful improvements in research quality and/or breadth.

(approximately 950 characters)

10.1.3 Implementation plan

Instructions: Provide a brief description of specifically what is planned to be done over the next 5 years to realize the potential of this Priority. For example: new hires, investments in equipment, starting collaborations, closing down existing activities, moving resources from existing activities, etc. Use the limited space provided here to discuss the most important aspects of how this activity will be carried out.

Motivation: For a Priority to be credible, there must be a plausible plan and what needs to be accomplished must have been thought through. It is understood that these plans will change over the next 5 years, however.

(approximately 950 characters)

10.1.4 What previous accomplishments indicate a high likelihood of success?

Instructions: Describe what recent (last 5 years) accomplishments make it clear that the there is a good chance of success in this project. Use specific examples (e.g., grant X, collaboration Y, paper Z) and explain how those recent accomplishments are evidence of having the competencies needed to be successful in this project.

Motivation: For a Priority to be credible, the expertise and track record needed to support it must be present.

(approximately 600 characters)

10.2 Current status of the area at Uppsala University

Instruction: Describe the current status of the area at Uppsala University as a whole. Include any existing funding, support, staff, and success in this area. Explicitly identify any overlap with other existing activities at the program(s), department, section, faculty, and/or university levels.

Motivation: To avoid duplicating efforts, it is important to understand the local Uppsala context when enhancing existing activities or starting new efforts. As part of the evaluation process, the panel will try to identify synergies between proposed Priorities.

(approximately 250 characters)

10.2.1 Current and planned contributions to support the initiative

Instructions: Describe the current (already in-place and on-going) and planned contributions to this goal from the local level (from the program for program proposals, from the department for department proposals, and from both the program(s) and department, as appropriate, for program proposals selected by the department). For example, co-funding, in-kind support, shared funding of facilities, transfers of FFFs, etc.

Motivation: Evidence of financial commitment from the local environment strongly supports the proposal as being important. Conversely, if the local environment is unable or unwilling to support it, the importance to the environment as a whole is much weaker.

(approximately 250 characters)

10.3 Strategic value

10.3.1 Strategic value of the area in the global context

Instruction: Describe the importance of the area in the global context. For example: fundamental challenges in research; new developments in research; societal challenges and priorities; global impact and importance.

Motivation: To ensure consideration of the larger context.

(approximately 250 characters)

10.3.2 Strategic value of the area at the next level

Instruction: Describe the importance of the area to the department (for program proposals) and for the section and faculty (for department proposals). For example: synergies with other activities, connections to teaching and collaboration, both currently and potential for new ones, etc. Explain the value of this activity beyond any overlapping ones identified above.

Motivation: To ensure that there is awareness of where this activity fits in at the next level up in the organization. This is particularly important if support is to be requested at that level.

(approximately 250 characters)

10.4 Contributions needed for success

Instructions: Identify what contributions are needed for success in terms of time, expertise, resources, facilities, staff, etc. Explicitly include estimates of financial resources needed and where they will come from.

Motivation: To ensure the costs and resources required have been thought through, and that they are reasonable given the scope of the benefit.

(approximately 250 characters)

10.4.1 Success indicators

Instructions: Describe specific results that will indicate success in 5 years. For example: increases in publications in top venues X and Y, publications in new field Z, strengthened or new collaborations with university A, new hires in B, new grants from C, etc.

Motivation: To ensure that the local- and faculty-levels will be able to assess whether this Priority was successful at the next evaluation so that we develop a positive cycle of following up on our strategic planning.

(approximately 250 characters)

10.4.2 First steps that can be taken today

Instructions: Describe the first concrete steps needed to move in this direction that can be taken today. These should be clear enough that they can be followed up on in a year to see what progress has been made. Identify initial activities that can be started locally to enable progress to help motivate further support for the larger goal. In the exceptional case where no steps can be taken today, explain why a Priority has been chosen that cannot be started.

Motivation: To ensure that there is a clear idea of how to get started and enable easy follow-up of how the Priority is progressing.

(approximately 250 characters)