
| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Academy of Finland | Evaluation report |
| Date | |
| Evaluation panel | |
| Experts | |
| Application number | |
| Call | Programme for Centres of Excellence in Research 2012–2017 |
| Applicant | |
| Project title | |

Please rate the applications using the scale below. You are encouraged to use the entire scale.

- 6 Outstanding proposal, which stands out for exceptional novelty, innovativeness and renewal of science at global level
- 5 Excellent proposal, which is extremely good in international comparison – no significant improvement needed
- 4 Very good proposal, which contains minor elements that could be improved
- 3 Good proposal, which contains specific elements that could be improved
- 2 Satisfactory proposal in need of substantial modification or improvement
- 1 Weak proposal with severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project

For each specific question, a written evaluation should be given in addition to indicating a rating number. In addition to the numerical rating, please give a written evaluation of each of the specific questions.

Reminder to the reviewer

Definition: Centre of Excellence (CoE) is a research and researcher training unit that is at the international cutting edge of research in its field. A CoE may consist of one or more high-level research teams working closely together, based at a university, a research institute or operating in several different organisations. A CoE may also have collaboration with private sector companies.

Centre of Excellence is characterised by being

- an innovative and target-oriented research environment that combines international cutting-edge research and promotes and supports researcher careers at all stages of the career
- a professionally led entity with a clear and challenging research vision
- expected to compete successfully for international research funding

The Centre of Excellence programme aims to

- create favourable operating conditions for consortia of research teams
- create potential for scientific breakthroughs at the interfaces of scientific disciplines and research fields
- reinforce the use of research infrastructures
- network Centres of Excellence nationally and internationally
- develop and support research collaboration with the best international researchers and research teams
- promote the societal impact of research
- have a positive impact on the Finnish research and innovation system
- promote the compatibility of the strategies of a CoE and its host organisations
- raise the quality, international competitiveness, visibility and esteem of Finnish research.

| | |
|--|--------|
| Scientific quality and innovativeness of the research plan | Rating |
|--|--------|

1. Assess the scientific quality and innovativeness of the research plan.
Subrating
Comments
2. Assess the potential of this research for significant new outcomes, scientific breakthroughs and the progress of science in its field. Are there potential risks that could threaten the project but a successful outcome would mean major progress in the field.
Subrating
Comments
3. Assess the scientific added value of working as a CoE.
Comments (no numerical rating)

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| Feasibility of the research plan | Rating |
|----------------------------------|--------|

4. Are the research methods sound and the research plan feasible? Do the applicants acknowledge potential scientific or methodological problem areas and how are alternative approaches being considered? Is the proposed schedule appropriate and well planned?
Subrating
Comments
5. Are the planned resources (personnel, financial and other material resources) adequate for the implementation of the planned CoE activities?
Subrating
Comments
6. Assess the structure and organisation of the CoE project.
Comments (no numerical rating)
7. How is the Materials management plan¹ considered?
Subrating
Comments
8. If there are ethical issues involved, how are these taken into account?
Comments (no numerical rating)

| | |
|--|--------|
| Competence of the applicant and research teams | Rating |
|--|--------|

9. Estimate overall quality of the publication record² of the proposed CoE director and deputy director.
Subrating

¹ The Academy requires that applicants give an account of how the project proposes to obtain its data materials, how information produced by the project will be used and stored and how subsequent use of the information will be facilitated. The account shall further cover the rights of ownership and use pertaining to the materials utilised and generated by the project. This is referred to as a materials management plan and it shall be presented in connection with the research plan. The Academy recommends that the research projects funded by the Academy deliver the social science research data they have gathered to the Finnish Social Science Data Archive (FSD), www.fsd.uta.fi.

² Normally, depending on the field, these are scientific publications and/or major research monographs. The length of the list of publications is not limited. The applicant has been asked to shortlist the ten most important publications in terms of the research plan at the beginning of the list.

Comments

10. Estimate overall quality of the publication record of the proposed CoE team leaders.

Subrating

Comments

11. Are the merits, scientific expertise and leadership skills of the proposed CoE director and deputy director appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project?

Subrating

Comments

12. Are the merits and scientific expertise of the proposed CoE team leaders appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project?

Subrating

Comments

13. Do the proposed CoE team leaders bring complementary expertise to the CoE project? Is the division of labour between research teams/sub-projects of the consortia appropriate?

Subrating

Comments

| | |
|--|--------|
| Research environment and collaboration | Rating |
|--|--------|

14. Besides scientific added value³, what is the added value of working as a CoE (e.g. promotion of multi-/inter-/transdisciplinary research, researcher training, structural benefits, promotion of creative research environment⁴ etc.)?

Subrating

Comments

15. Assess the compatibility of the research of the CoE project with the strategies of the host institutions. How do host institutions support the CoE project (including appropriate research infrastructures)?

Comments (no numerical rating)

16. Assess the national research collaborations that can significantly contribute to the success of the CoE project.

Subrating

Comments

17. Assess the international research collaborations that can significantly contribute to the success of the CoE project.

Subrating

Comments

| | |
|---|--------|
| Significance of the CoE for the researcher training and promotion of professional careers in research | Rating |
|---|--------|

³ See section 1.

⁴ Creative research environment is described for example in The State and Quality of Scientific Research in Finland 2009, chapter 2.4 'Research environments and cooperation' (Academy publications 10/09), available in pdf at www.aka.fi/publications.

18. Evaluate the objectives and resources of the CoE to supervise doctoral students and integration of these activities into larger frameworks, such as graduate schools and the promotion of researcher mobility.

Subrating
Comments

19. Evaluate the objectives and resources of the CoE to support postdoctoral research careers, including promotion of researcher mobility.

Subrating
Comments

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Societal impact | |
|-----------------|--|

20. Assess the expected societal impact of the CoE project.
Comments (no numerical rating)

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| International competitiveness | |
|-------------------------------|--|

21. Assess how the CoE as a whole rates in relation to top international research in its field. The CoE as a unit belongs to the

- best 1% (=subrating 6)
- best 5% (=subrating 5)
- best 10% (=subrating 4)
- not among the best 10% (=subrating 3)
- not among the best 20% (=subrating 2)

Subrating
Comments

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Overall assessment | |
|--------------------|--|

Main strengths and weaknesses of the project. Additional comments and suggestions.

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Final rating | |
|--------------|--|