

Report Template for Review Panels

The review panels are asked to assess the following aspects of the Unit of Assessment (UoA):

1. Quality of Research, criteria:
 - 1.1. Scientific Quality
 - 1.2. Scientific Environment and Leadership
 - 1.3. Strategy for Scientific Development
2. Societal Impact of Research, criteria:
 - 2.1 Activities and Outputs
 - 2.2 Outcomes
 - 2.3 Impact Strategy
3. Capacity for Collaboration with Society

These assessments are to be based upon the information submitted to the panel for each UoA, including:

- Self-evaluation by the UoA, including case studies
- Bibliometric analyses
- Facts & Figures (provided by the UoA and SLU's central administration)

as well as the [interview with the UoA's representatives](#).

For brief definitions of the criteria, see 'Instructions to the Scientific Panels', Criteria for Evaluation and Scoring.

Panel/ Research field (no. and name):	
--	--

Report on individual Unit of Assessment

UoA (no. and name)	
---------------------------	--

General assessment of the Unit of Assessment

[Based upon the all the information submitted to the panel for each UoA and the interview.](#)

Give the panel's overall impression of the research conducted within the UoA, covering the three aspects: Quality of Research, Societal Impact of Research and Capacity for Collaboration with Society.

Maximum 300 words

Section 1 Quality of Research

1.1 Scientific Quality

This section focuses on the current situation of the UoA, as judged from its performance during the most recent years.

Specific cross references to the UoA's self-assessment:

[Section 1 Quality of Research,](#)

Sub-section 1.1

Scientific Quality, questions 1.1a, 1.1b, 1.1c;

[Section 4 Facts and Figures,](#)

Sub-section 4.1

Research Activities and Outputs, tables 4.1a, 4.1b, 4.1c, 4.1d, 4.1e, 4.1f, and 4.1g;

Sub-section 4.4

Other factors the UoA would like the expert panel to consider, question 4.4a may also be relevant.

1.1a Comment on the scientific quality (depth and breadth of research profile, originality of ideas, choice of methods, scientific productivity, scientific impact, and prominence in the field of science) with emphasis on identifying strong research and successful research constellations.

Maximum 1000 words

On the basis of this evaluation, award a score for Scientific Quality from 1-6:

(i.e. the UoA performs at a standard that is:) 6= World-leading; 5= High international;
4= Internationally recognised; 3= Moderate; 2= Inadequate; 1= Poor

1.2 Scientific Environment and Leadership

Specific cross references to the UoA's self-assessment:

[Section 1 Quality of Research,](#)

Sub-section 1.2

Scientific Environment and Leadership, questions 1.2a, 1.2b, 1.2c, 1.2d;

[Section 4 Facts and Figures,](#)

Sub-section 4.2

Research Environment and Infrastructure, tables 4.2a, 4.2b, 4.2c;

Sub-section 4.3

Interactions with Society, tables 4.3a, 4.3b;

Sub-section 4.4

Other factors the UoA would like the expert panel to consider, question 4.4a.

The cross references mentioned above in 1.1 Scientific Quality may also be relevant.

1.2a Comment on how the UoA manages to maintain a creative, intellectually vigorous and productive environment. Comment on the level of diversity within the unit in terms of e.g. gender and the balance between senior and junior faculty. Comment on the degree of external influence through international recruitment, mobility, etc.

Maximum 400 words

1.2b Comment on how the UoA supports young faculty and encourages their development into independent researchers.

Maximum 200 words

1.2c Comment on the geographical scope and character of the academic networks and collaborations, and how the unit impacts the scientific debate in its field.

Maximum 200 words

1.2d Comment on the depth and breadth of the interdisciplinarity of the research unit. Comment on whether synergies between different UoAs at SLU are being developed to their full potential.

Maximum 200 words

On the basis of this evaluation, award a score from 1-6 for Scientific Environment and Leadership of the UoA.

6= Outstanding ; 5= Excellent ; 4= Good; 3= Moderate; 2= Inadequate; 1= Poor

1.3 Strategy for Scientific Development

Specific cross references to the UoA's self-assessment:

[Section 1 Quality of Research,](#)

Sub-section 1.3

Strategy for Scientific Development, questions 1.3a, 1.3b, and 1.3c;

sub-section 4.4

Other factors the UoA would like the expert panel to consider, question 4.4a.

The cross references mentioned above in [1.1 Scientific Quality](#) and [1.2 Scientific Environment and Leadership](#) may also be relevant.

1.3a Assess the UoA's strategy for scientific quality and in particular for scientific renewal. How insightful and realistic is the strategy?

Maximum 400 words

1.3b Comment on the plans for future research directions and the units potential for making significant contributions within these.

Maximum 200 words

On the basis of this evaluation, award a score from 1-6 for the Strategy for Scientific Development of the UoA.

6= Outstanding ; 5= Excellent ; 4= Good; 3= Moderate; 2= Inadequate; 1= Poor

1.3c What are the most important challenges for further successful scientific development (internal as well as external factors)?

Maximum 200 words

1.4 Additional comments

1.4a Comment on other issues of choice that SLU should consider at a strategic level.

Maximum 200 words

Section 2 Societal Impact of Research

Impact of research on society, is here defined as 'an effect on, change or benefit to the economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life, beyond academia'.

<http://www.hefce.ac.uk/rsrch/REFimpact/>

2.1 Activities and Outputs

Specific cross references to the UoA's self-assessment:

Section 2. Impact of Research,

Sub-section 2.1

Activities and Outputs, questions 2.1a, and 2.1b;

Sub-section 2.4

Impact Case Studies, case study 2.4a, 2.4b, and 2.4c;

Sub-section 4.4

Other factors the UoA would like the expert panel to consider, question 4.4a.

2.1a Given the UoA's current research profile, is the full potential for societal impact realized in terms of activities and outputs (methods, productivity, range and relevance of stakeholders, etc.)?

Maximum 300 words

On the basis of this evaluation, award a score for Activities and Outputs from 1-3:

3= Excellent; 2= Good; 1= Inadequate

2.2 Outcomes

Specific cross references to the UoA's self-assessment:

[Section 2. Impact of Research,](#)

Sub-section 2.2

Outcomes, question 2.2a;

Sub-section 2.4

Impact Case Studies, case study 2.4a, 2.4b, and 2.4c;

Sub-section 4.4

Other factors the UoA would like the expert panel to consider, question 4.4a.

2.2a Comment on the outcomes of the unit's research, given their current profile and scientific quality. Is the full potential for societal impact realised in terms of outcomes, as far as the UoA could affect it? The case studies serve as a set number of examples on how research within the UoA has been realised in terms of societal impact.

Maximum 400 words

On the basis of this evaluation, award a score 1-3 for Outcomes.

3= Excellent; 2= Good; 1= Inadequate

2.3 Impact strategy

Specific cross references to the UoA's self-assessment:

[Section 2. Impact of Research,](#)

Sub-section 2.3

Impact strategy, question 2.3a, 2.3b, 2.3c;

Sub-section 2.4

Impact Case Studies, case study 2.4a, 2.4b, and 2.4c; and in some cases,

Sub-section 4.4

Other factors the UoA would like the expert panel to consider, question 4.4a..

2.3a Comment on the UoA's strategic goals for societal impact. How realistic is the strategy given the depth and breadth of the unit's research profile? Are incentives and measures sufficient for implementing the strategy?

Maximum 300 words

On the basis of this evaluation, award a score for Impact Strategy from 1-3:

3= Excellent; 2= Good; 1= Inadequate

Section 3 Capacity for Collaboration with Society

The evaluation panels are asked to perform a context dependent qualitative assessment of the UoA's capacity for collaboration with society. The assessment will not result in a numeric score, but the panel is asked to give constructive feedback that can aid the UoA to develop their understanding and skills in collaborating with actors outside academia. [The text in Section 3 of the self-assessment 'gives a definition of capacity for collaboration with society and a justification of how this is in line with SLU's mission.](#)

The two collaboration case studies, one successful and one less successful, are included to illustrate the UoA's perception and reflections of actual collaborative processes. The justification of including

Specific cross references to the UoA's self-assessment:

[Section 3. Capacity for Collaboration with Society,](#)

Sub-section 2.3

Impact strategy, question 2.3a, 2.3b, 2.3c;

Sub-section 2.4

Impact Case Studies, case study 2.4a, 2.4b, and 2.4c;

Sub-section 4.4

Other factors the UoA would like the expert panel to consider, question 4.4a.

The cross references mentioned above in [1.1 Scientific Quality](#) and [1.2 Scientific Environment and Leadership](#) may also be relevant.

3.1a Comment on the UoA's approach to collaboration with society. Give your impression on their understanding of the collaborative process (factors affecting collaboration, importance of mutuality, dialogue, etc.)

Maximum 300 words

3.1b Give the panel's recommendations on how the unit can develop their capacity for collaboration with actors outside academia.

Maximum 300 words