

Publications of the Academy of Finland 6/09

RUSSIA IN FLUX RESEARCH PROGRAMME 2004–2007



Evaluation Report



ACADEMY OF FINLAND
RESEARCH FUNDING AND EXPERTISE

RUSSIA IN FLUX
RESEARCH
PROGRAMME
(2004–2007)

Evaluation Report

Evaluation Panel

Professor Stanley D. Brunn
Professor Harley Johansen
Dr. Roy Allison
Professor Hilary Pilkington
Professor Andrei Zorin
Professor Holly Barcus

ACADEMY OF FINLAND IN BRIEF

The Academy's mission is to finance high-quality scientific research, act as a science and science policy expert and strengthen the position of science and research. The Academy's activities cover all scientific disciplines.

The main focus of the Academy's development activities is on improving opportunities for professional careers in research, providing resources and facilities for high-profile research environments and making the best possible use of international opportunities in all fields of research, research funding, and science policy.

The Academy has a number of funding instruments for various purposes. In its research funding, the Academy of Finland promotes gender equality and encourages in particular women researchers to apply for research posts and research grants from the Academy.

The Academy's annual research funding amounts to more than 287 million euros, which represents some 15 per cent of the government's total R&D spending.

Each year Academy-funded projects account for some 3,000 researcher-years at universities and research institutes.

The wide range of high-level basic research funded by the Academy generates new knowledge and new experts. The Academy of Finland operates within the administrative sector of the Ministry of Education and receives its funding through the state budget.

For more information on the Academy of Finland, go to www.aka.fi/eng.

CONTENTS

Foreword.....	8
1 The Russia in Flux research programme.....	13
1.1 Background	13
1.2 Objectives	14
1.3 Basic information on the programme.....	14
2 Evaluation procedure	16
3 Overall evaluation of the Russia in Flux programme	18
3.1 Strategic planning of the programme	18
3.2 Funding decisions and funded projects in creating the necessary preconditions.....	18
3.3 Scientific quality and results	18
3.4 Success of the implementation of the programme goals and objectives, inter- and transdisciplinarity.....	19
3.5 Added value of the programme.....	20
3.6 Programme coordination and activities	21
3.7 Benefits of the Russia in Flux programme.....	21
4 Conclusions and recommendations for the future.....	22
Annex 1 The assignment to the evaluation panel	26
Annex 2 Members of the evaluation panel	27
Annex 3 The agenda of the evaluation panel meeting.....	28
Annex 4 List of the projects and their funding.....	29
Annex 5 Material used in the evaluation	32
Annex 6a Self-evaluation form for the project leaders	33
Annex 6b Self-evaluation form for the project researchers	38

Description

Publisher	Academy of Finland	Date	May 2009
Author(s)	Evaluation Panel		
Title	Russia in Flux Research Programme 2004–2007. Evaluation Report		
Abstract	<p>The Board of the Academy of Finland decided in November 2002 to launch the Russia in Flux Research Programme. The aim of the programme was to contribute to knowledge of Russia as a state, a society, a natural environment and as an economic and cultural area. Another aim was to gain a clearer picture of the conditions prevailing in Russia today, the ongoing processes of change and the underlying causes of those processes and their impacts. The research was expected to generate knowledge that will help us reach a deeper understanding of Russia and that can be used in strategic decision-making in different sectors of society.</p> <p>Initially, the budget of the research programme was 9.5 million euros, and the programme comprised 30 research projects. Later, three more projects were included in the programme, two of which were funded through a Finnish-Russian joint call. Ultimately, the programme comprised 33 projects with a total funding of nearly 10 million euros. In addition to the Academy of Finland, the programme was funded by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, the Ministry of Defence, the Ministry of the Environment, the Ministry of Transport and Communications and Tekes. The Russian Foundation for the Humanities contributed to the funding of two Finnish-Russian joint projects.</p> <p>In 2008, an international evaluation panel was appointed to evaluate the Russia in Flux Research Programme. The panel was asked to evaluate the programme as a whole with a special focus on the following issues: planning of the programme and the programme's scientific quality, success in the implementation of the programme objectives, contribution to researcher training, collaboration and networking, significance and applicability of research results, as well as recommendations to the Academy of Finland for future programmes. This report includes the results of the evaluation panel's work.</p> <p>According to the panel, the timing of the programme was right and demonstrates that the Academy of Finland funds top research focused on Russia. The panel praised the programme's international engagement, the active participation of Russian researchers and the efforts of researchers to make the research results known among the general public. The panel found the programme's thematic scope a strength in terms of Russian studies carried out in Europe. However, the panel noted that certain important fields were underrepresented or even absent among the projects funded through the programme.</p>		
Key words	research programme, evaluation, research funding, Russia		
Name and number of series	Publication of the Academy of Finland 6/09		
ISSN	0358-9153		
ISBN	Print 978-951-715-735-3	Pdf	978-951-715-736-0
Number of pages	38		
Distributed by	Academy of Finland, POB 99, FI-00501 Helsinki, viestinta@aka.fi		
Published by	Academy of Finland		
Place and date of printing	Edita Prima, 2009		
Other information	www.aka.fi/publications		

Kuvailulehti

Julkaisija	Suomen Akatemia	Päivämäärä Toukokuu 2009
Tekijä(t)	Arvointipaneeli	
Julkaisun nimi	Russia in Flux Research Programme 2004–2007. Evaluation Report	
Tiivistelmä	<p>Suomen Akatemian hallitus päätti marraskuussa 2002 käynnistää Muuttuva Venäjä -tutkimusohjelman. Tutkimusohjelman tavoitteena oli lisätä tietoa Venäjästä valtiona, yhteiskuntana, luonnonympäristönä sekä talous- ja kulttuurialueena. Tavoitteena oli selkeyttää kuva vallitsevista olosuhteista, muutoksista, muutosten syistä ja vaikutuksista. Tutkimuksen avulla toivottiin syntynyt tietoa, joka auttaa paremmin ymmärtämään Venäjää ja jota voidaan käyttää hyväksi strategisessa päätöksenteossa yhteiskunnan eri sektoreilla.</p> <p>Tutkimusohjelman budjetti oli alun perin 9,5 miljoonaa euroa ja se koostui 30 tutkimushankkeesta. Tutkimusohjelmaa liitettiin myöhemmin kolme hanketta, joista kaksi oli rahoitettu suomalais-venäläisessä yhteishauassa. Lopulta ohjelmaan kuului 33 hanketta, joiden kokonaisrahoitus oli lähes 10 miljoonaa euroa. Suomen Akatemian ohella ohjelman kansallislaa rahoittajia olivat ulkoministeriö, maa- ja metsätalousministeriö, puolustusministeriö, ympäristöministeriö, liikenne- ja viestintäministeriö ja Tekes. Venäjän humanistinen tiederahasto osallistui kahden suomalais-venäläisen yhteishankkeen rahoitukseen.</p> <p>Vuonna 2008 Muuttuva Venäjä -tutkimusohjelmaa arvioimaan nimittiin kansainvälinen arvointipaneeli. Paneelin tehtäväänä oli arvioida ohjelma kokonaisuudessaan kiinnittäen erityistä huomiota seuraaviin seikkoihin: tutkimusohjelman valmistelu ja ohjelman tieteellinen laatu, ohjelman tavoitteiden saavuttaminen, panostus tutkijankoulutukseen, yhteistyö ja verkottuminen, tutkimustulosten merkittävyys ja sovellettavuus sekä suositukset Suomen Akatemialle tulevia ohjelmia varten. Tämä raportti sisältää arvointipaneelin työn tulokset.</p> <p>Paneelin mukaan ohjelma osui oikeaan aikaan ja osoittaa, että Suomen Akatemia selvästi rahoittaa Venäjään kohdistuvaa huippututkimusta. Paneeli kiitteli ohjelman kansainvälisyyttä, venäläisten tutkijoiden aktiivista mukanaoloa ja tutkijoiden aktiivista panosta tutkimustulosten tunnetuksi tekemisessä myös laajemmalle yleisölle. Paneeli piti vahvuutteina ohjelman temaatista laajuutta Euroopassa tehtävän Venäjä-tutkimuksen kannalta. Toisaalta paneeli näki, että jotkut tärkeät alat olivat aliedustettuna tai puuttuivat kokonaan rahoitettujen hankkeiden joukosta.</p>	
Asiasanat	tutkimusohjelma, arvointi, tutkimusrahoitus, Venäjä	
Julkaisusarjan nimi ja numero	Suomen Akatemian julkaisuja 6/09	
ISSN	0358-9153	
ISBN	Painetulle kirjalle annettu tunnus 978-951-715-735-3	Pdf-versiossa annettu tunnus 978-951-715-736-0
Sivumäärä	38	
Julkaisun jakaja	Suomen Akatemia, PL 99, 00501 Helsinki, viestinta@aka.fi	
Julkaisun kustantaja	Suomen Akatemia	
Painopaikka ja -aika	Edita Prima, 2009	
Muut tiedot	www.aka.fi/julkaisut	

FOREWORD

The *Russia in Flux* Research Programme can be regarded as unique in the world. I will explain why:

The size of the programme. The programme included a large variety of research projects, more than 30 in all. The funding that the projects received exceeded nine million euros. One may ask: what other country can produce such an enormous range of scientific research on Russia?

The scientific scope. Russian studies are usually understood as research on Russian culture and society. The *Russia in Flux* programme covered not only these traditional fields of Russian studies, but also a substantial number of projects with roots in the natural sciences. These projects dealt with issues such as the environment, oil production, geography, forestry, and even the genetic background of a certain breed of cattle in Siberia.

The number of research funding agencies. The Academy of Finland has a long tradition of co-funding research programmes with Finnish partners, especially with different ministries and Tekes, the Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation. However, it is often the case that these partners are eager to determine the topic of a programme, but less active when it comes to providing funding. In the *Russia in Flux* programme the situation was much better: as many as four Finnish ministries and Tekes contributed to the funding of individual projects. This suggests that there is a great interest in research on Russia in Finnish society at large.

The quality of research. The quality of the individual projects was guaranteed by a careful selection procedure. Out of the 150 proposals received at the first stage, only 33 were eventually accepted for funding. Naturally, one can always wish for more international visibility, but as such the programme contributed substantially to the international scientific debate, as stated in the present evaluation.

Cooperation with Russian scholars. When carrying out research on Russia, it is natural to work in cooperation with Russian scholars. Despite this obvious fact, it seems that numerous researchers around the world are ignoring this obvious opportunity for one reason or another. In the selection of projects for the research programme, active cooperation with Russian researchers in the given field was a prerequisite for being accepted for funding.

Any research programme can produce a great number of scientific publications. The *Russia in Flux* programme has been no exception. Despite this, the most important result of the research is not the publications themselves, but the growth in the expertise and knowledge of the researchers involved. I hope that Finnish society will utilise the great potential of the researchers that have participated in the programme. In view of Finland's historical destiny in having Russia as a neighbour, leading to close contacts (both economic and cultural) between Russia and Finland, there is self-evidently a great demand for high-level experts on Russian matters.

In scientific terms, Russian studies is one of the very few research fields (or perhaps the only one) in which Finland can be an absolute world leader. Research funding agencies should bear this in mind as they search for topics on which to concentrate as far as national top-level research priorities are concerned.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Evaluation Panel very cordially for the tremendous job they did in assessing the results of the research programme, and for making a great number of very valuable recommendations. Some of them deal with major science policy questions, such as the multidisciplinary nature of research; others include practical advice for the procedures involved in administering a research programme. These recommendations should be studied very thoroughly by those involved in similar procedures at the Academy of Finland.

Arto Mustajoki

Professor of Russian Language
University of Helsinki
Chair of the Programme Committee of the *Russia in Flux* Research Programme

I THE RUSSIA IN FLUX PROGRAMME

1.1 Background

The purpose of the international Panel was to evaluate the totality of the Russia in Flux programme, including whether its objectives have been met, the decision-making process in awarding grants, the scientific merits and impacts of the funded research, the outcomes (to research communities, Russian collaborators, and wider Finnish society), and to give recommendations for future Academy of Finland funding. (See Annex 1 for the assignment and Annex 2 for a list of the members of the evaluation panel.)

The programme is described in a 2003 memorandum by the Academy of Finland entitled *Research Programme on Russia in Flux*.

“The research programme is concerned with Russia in flux; its purpose is to shed light on Russia as a state, society, natural environment and as an economic and cultural area. More specifically, the aim is to gain a clearer picture of the conditions prevailing in Russia today, the ongoing processes of change, and the underlying causes of those processes, and also their impacts. It is expected that the research will generate information that can help us reach a deeper understanding of Russia and that can be used in strategic decision-making in different sectors of society.”

“A key condition for success in this programme is that researchers working in the field commit themselves to closer national and international cooperation. The programme will also aim to increase the visibility of research in this area, to improve the availability of research knowledge, and to support exchange between the research community, public administration, and business and industry.”

The memorandum continues by listing the criteria that will be used to fund projects:

“The project is relevant in terms of its societal impacts (which may have to do with society, the economy, and technology, culture, people or the environment),”

“The project is on the cutting edge of international research in the sense that it has a clear and visible impact on the development of Russian studies around the world,”

“The project represents a field of study in which Finland occupies a special place on account of its history and location as Russia’s neighbour.”

The memorandum also notes the importance of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research to understanding problems and processes in the broad thematic areas identified below. In geographical terms, the research may focus upon Russia, although it may also involve a comparative element in so far as it is conducive to a better understanding of what is happening in Russia. Cooperation with Russian scholars is encouraged, although not required for Academy funding. This point is

elaborated in the ‘National and International Cooperation’ section of the memorandum.

1.2 Objectives

There are seven broad ‘Thematic Areas’ identified in this memorandum which will inform and advise scholars interested in submitting proposals for Academy of Finland funding. These are:

- Russia as an international actor,
- Regional policy, internal administration and security,
- Natural resources, the environment, and sustainable development,
- Economic mechanisms,
- Technological prospects,
- Health and well-being,
- Cultural change,
- Values in society and education.

The final portions of the memorandum identify the various funding bodies supporting the Russia in Flux programme and the Instructions for Preparing Applications and Timetables. Aside from the Academy of Finland, these are the ministries who are committing funds: Transport and Communications, Agriculture and Forestry, Education, Defence, Interior, Foreign Affairs, the Environment. Tekes, the Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation, also contributed to the funding programme.

1.3 Basic Information on the Programme

The information below on ‘Instructions for Preparing Applications and Timetables’ is included in the ‘Research Programme on Russia in Flux’ memorandum mentioned above.

“Programme funding will be made available to research teams that are based at Finnish universities, research institutes and other public sector organizations. The monies allocated to projects may also include grants for Russian researchers working in their home country.”

“Applications for participation in the programme will be processed in two stages. The deadline is final; letters of intent must be submitted no later than 11 August 2003. Letters of interest must be submitted either online www.aka.fi > Electronic services, or by using the Academy’s application form SA1.2003 (Finnish), SA 1.2003R (Swedish) or SA 1.2003E (English). The programme code ‘RUSSIA’ must be on the application. All applicants must indicate whether they also plan to apply for funding from other sources under item 38 of the application. When applicants are filed online, one hard copy must be mailed to the Academy with the applicants’ signatures. When using the printed application form, 20 copies (original and 19 sets of copies) of all documents with appendices must be sent to the Academy of Finland’s Registrar’s office.”

“The application form must be completed in accordance with the instructions given, with the exception that only the following appendices are to be attached to the application:

- A research plan of no more than three pages;
- The CV of the project’s Principal Investigator of no more than two pages in length, and
- A list of no more than 20 scientific publications most directly relevant to the research project by the Principal Investigator or other senior researchers involved in the project.”

“The research plan must include a description of the proposed research and its objectives, how the research ties in with the themes of the programme and other related research, the main methods used, the timetable of the research, national and international cooperation, expected results and their publication and utilization, an account of researcher training and a tentative budget.”

“If the application is filed in the name of a consortium, the researcher in charge shall complete a joint application form and attach a three-page research plan for the consortium, which in addition to the points just mentioned also describes the added value that will be achieved by working as a consortium. In addition, each project involved in the consortium shall complete its own application form and attach appendices 2–3 as mentioned above and compile their own research plan. Consortium applications must be submitted in one package.”

“Letters of intent will be reviewed by the Programme Steering Committee in which all funding bodies are represented. The final decision on projects which research the second stage will be made by a separate subcommittee. Those projects will then be invited to submit full applications in the English language; the deadline for these applications is 6 October 2003.”

2 EVALUATION PROCEDURE

The Evaluation Panel met on 9–10 December 2008 at the Academy of Finland (See Annex 3 for the agenda.) Before we arrived for the Evaluation meeting, the Panel was provided with a great deal of information about the Russia in Flux research programme, the list of awardees and the funds received (See Annex 4) and their final report to the Academy. Once we arrived we received additional information. Altogether we received for study, review, and discussion other useful pieces of information (See Annex 5).

The Evaluation Panel met with the Programme Manager, Dr. Ylikangas, on Monday evening 8 December at a local restaurant. This was a get-acquainted session as many Panel members did not know each other except via e-mail from Dr. Ylikangas. The following morning the Panel was taken to the Academy of Finland where we also met Programme Manager, Dr. Pietikäinen and the programme's Project Secretary, Ms Vitikainen. We were presented an overview of the Russia in Flux programme by Dr. Ylikangas followed by a question-and-answer session with members of the Evaluation Panel. Following a break, the Panel met with the previous Programme Manager, Dr. Kangaspuro, who directed the programme at its inception. We had very useful conversations with him about the purpose of the programme, funding, proposals submitted, and evaluation criteria.

The remainder of our first day was spent interviewing in groups fourteen researchers, including senior scholars and postdoctoral students, about their Russia in Flux programme experiences. All members of the Evaluation Panel participated in the valuable and candid exchanges. Among the topics discussed were the following: their own perceived benefits from participating, the collaboration with Russian scholars, logistical problems working with Russians, field experiences in one or more Russian city or administrative area, use of Russian language, data gathering, and participation in conferences, workshops, and publications. We also inquired about their commitments to continued research about and in Russia.

The final meeting of our first day was with the Chair and one member of the Programme Steering Committee. This discussion proved most valuable in our evaluation as this is the Committee that decides on the major themes for the programme, the rankings of the proposals, and ‘who gets how much’ for her/his research. There were a number of serious questions raised by Evaluation Panel members regarding the transparency of the final selection of topics and monies, the uneven distribution of funds (e.g., very few in the humanities and international relations – two themes mentioned above as being important in the Russia in Flux programme), and relative uneven participation of Steering Committee members throughout the process.

There were two major tasks for the Evaluation Panel’s second day. First was a second meeting with the Programme Manager, Dr. Ylikangas. At this meeting there were numerous questions asked by Panel members about a number of issues. Some of the questions were of a generic nature, while others were more specific. The questions

included the role of the Steering Committee in final decisions regarding selection of proposals for funding and the amount of funding, the composition of Steering Committee members (did they represent the thematic areas described in the Call for Proposals?), the absence of some topics being funded (examples: international relations and Russian arts/literature/language), the unevenness in universities receiving funds (most went to Helsinki and Tampere), the role of international scholars reviewing proposals, the variations in rating of proposals (some referees may be tougher or more lenient than others), the incomplete reporting of data from funded scholars, the lack of punitive measures against those who receive funding and seem to have published little from their grants, the amount of an award, the role of other ministries dealing with forestry and environmental science research in the selection of topics for funding (separate from Steering Committee and outside reviewers' recommendations), the perceived emphasis on 'quantity' rather than 'quality' publications, the value of the programme to Russian collaborators, the apparent preference in many instances for awards to senior scholars rather than the next and younger generation of scholars, and, finally, the dissemination of research results to members of Finnish Parliament, respective scholarly communities, and Finnish society at large. The Panel in general was pleased with the exchanges as they provided useful information about the programme's background, procedures, and successes. Some of the responses are highlighted below in regards to benefits of the programme, while others are incorporated into recommendations.

The second agenda item on day two discussed a draft of elements in the Panel's final report to the Academy of Finland. We agreed to include in our report information on the background of the Russia in flux programme, what items we were provided with to evaluate the programme, the benefits of the programme, and finally, specific recommendations for the Academy's final deliberations on the programme. We concluded our formal meeting thanking Dr. Ylikangas, Dr. Pietikäinen, and Ms Vitikainen for their most generous hospitality, the useful materials they provided us, and, finally, their willingness to answer tough questions by Panel members.

3 OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE RUSSIA IN FLUX PROGRAMME

3.1 Strategic planning of the programme

The objectives of the programme were clearly stated in the document requesting proposals (programme memorandum). The members of the Steering Committee are listed in the programme memorandum.

3.2 Funding decisions and funded projects in creating the necessary preconditions

The procedures used to identify funded proposals are described in the materials provided the Evaluation Panel. The questions the Panel raised that were of concern relate to (a) the lack of funding for some projects we thought would benefit from the Russia in Flux programme funding, viz., international relations and broad coverage of the arts, (b) the potential for unevenness in rating by international evaluators (some may have been tougher than others), (c) the Ministries made decisions to fund projects which were given lower ratings than those required for funding by the Academy of Finland by Steering Committee and international evaluators, and (d) the funding for projects (specifically pollution and forestry) that did not seem to ‘fit’ the Russia in Flux programme initiatives. We revisit these questions in the recommendations

3.3 Scientific quality and results

Overall, the Panel was very impressed by the final reports the project directors submitted. These included many examples of articles, chapters, and books published as well as presentations at national, European, and international conferences. The Academy is clearly funding important cutting-edge research on Russia by Finnish scholars, many working with Russian scholars, who are actively disseminating their results to various audiences. We were pleasantly surprised that many project directors considered it an important part of their grant to disseminate results of their research in a wide variety of professional sources. We also were pleased that many included youthful career professionals in their publications. Finally, we noted that a few projects yielded many results, while for others the ‘outputs’ were more modest. And in a few cases we were concerned about a complete absence of information reported on funded outcomes.

The Panel spent some time discussing the ‘quantity vs. quality’ products. We had very little idea about how to evaluate the ‘quality outcomes’, as we were basically unfamiliar with many of the single and multiple authored publications in not so well-known, and often Finnish, journals. While some of these short publications or chapters may have appeared in major journals, and be significant contributions to a field, we could not discern this from the material presented. We make a

recommendation to the Academy below about each Principal Investigator inform an Evaluation Panel what are the most significant publications resulting from the research and why these are significant.

3.4 Success of the implementation of the programme goals and objectives, inter- and transdisciplinarity

The Academy's description of the Russia in Flux programme emphasized the importance of interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research in both the submission of projects for potential funding and for the completion of funded projects. This was an important objective. And the final reports of project directors illustrated both the inter- and transdisciplinary merits of their research. On reflection, the Panel had two reactions. First, that it appeared that the inter- and transdisciplinary emphasis was rather 'forced' on the part of the research. This is not to say that these emphases are not or were no important, but that it must be realized that sometimes strictly disciplinary research can be as important and productive as that which crosses disciplines. Second, there were some broad areas of inter- and transdisciplinary research we thought were missing from the funded projects. We see this 'gap' especially in the areas of international relations and security and the arts (music, art, literature) as broadly defined.

Collaboration and networking

There is no question but that both collaboration and networking provided valuable dividends for all who engaged in the Russia in Flux programme. These included the scientists and their students, but also their contacts with other Russia in Flux programme scholars and international collaborators. The professional conferences organized and attended as well as the public presentations were beneficial. They informed other members of the various scientific communities as well as the Steering Committee, members of Finnish Parliament, and the general public.

International cooperation

This was a very important component of the Russia in Flux programme. We found that the senior scholars benefited as did the doctoral and postdoctoral students and so did, we think, the Russian scientists who collaborated on the research. We were told that for many of the Russian scholars this was their first collaborative research with scientists from the West.

Contributions to researcher training and mobility

The major benefits we observed and learned from our interviews with funded project directors and their students were that it provided opportunities especially for young Finnish scholars to be engaged on topics about Russia, with Russians, and in Russia. The language training was a major bonus for those who studied the language and actually used it as part of their postdoctoral research or research that resulted in publications and presentations with senior professors.

Communication

Communication was and is an important part of any programme. We were pleased to learn that there were meetings of funded project directors where they could share results and concerns about the programme. We were pleased that the Programme Manager himself considered a major part of his responsibility to maintain close contact with project leaders. And there were meetings with selected Steering Committee members and with the public, both which yielded benefits to the scholars, the Academy, and the general public.

Socio-economic impacts

While direct socio-economic impacts were not part of the Russia in Flux programme, because they were primarily academic in nature, we recognize that there were some projects that would have immediate and direct benefits. These would include projects that dealt with public housing, reproductive health, Russian competitiveness, and local economies (forest or pastoral). Others that eventually help in community relations and economic development dealt with local empowerment, Finnish-Russian enterprises, and everyday racism. Even projects that dealt with World War II memories of the Karelians or forest harvesting methods would be important in understanding Finnish-Russian issues.

Technological impacts

This was not considered a major part of the programme. Most of the projects were in the social sciences and humanities where technological innovations were not called for or integral parts of the Russia in Flux programme initiative.

3.5 Added value of the programme

This is a topic that generated some discussion among Panel members as we sought to wrestle with exactly how one does define and measure ‘value added’. The Panel agreed that ‘value added’ was significant for some individual fields, such as health care and local economies, but also for several broad interdisciplinary programmes, including environmental and economic development. In addition, some of the contributions have distinct scientific merit, such as advancing a theory or opening a new area of disciplinary or transdisciplinary research, while other contributions provide benefits of society as a whole or to an understanding of Russian society in transition. In sum, the Panel was very supportive of both the broad focus of the Russia in Flux programme and the individual merits of many projects.

The Panel strongly agrees that the diversity of topics funded by the Academy of Finland in the Russia in Flux programme is a major strength for European and Russian scholars studying Russia in transition times. We found much in favour of topics that were funded; those that were theoretical in nature, designed primarily to train students in Russia about Russia, and promoted collaboration between Finnish and Russian researchers. Each of these brings benefits and added value to the programme. The Programme Manager needs to be congratulated for successfully initiating strong interdisciplinary and also Russian-Finnish scholarly collaboration.

We do not wish to sit in judgment declaring that only one specific kind of project or funded programme yielded greater added value. Rather we found benefits in many projects that were funded.

3.6 Programme coordination and activities

We were impressed and pleased to note the amount and kinds of efforts made by the Programme Manager to work with project leaders and team members. He devoted a significant amount of time to ensure that the individual projects were running smoothly and that the Steering Committee, members of the Academy of Finland, and also the general public were aware of what the scholars were studying. His report identifies a variety of initiatives that were important to the programme's success.

3.7 Benefits of the Russia in Flux research programme

1. Timely and relevant research conducted by junior and senior scholars,
2. It represents Finland's continuing interest in its eastern neighbour,
3. It confirms that Finland is one of the leaders among EU countries in Russian and Baltic States' economies, cultures, politics, and environmental problems,
4. Involves outside evaluators as part of the Academy of Finland's decisions on grants,
5. Involves international evaluators in the final review of the Russia in Flux programme,
6. Strongly encourages and supports multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary research,
7. Strongly encourages and engages Russian researchers as collaborators,
8. From the Russian side, provides opportunities to learn from Finnish experts about contemporary research agendas, the merits of international collaborative research, and also monetary compensation,
9. Develops national and international networks on individual projects,
10. Provides training and mentoring of young doctoral and postdoctoral students, viz., the next generation of scholars interested in Russia,
11. Involves graduate students in research projects as well as in professional presentations and research publications,
12. The Russia in Flux programme was timely and came at the right time for many career professionals,
13. Many who received funding plan to continue research on projects dealing with Russia,
14. Many junior and senior scholars have attended and benefited from international conferences and presentations,
15. Those involved are definitely involved in cutting-edge research topics,
16. Publications appeared in a wide variety of professional journals, including many highly ranked,
17. Those benefiting from the programme were and are highly visible within their universities, their own scholarly communities, Finnish Parliament, and a wider public,
18. Some developed language skills as an outgrowth of their research,
19. Some developed necessary expertise in data-handling methods and methodologies.

4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

Before stating our recommendations, we would hope that Finnish scholars, in collaboration with those from Russia, will continue to seek Academy of Finland funds to pursue cutting-edge research topics and also publish their collaborative research in disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and international journals.

For each recommendation below, we are providing a rationale for that recommendation.

1. That the Academy of Finland establishes a funding source for intensive language study in Russian by junior and senior scholars wishing to pursue Finnish-Russian collaborative research in their careers.

Rationale: The Academy will send a strong message to junior and senior scholars interested in collaborative Russian-Finnish research by supporting Intensive language training for those in graduate or postdoctoral programmes.

2. That the Academy of Finland provides stronger wording in future programmes advertising and promotion that welcomes and ensures greater diversity in funding both the sciences and humanities.

Rationale: The Russia in Flux proposals that were funded reveal some unevenness in the grants and possibly even some marginalization of some broad research areas, including international relations, security, literature, language, and the arts.

3. That there be greater transparency in the grant reward process.

Rationale: There is a lack of clarity and consistency in regards to who are the evaluators (specialists, etc.), who reviewed what? Potential conflicts of interest and also the rankings (their average scores, etc.) may surface. There may also be differential rankings between natural and social scientists and between those in the sciences and the humanities. One suggestion is to ask the Principal Investigator to choose whether to have the proposal reviewed by social or natural scientists or someone in the humanities; also whether she/he prefers to have the proposal reviewed by disciplinary or interdisciplinary evaluators.

4. That future interdisciplinary programmes, such as Russia in Flux, establish major categories for funding in the various fields and disciplines that will ensure there is greater diversity in the projects funded. It is probably desirable, if for no other reason than equity and transparency, to ensure that at least all areas of interest are funded, even if only minimal amounts. To neglect major areas may be perceived as deliberate bias by evaluators.

Rationale: The current Russia in Flux programme overemphasizes some fields, for example, sociology and cultural studies and forestry, to the effect (or impression) of marginalizing other fields we believe would merit the Russia in Flux funding.

5. That the multi- and interdisciplinary foci of Academy of Finland programmes be continued and emphasized, but not required in all funded research. However, for those that are multi- and interdisciplinary, the clusters should be carefully and clearly identified.

Rationale: While we support the merits of collaborative research across disciplines, such as public health, international relations, and global environmental change, we recognize that in some fields it may not be absolutely necessary to achieve a major scientific contribution.

6. That the Academy of Finland continues its strong emphasis to fund international research projects.

Rationale: Finland is ahead of many other European countries in regards to funding collaborative Finnish-Russian research projects. The Russia in Flux research programme's success in these areas can serve as benchmarks for other international research programmes.

7. That the Academy of Finland initiates a "seed funding" programme whereby scholars can submit short proposals for small and short-term research projects on innovative topics or those where the Principal Investigator is embarking on new career directions.

Rationale: The Academy of Finland needs to provide opportunities for both junior and senior scholars working on new or cutting-edge fields that may be disciplinary or multidisciplinary in nature. These grants, some of which may require very modest funding, may lead to the formal submission of longer research proposals for more funding to collect more data, carry out new analyses, or collaborate with a wider scholarly community. Junior scholars especially need to be provided these incentives.

8. That the Academy of Finland ensures in its funding research that junior and youthful scholars are not penalized or dis-rewarded by grants going instead to established senior scholars, whose careers are identified by many projects funded by the Academy of Finland.

Rationale: The Academy needs to invest in the career futures of youthful scholars (whether in the academia or the private sector) and work with these early-career professionals to mentor them, to aid them in publishing, and to assist them in writing strong and competitive research projects. Workshops and seminars sponsored by the Academy of Finland are possible vehicles to accomplish this objective. Senior scholars with successful track records could be mentors to the next generation of scholars; the mentors need not come from one's own research specialization. What is sought are successful strategies to becoming successful in one's publishing and professional career.

9. That there be more transparency in evaluating the quality of research materials and outcomes included in the Principal Investigator's final report. (The summary matrix is a technical compilation and is based on the final reports of the projects.)

Rationale: There is a certain ambiguity and lack of clarity regarding the reporting of research outcomes generated by the Russia in flux funding. Uncertainty regarding which publications (books, articles, chapters, presentations, conference invitations, etc.) are most important. Evaluators need to be informed by quality measures. Reports might include the following specific categories: number of individual and collaborative efforts, publications in refereed journals, publications in disciplinary and interdisciplinary journals, multidisciplinary efforts, items submitted (under consideration) and forthcoming or planned submissions.

10. That the Principal Investigators identify in their final reports the five most important research publications and why these were selected.
Rationale: Reviewers of Academy of Finland programmes need to be provided this ‘quality’ information and also why the Principal Investigators consider these as her/his best efforts. (The evaluators did not find the ‘summary matrix’ especially useful in relaying information on what had been accomplished substantively. The matrix seems to emphasize quantity rather than quality. The Academy needs to introduce a system of quality assessment that is fair and transparent to those in the sciences and humanities. (We are unaware if the Academy has developed such a quality assessment that is used in other areas of its activities.)
11. That the Academy of Finland considers sanctions of some sort on those who fail to submit data for the outside evaluation panel.
Rationale: The absence of publication and presentation data by the Principal Investigators for inspection by the Evaluation Panel is a concern. No or little reporting raises questions, even though we know some projects we discussed were given extensions because of serious illness and other legitimate reasons; these individuals were not asked to provide interim reports for our evaluation. For those who have been given extensions, they still should attempt to prepare and submit interim reports at the time outside evaluators are assessing the entire programme. It is our understanding that those submitting reports later will have them checked by the Programme Manager and the Research Councils. (It is our understanding that those submitting final reports later will be evaluated by outside evaluators.) For those who fail to submit data on publications and presentations to the outside review panel, and the Programme Manager and Research Councils, the Academy would be prudent to consider some professional sanctions, which might include future Academy funding for future research and travel to professional conferences.
12. That the Programme Manager pursue project directors if they receive Academy funding , perform little or no research, and submit incomplete reports.
Rationale: The results of all funded research by the Academy should be made available to the scientific community, the Academy of Finland, and the general public.
13. That timely completion of a project funded by the Academy, including a reporting of publications and presentations, should be considered an important factor in making decisions about future funding.
Rationale: The Academy of Finland, in its efforts to conform to international competitive scientific funding standards, needs to develop procedures to ensure those grant recipients who completed their projects and have scholarly outcomes (publications in major referred journals, presentations at international conferences, etc.) be eligible for future funding.
14. That the Academy of Finland continues its practice of involving outside evaluators in the grant review process and in the final evaluation process.
Rationale: The practice needs to be encouraged and promoted. Tighter or reduced Academy budgets should not curtail this practice as it provides an excellent ‘window’ for outside scholars examining Finnish research and vice-versa.

15. That there be some creative ways proposed to disseminate Academy research project information and findings.
Rationale: This issue is of extreme importance to scholarly communities, the government, and the public. Suggestions: to strongly encourage researchers to submit their research data and results to the Social Science Data Archive in order that future researchers, teachers, and students can use them (we understand that currently submission is voluntary); to provide financial support to publish books based on funded research, for postdoctoral students to attend international conferences, for translations of Academy funded research into Russian journals, and for carry-over grants for other funded projects.
16. That the Programme Manager be provided additional funds for ‘seed grants’ or short-term grants to gather perishable data (examples: new refugee migrations into Finland, unexpected natural disasters, or victims of financial collapses).
Rationale: The Academy needs to provide opportunities for those seeking funds for small projects that are innovative and cutting-edge. These may be national or international, disciplinary or interdisciplinary.
17. That the Programme Manager works with an active Steering Committee and one or two international evaluators to make decisions on short-term grant funding.
Rationale: The Programme Manager should be able to make these decisions without a lengthy and complicated review process. The criteria might be: the originality of the proposal, timeliness, short- and long-term scholarly impacts, and likelihood of additional Academy of Finland funding.
18. The other Ministries declare up-front what research projects they are willing to fund.
Rationale: This practice is preferred to other ministries making their decisions after the Academy has already ranked proposals and made decisions. There is some concern when other ministries enter the process late and give grants to proposals that failed to receive high marks from the final review panel.
19. That the Academy continues to develop interdisciplinary programmes that integrate the different research communities (sciences and humanities).
Rationale: The Russia in Flux research programme represents an excellent example of a successful international and interdisciplinary programme. The model should be continued.
20. It is the Panel’s strongest wish that the Academy of Finland continue to fund international, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research, especially on Russia and the European Union.
Rationale: Such funding reflects well on the Academy of Finland, the various Finnish scholarly organizations, and the importance of Finland in European scientific communities.

ANNEX I

THE ASSIGNMENT

The tasks of the Evaluation Panel were spelled out in a 6 November 2008 document.

“The objective of the evaluation is to estimate to which degree the Russia in Flux Research Programme has succeeded in fulfilling the objectives set for it in the Programme Memorandum. Of specific interest are the programmatic approach, added value and programme impacts, interdisciplinarity, applicability of research, networking and dissemination of results.”

“In the Evaluation Report, the panel is expected to assess the programme as a whole and reflect especially on the following issues:

1. Planning of the research programme
 - Preparation of the programme and planning of the contents of the programme
 - Research projects funded and funding decisions in creating the necessary preconditions for the programme
2. Scientific quality of Russia in Flux programme
 - Scientific quality and innovativeness of the research
 - Scientific competence of the consortia
3. Success of the implementation of the programme goals and objectives
 - Concordance with the objectives of the research programme
 - Functioning of the programme
 - Added value of the programme
 - Contribution to enhancing inter- and multidisciplinary in research
 - Scientific and administrative coordination
4. Contribution to researcher and expert training
5. Collaboration and networking
 - Collaboration within the programme
 - Collaboration with other Finnish groups
 - International cooperation
 - Collaboration with the end-users.
6. Applicability of research and importance to the end-users
 - Contribution to promoting the applicability of research results
 - Relevance and importance to the end-users
 - National and international impact of the programme
7. Recommendations for the future (including the justification for the recommendations).”

ANNEX 2

MEMBERS OF THE EVALUATION PANEL

Professor *Stanley D. Brunn*, Panel Chair, Department of Geography, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506-0027

Professor *Harley Johansen*, Department of Geography, University of Idaho, Moscow, ID 83844-3021

Dr. *Roy Allison*, Department of International Relations, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, United Kingdom WC2A 2AE

Professor *Hilary Pilkington*, Department of Sociology, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK CV4 7AL

Professor *Andrei Zorin*, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK OX1 2JF

Professor *Holly Barcus*, Panel Secretary, Department of Geography, Macalester College, St. Paul, MN 55105

ANNEX 3

THE AGENDA OF THE EVALUATION PANEL MEETING

Russia in Flux research programme 2004–2007

Evaluation panel meeting

Date: 9–10 December 2008

Work schedule

Place: Academy of Finland, Helsinki (Vilhonvuorenkatu 6, meeting room 216)

Hosts: Programme Manager Mikko Ylikangas, PhD

Programme Manager Petteri Pietikäinen, PhD

Ms Sanna Vitikainen

Saturday, 6 December– Monday, 8 December

Evaluators arrive to Helsinki

Monday, 8 December

19:00 Get-together dinner, Restaurant Bellevue (Mikko meets the guests in the hotel lobby at 18:30)

Tuesday, 9 December

08:30 Meeting in the hotel lobby, by metro to the Academy of Finland
09:00–10:00 Kick-off of the Panel meeting
Introductions of the panel members and the Academy of Finland staff
Presentation of the Academy of Finland (Programme Manager)
Presentation of the research programme evaluation
(Programme Manager)
Organization of the panel work (Chair)
10:00–10:45 Interview: Programme Manager
10:45–12:30 Interviews: research project leaders
12:30–13:30 Lunch
13:00–14:00 Interviews: researchers
14:00–15:00 Interview: Programme Steering Group
15:00–16:00 Interviews: Stakeholders
16:00–18:00 Summary of day one, drafting of the Evaluation Report
18:30 Panel dinner, Restaurant Lasipalatsi

Wednesday, 10 December

08:30 Meeting in the hotel lobby, by metro to the Academy of Finland
09:00–09:45 Interview: Programme Manager
09:45–11:30 Panel work, writing of the Evaluation Report
12:30–13:30 Lunch
13:30–15:00 Panel work, writing of the Evaluation Report
15:00–16:00 Summary of the Panel and feedback to the Academy of Finland;
agree on the delivery of the Evaluation Report

ANNEX 4

LIST OF THE PROJECTS AND THEIR FUNDING

Projects funded in the Russia in Flux Research Programme 2004–2007/2008

Aarva, Pauliina (University of Tampere)

Health Values and Society: Changing Society, Health Policy and
Values in Post-Soviet Russia, €343,680

Alapuro, Risto (University of Helsinki)

Self-Governing Associations in Northwestern Russia: Common Things
as the Foundation for Res Publica, €203,570

Alho, Kari (ETLA)

Opening of the Russian Economy and Its Integration with the European Union,
€185,570

Eskelinen, Heikki (University of Joensuu)

Reconstitution of Northwest Russia as an Economic, Social and Political Space:
The Role of Cross-border Interaction, €336,220

Forbes, Bruce (University of Lapland, Arctic Center)

Environmental and Social Impacts of Industrial Development in Northern Russia,
€420,620

Granberg, Leo (University of Helsinki)

Specialisation and Diversification of Enterprising during Transition
– A Comparative Study of Development in Estonian and Russian Countryside
(3-year funding, joined 2005), €241,000

Hemminki, Elina (STAKES)

Reproductive health in Russia – Discovering Determinants through Comparative
Research (REFER consortium), €313,960

Häyrynen, Maunu (University of Turku)

Transboundary Landscapes, €206,370

Järvelä, Marja (University of Jyväskylä)

Dynamics of Sustainable Livelihoods. Social Impact Assessment of
Wood Procurement in Russian Northwest Villages and Towns, €321,560

Kallas, Juha (Lappeenranta University of Technology)

Catalytic Abatement of Liquid and Gaseous Industrial Pollutants:
Solving Acute Technogenic Problems, €331,280

Karjalainen, Timo (Metla)

Intensification of Forest Management and Improvement of Wood Harvesting
in Northwest Russia (Metla consortium), €360,630

Kerminen, Veli-Matti (Finnish Meteorological Institute)

Interaction between Boreal Forests and the Atmospheric Aerosol System,
€391,220

- Liljeblom, Eva* (Hanken)
Corporate Governance in Russia, €368,930
- Linden, Harjo* (RKTL)
Impact of Forestry in Taiga Ecosystems, Species Diversity and Distribution in North-West Russia, €301,620
- Liuhto, Kari* (Turku School of Economics)
New Role of Russian Enterprises as Actors in International Business Arena, €319,460
- Mäki-Tanila, Asko* (MTT Agrifood Research Finland)
Genetic Resources of Russian Farm Animals – The State of Endangerment and Ethno-ecological, Technical and Social Opportunities for Conservation, €369,840
- Nordenstreng, Kaarle* (University of Tampere)
Media in Changing Russia (funded in 2005), €304,010
- Nuorluoto, Juhani* (University of Helsinki)
The Ethnic, Linguistic and Cultural Making of Northern Russia, €320,020
- Nysten-Haarala, Soili* (University of Lapland)
Governance of Renewable Natural Resources in Northwest Russia, €368,700
- Paatero, Jussi* (Finnish Meteorological Institute)
Environmental Effects of the Kola Air Pollution Sources in the Kola Area and in Finnish Lapland (funded by the Ministry of the Environment), €400,000
- Pesonen, Pekka* (University of Helsinki)
St. Petersburg / Leningrad: Narration – History – Present, €368,500
- Primmer, Craig* (University of Helsinki)
Towards Sustainable Fishing and Biodiversity Preservation of Northwest Russian Salmonid Stocks by Using Molecular Genetics Techniques for Stock and Parasite Monitoring, €336,090
- Puuronen, Vesa* (University of Joensuu)
Living with Difference in Russia – Hybrid Identities and Everyday Racism among Young ‘Rossyany’, €412,380
- Rosenholm, Arja* (University of Tampere)
Making a ‘Good Life’: Post-Soviet selves in Russian Mass Media 1980–2006 (funded in 2005), €296,010
- Rotkirch, Anna* (University of Helsinki)
Fertility Patterns and Family Forms in St Petersburg (REFER consortium), €307,280
- Rytövuori-Apunen, Helena* (University of Tampere)
New and Old Russia in the Transition Discourses of Finnish-Russian Relationships, €239,170
- Saastamoinen, Olli* (Metla)
Forest Policy, Politics and Forest Programmes in Russia (Metla consortium, funded by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry), €55,020

Siikala, Anna-Leena (University of Helsinki)

The Other Russia. Cultural Multiplicity in the Making, €69,990

Tiusanen, Tauno (Lappeenranta University of Technology)

Developing Russian Competitiveness – The Role of R&D Activities, Innovations and SMEs (funded by Tekes), €322,000

Toppinen, Anne (Metla)

Exports of Roundwood and Sawnwood from Russia and Effects on Market Competition (Metla consortium, funded by the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry), €34,520

Tykkyläinen, Markku (University of Joensuu)

Does the Geography of Russian Northern Peripheries Really Change? – Dynamics of Spatial Restructuring and Industrial Development Especially in Murmansk Oblast and the Krasnoyarsk Region, €507,610

Vaahtoranta, Tapani (Finnish Institute of International Affairs)

Russia's European Choice: With or Into the EU (funded by the Ministry for transport and communications and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs), €350,000

Vuorela, Ulla (University of Helsinki)

Multi-sited Lives in Transnational Russia: Questions of Identity, Belonging and Mutual Care, €473,930

ANNEX 5

MATERIAL USED IN THE EVALUATION

- A description of the Russia in Flux Programme in the programme memorandum.
- A ‘step-by-step’ description of the programme from 2000–2002 through 15 June 2008 when final reports were due. (We noted that two proposals will continue through the end of 2008 and will not submit their final reports until June 2009.)
- A list of all those 87 who were invited to submit proposals for the second round of possible funding. This table includes the names of scholars, the titles of their projects, the field of research (sociology, geography, ecology, etc.), whether the proposal was funded (yes-no decision), the amount of monies requested and the amount funded.
- A list of those 33 who received funding, the Principal Investigators, their project title, how much they requested and how much they received, and the rating by the final panel (from 1 – low to 5 – highest). See Annex 3.
- Research plans of all funded projects
- Coordination Reports for 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008.
- Self-evaluations prepared by the project leaders and a summary (compiled by the coordinator). (See Annex 6.)
- Self-evaluations prepared by the project researchers and a summary (compiled by the coordinator). (See Annex 6.)
- Programme Manager’s self-evaluation report (which the Panel found very useful).
- A list of events organized by the Russia in Flux Programme from 2004–2008
- Planning/Steering Committee Members, Deputy Members and Advisors:
 - 1 December 2003–28 January 2004
 - 28 January 2004–17 January 2007
 - 17 January 2007–31 December 2008
- Coordination Expenses Budget 2004–2007 (euros) for Russia in Flux Programme
- List of reviewers of the letters of intent in 2003
- List of panelists (evaluators of full applications) in 2003
- Example of the table of contents of a final evaluation report of a research programme
- The final reports of those funded, which included the project description and abstract, a list of publications, presentations made, conferences attended, doctoral dissertations supervised, etc.
- A detailed list of project publications. These included articles in scientific journals, conference proceedings, chapters in edited volumes, monographs published, and other scientific publications. (Note: there was very wide variation in the number of entries of those receiving Academy of Finland funding, from less than 10 to more than 1,000.)
- A table summarizing the funded projects: names, project title, field, final ranking, monies requested and granted, personnel involved, including doctoral students, publications (various categories), degrees awarded and collaborative efforts.
- Academy of Finland in Brief brochure
- Russia in Flux brochure
- (A collection of books and articles published by the projects was available on site in Helsinki)

ANNEX 6A

SELF-EVALUATION FORMS FOR THE PROJECT LEADERS

RUSSIA IN FLUX Research Programme (2004–2007) evaluation form

FORM 1 (To be filled by Russia in Flux Project Leaders)

Confidential

This questionnaire is supplementary to the project's final report. This questionnaire gives further feedback to the Academy of Finland and is input material to the programme evaluation.

You are kindly asked to answer all the questions, even if negative, in order for us to be sure there are no omissions.

A summary report will be compiled based on the questionnaire.

NOTE: all forms will also be sent to the Evaluation Panel members.

A. Description of the project

1 The organisation and structure of the project

Your name: _____

Project or consortium leader: Consortium sub-leader

Project title (and home page on the Internet, if applicable): _____

Consortium Yes No

Name _____

2 The progress of the project and main results

Please describe the aims, the main scientific results and achievements, including the innovativeness (novelty).

3 Multi- and interdisciplinarity of the project

How did multi- and interdisciplinarity become concrete?

(Multidisciplinarity means that a given set of problems is analysed simultaneously from the vantage point of several different disciplines. Interdisciplinarity implies deeper integration: research will also borrow concepts, methods and perspectives from other disciplines.)

4 What, if any, changes were made to the original research plan?

How did the project follow the research plan and why the plan had to be changed?

5 Drawbacks

What factors, if any, hindered the planned progress of the project? Were the risks identified at the beginning of the project?

6 The national and international collaboration and networking of the project

Please, specify the nature of collaboration and type of collaboration partners. Specify if the networking have resulted in co-publication or other documented output.

Did the Russia in Flux programme bring about co-operation, which you would not have had without this funding?

Did you have collaboration with other Russia in Flux programme projects, and what was the level of collaboration? Was this collaboration old, or brought about by the Russia in Flux programme?

Number of seminars, workshops etc. organized by the project

7 The postgraduate training of the personnel

How was the postgraduate training in the project organized in general? What training did the researchers receive and who organised it? Were the researchers enrolled in a graduate school? If yes, which?

8 How did the project promote equality?

B. Self-evaluation of the project

Project results and benefit of consortium (when applicable)

To what extent did your projects achieve its goals and objectives?

Excellently *Very well* *Well* *Satisfactorily* *Poorly*

1. Where there any unexpected but remarkable results?
2. Which have been the greatest obstacles, if any, in reaching your objectives?
3. Added value of the consortium (when applicable) – has working as a consortium advanced the research of your project? How?
4. Networking within the consortium (when applicable). How much of the research work has been carried out as team-work between the research groups (sub-projects)

The applicability of the research results – contribution to practice and decision-making

5. Has your research also other than scientific impact (cultural, social, economic, technological and other societal impact)? If yes, specify.

Yes *No*

6. How could your results be utilized and by whom? Identify possible end-users. Have your research results been used? When, by whom?

Communication of the results

7. How did/does the project communicate with the end-users? Specify these end-users.
8. How did/does the project disseminate the results? Have your results been presented or published in any media outside the scientific community? If yes, what media and when?

Objectives of Russia in Flux Research Programme

The objectives of the Russia in Flux research programme were stated as follows in the programme memorandum: “*The research programme is concerned with Russia in flux. Its purpose is to shed light on Russia as a state, society, natural environment and as an economic and cultural area. More specifically, the aim is to gain a clearer picture of the conditions prevailing in Russia today, the ongoing processes of change, and the underlying causes of those processes, and also their impacts. It is expected that the research will generate information that can help us reach a deeper understanding of Russia and that can be used in strategic decision-making in different sectors of society.*

The programme will also aim to increase the visibility of research in this area, to improve the availability of research knowledge, and to support exchange between the research community, public administration, and business and industry.”

9. To what extent did the Russia in Flux programme achieve these objectives?

Excellently *Very well* *Well* *Satisfactorily* *Poorly*

10. Were the goals relevant and achievable?

Yes *No*

11. To what extent did your project contribute to the objectives of the Russia in Flux programme?

Co-ordination and programme management

12. How did the programme coordination manage its task in trying to achieve the objectives?

Excellently *Very well* *Well* *Satisfactorily* *Poorly*

13. How did your project benefit from the programme co-ordination?

14. Which of the events organized by the coordinator did you find useful:

- Opening ceremony and seminar. 2 February 2004
- Seminar on the change of the social scenery, culture and nature in the periphery and arctic regions in Russia. (Venäjän maaseudun, ja arktisten alueiden sosiaalisien maiseman, kulttuurin ja luonnon muutos) 26 November 2004
- Joint seminar with the University of Joensuu, the Finnish Forest Research Institute, and the Institute for Further Education in Forest Economy of Russia: Sustainable economic, ecologic and social development of the North-West Russia. (Luoteis-Venäjän metsäteollisuuden kehittäminen huomioiden taloudellinen, ekologinen ja sosiaalinen kestävyytys) 22 March 2005
- ‘Media breakfast’: New Information on Reproductive Health in St Petersburg. (Uutta tietoa pietarilaisten lisääntymisterveydestä) 1 June 2005
- Joint workshop with the Baltic Sea Research Programme: Researcher in media. (Tieteellisen tiedonvälityksen työpaja) 13 October 2005
- Seminar: Multi, cross, and interdisciplinarity in research. (Poikkitieteisyys, monitieteisyys ja tieteidenvälisyyys) 2 November 2005
- Joint seminar with the University of Helsinki and the Finnish Social Science Data Archive: Sources and knowledge mining in Russian studies. (Venäjän tutkimuksen tiedonlähteet ja tiedonhaku) 10 March 2006

- Seminar: From research to scientific publication. ('Tutkimuksesta tieteelliseksi julkaisuksi') 26 April 2006
 - Half-way seminar: Transitions and Visions. 16–17 May 2006
 - Thematic seminar on Russian economy (within an international conference in Turku Business School 'The Future Competitiveness of the EU and its Eastern Neighbours'). 9 September 2006
 - Seminar: How to Study Russian Media? 27 October 2006
 - Seminar on forests. (Metsäseminaari) 7 November 2006
 - Joint seminar with the Finnish Society for Russian and East European Studies. (VIEPÄ 2007) 30 March 2007
 - Session within the international seminar Europe in Russia (University of Helsinki). 28–30 August 2007
 - Closing seminar. 3–4 December 2007
15. Was the amount and nature of events sufficient? Was something missing?
16. Has your project and its researchers participated in the joint programme actions and events?
17. How has the participation been reflected in the work of your research group?
18. What kind of support would your project have required more from the coordination? What did the coordination fail to achieve? Other comments.

Funding

19. How essential was the Russia in Flux funding for your research?
Very essential *Essential* *Not very essential* *Not at all important*
20. Did your project receive the funding that you applied for?
Yes *No*
21. Funding level versus applied funding. Was the funding sufficient compared to the research plan? Was your research funded in an appropriate level? If your applied funding was cut, how did it affect on the research?
22. Other comments on funding.
23. Did the research field gain any added value for having a research programme compared to general research grants? What about your project?
24. How, if at all, did the programme enhance the development of the research area?
25. Which do you think were the most important gaps in the research area not covered by the Russia in Flux Research Programme?
26. What did you achieve that could not have been done without the Russia in Flux funding?

Strengths and weaknesses

27. What were the strengths of the Russia in Flux programme?
28. What were the weaknesses of the Russia in Flux programme?
29. How could the Russia in Flux programme have been improved?

Future

30. What are the future possibilities and plans of your research team after the Russia in Flux programme? On terms of funding, completion of studies, employment of the personnel, etc.
31. In what form do you anticipate the present national/international collaboration of your project to continue?

Recommendations for the future

32. What are the greatest shortcomings, problem areas, and needs in your field of research?
33. Other comments

ANNEX 6B

SELF-EVALUATION FORM FOR THE PROJECT RESEARCHERS

RUSSIA IN FLUX Research Programme (2004–2007) evaluation form

FORM 2 (To be filled by those who were employed fully/partly by the Russia in Flux projects)

Confidential

You are kindly asked to answer all the questions, even if negative, in order for us to be sure there are no omissions.

A summary report will be compiled based on the questionnaire.

NOTE: all forms will also be sent to the evaluation panel members.

Name of researcher: _____

Name of project: _____

Research field: _____

Period of work in the project: _____

Evaluation criteria

1. Goals and focus

1.1. What were the goals and focus of your work in the project?

1.2. To what extent did you achieve them?

Excellently *Well* *Satisfactorily* *Poorly*

Explain:

2. Scientific results

2.1. What are the new scientific results achieved by your part of the project?

2.2. Education

a) Did you or will you receive a university degree as a result of the project?

Yes *No*

Which degree? *MA/MSc* *Licentiate* *PhD* *other, specify*

b) How were you employed after the project ended?

- Academic research and teaching (same field)
- Academic research and teaching (different field)
- Other publicly financed research and development work
- Teaching outside university
- Administration work
- Other, specify

3. Co-operation

3.1. How has the project leader functioned?

Excellentely *Well* *Satisfactorily* *Poorly*

Comments:

3.2. How has the coordination of the research programme functioned?

Excellentely *Well* *Satisfactorily* *Poorly*

Comments:

3.3. Which of the joint programme activities have you participated?

- Opening ceremony and seminar, 2 February 2004*
- Seminar on the change of the social scenery, culture and nature in the periphery and arctic regions in Russia. (*Venäjän maaseudun, ja arktisten alueiden sosiaali-sen maiseman, kulttuurin ja luonnon muutos*) 26 November 2004
- Joint seminar with the University of Joensuu, the Finnish Forest Research Institute, and the Institute for Further education in Forest economy of Russia: Sustainable economic, ecologic and social development of the North-West Russia. (*Luoteis-Venäjän metsäteollisuuden kehittäminen huomioiden taloudellinen, ekologinen ja sosiaalinen kestävyys*) 22 March 2005
- ‘Media breakfast’: New Information on Reproductive Health in St Petersburg. (*Uutta tietoa pietarilaisten lisääntymistervestä*) 1 June 2005
- Joint workshop with the Baltic Sea Research Programme: Researcher in media. (*Tieteellisen tiedonvälityksen työpaja*) 13 October 2005
- Seminar: Multi-, cross- and interdisciplinarity in research. (*Poikkitieteisyys, monitieteisyys ja tieteidenvälisyyss*) 2 November 2005
- Joint seminar with the University of Helsinki and the Finnish Social Science Data Archive: Sources and knowledge mining in Russian studies. (*Venäjän tutkimuksen tiedonlähteet ja tiedonhaku*) 10 March 2006
- Seminar: *From research to scientific publication.* (*Tutkimuksesta tieteelliseksi julkaisuki*) 26 April 2006
- Half-way seminar: Transitions and Visions. 16-17 May 2006
- Thematic seminar on Russian economy (within an international conference in Turku Business School ‘The Future Competitiveness of the EU and its Eastern Neighbours’). 9 September 2006
- Seminar: How to Study Russian Media? 27 October 2006
- Seminar on forests. (*Metsäseminaari*) 7 November 2006
- Joint seminar with the Finnish Society for Russian and East European Studies. (VIEPÄ 2007) 30 March 2007
- Session within the international seminar Europe in Russia (University of Helsinki). 28–30 August 2007
- Closing seminar. 3–4 December 2007

- 3.4. Was the amount and nature of the events sufficient? Was something missing?
How has the participation been reflected in your work?
- 3.5. Did the programme bring about cooperation with researchers from Finland/
other countries that you would not have had without this funding?

Yes *No*

Specify:

4. Project funding

- 4.1. Describe the project funding you received by calendar year from the following sources:

Funding source:	year	2004	2005	2006	2007
Russia in Flux programme					
Other funding (specify)					

- 4.2. Was the funding that you received sufficient and appropriate in view of your research plan?

Yes *No*

Comments:

5. Strengths and weaknesses

- a) What were the strengths of the Russia in Flux programme?
- b) What were the weaknesses of the Russia in Flux programme?
- c) How could the Russia in Flux programme have been improved?

6. Recommendations for the future

- a) How would you raise the level of research in your field in Finland
- b) How would you compare the level of research in your field in Finland to other countries?
- c) What are the greatest shortcomings, problem areas, and needs in your field of research?
- d) Suggestions for improving future research programmes

Thank you!

The Research Programme Russia in Flux was launched by the Academy of Finland for the years 2004–2007. The aim of the programme was to contribute to knowledge of Russia as a state, a society, a natural environment and as an economic and cultural area. Another aim was to gain a clearer picture of the conditions prevailing in Russia today, the ongoing processes of change and the underlying causes of the processes and their impacts.

The programme comprised 33 research projects.

The research programme and its success in attaining the objectives set for it in the programme memorandum were evaluated by an international panel. This report includes the results of the evaluation and the recommendations of the panel.



ACADEMY OF FINLAND

Vilhonvuorenkatu 6 • PO Box 99, 00501 Helsinki
Tel. +358 9 774 881 • Fax +358 9 7748 8299
www.aka.fi/eng • viestinta@aka.fi