

28.8.2018

## Review form

### Call: Competitive funding to strengthen university research profiles

Date:

Review panel:

Panel members:

Application number:

Applicant (university):

Please write the review based on the defined review questions. It is important to get feedback both on the university's action plan as a whole and on the proposed profiling measures individually in relation to the aspired level of research. In addition to your written comments, please give two ratings: 1) a rating for distribution of work and collaboration in the profiling areas with other Finnish universities, and 2) a final rating for the application.

### Final rating:

**6 Outstanding:** The action plan includes viable, significant and very concrete profiling measures that clearly promote strategic profiling within the university and that contribute to significantly enhancing research quality in the Finnish research and innovation system.

**5 Excellent:** The action plan includes viable, significant and very concrete profiling measures that promote strategic profiling within the university and that contribute to enhancing research quality in the Finnish research and innovation system.

**4 Good:** The action plan includes viable and concrete profiling measures. The proposed profiling measures should have been more extensive to reach the target and to contribute to the Finnish research and innovation system.

**3 Modest:** The action plan includes moderate profiling measures. For instance, the profiling measures should have been more extensive or viable.

**2 Weak:** The action plan is not viable in its present form.

**1 Unsatisfactory:** The action plan is out of scope.

### Review questions:

#### 1 Action plan and profiling measures

- 1 How justified and clear is the action plan as regards the university's strategic profiling areas? To what extent will the profiling measures strengthen the implementation of the strategy?
- 2 How viable is the action plan to reach the aspired international level of research in the profiling areas for which funding is applied for in terms of the planned measures during and beyond the funding period? Is the planned schedule feasible? To what extent will the measures strengthen the profiling areas? How viable is the plan to renew research in the profiling areas by introducing new research topics, methods and approaches?



## ACADEMY OF FINLAND

- 3 How viable are the plans to follow the implementation and impacts of the profiling measures?
- 4 What is the university's overall commitment to improving the quality of research?

### **2 Distribution of work and collaboration with other Finnish universities**

- 1 How strategic and viable are and what is the status of the arrangements for distribution of work and collaboration with other Finnish universities in the respective profiling areas? What is the research-related added value compared to other Finnish universities?

#### **Rating:**

**6/6:** Viable, significant and very concrete; clearly promotes strategic profiling within the universities and contributes significantly to enhancing research quality in the Finnish research and innovation system

**5/6:** Viable, significant and concrete; promotes strategic profiling within the universities and contributes to enhancing research quality in the Finnish research and innovation system

**4/6:** Viable and concrete

**3/6:** Modest

**2/6:** Not viable

**1/6:** No distribution of work or collaboration

### **3 Distribution of work and collaboration with other partners**

- 1 How strategic and viable are and what is the status of the arrangements for distribution of work and collaboration with Finnish research institutes, polytechnics, hospital districts and other partners?
- 2 What is the relevance and significance of the university's choices from the point of view of knowledge transfer, competence-based growth and other needs in society?

### **4 Overall assessment (to be finalised in the panel meeting)**

- 1 Summary of key strengths and weaknesses of the proposed action plan
- 2 Recommendations and other feedback for the university; development needs and opportunities

### **5 Final rating (scale 1–6)**

