



Programdirektörer för stiftelseprogram som halvtidsutvärderas år 2000

Instruktion för rapportering inför halvtidsgranskning år 2000

Stiftelsen för Strategisk Forskning översänder härmed instruktioner för författandet av programmets halvtidsrapport. Rapporten utgör basen för stiftelsens halvtidsgranskning. Denna granskning är som bekant inte längre utgångspunkten för fortsatt anslagstilldelning utan den har nu väsentligen karaktär av en uppföljning och kan med fördel betraktas som en del av programmets kvalitetsarbete. Programmen kommer att efter genomförd utvärdering få i uppdrag att redovisa kommentarer och eventuella åtgärder med anledning av utvärderingsresultatet.

Antalet program som skall granskas är stort varför vi för aktuella program till endera av två separata omgångar. Varje omgång program utvärderas av en strategisk utvärderingsgrupp som stiftelsen senare kommer att tillsätta. Utvärderingstidpunkt blir någon gång under perioden april - augusti. Besök på högskoleenheter kommer normalt inte att genomföras utan vi kommer att be programmen att komma till Stockholm där granskningsgruppen möter i våra lokaler.

Den vetenskapliga granskningen bör från och denna utvärderingsomgång genomföras av programmet självt och med utnyttjande av internationell expertis t ex ledamöter i programmets vetenskapliga råd, om sådant finnes. Om programmet så önskar är stiftelsen, som ett alternativ, beredd att för ändamålet kontakta de utvärderare som användes av stiftelsen i samband med programmets initiering. Ett sådant önskemål bör meddelas senast den 30 november 1999.

Rapporterna skall vara stiftelsen tillhanda senast den 31 mars år 2000. Ekonomisk rapport lämnas vid samma tidpunkt enligt instruktioner som stiftelsen senare meddelar.

Närmare upplysningar lämnas av områdesansvarig handläggare eller undertecknade.

Björn Brandt
Kanslichef

Olof Lindgren
Utvärderingsansvarig

Guidelines for mid-term report

The purpose of the report is to provide a basis for a mid-term assessment of the research programme/graduate school. The report should contain an account of the activity up till now as well as plans for the remaining period of the programme. The report will be an important document both for the assessment of scientific quality and the strategic relevance of the programme. The Foundation will carry out a strategic assessment sometime during the period April-August 2000. The assessment of the scientific quality, based on the mid-term report, should preferably be carried out within the programme/graduate school itself with the help of the international scientific board, provided one exists. If this is not the case, the Foundation may arrange also this assessment. The scientific assessment should be completed and reported to the Foundation by June 30, 2000. A comparison of the position and results achieved so far with the objectives, milestones, and deliverables expressed in the programme plan is of high importance. The criteria for the assessment are enclosed (Encl. 1: Minutes, Board Meeting, 1996-10-10).

The mid-term assessment is part of the important quality control of the work carried out. It will result in advice to the programme management, useful for the remaining programme period, and to the Foundation for decisions concerning future activities.

The report should be written in English and be no more than 30 pages long. It should be the Foundation at hand (in 30 copies) by March 31, 2000. Below is a proposed outline of the report.

Summary

An executive summary of the report (1 page).

1. Background, objectives and organization of the programme

An introductory description (2-3 pages) of the programme with regard to:

- 1.1 Background, motivation and long term vision (10-15 yrs). For non-network programmes descriptions of other activities of the participating research groups, incl. their financing, should be included.
- 1.2 Concrete goals
- 1.3 Commission given by SSF, incl. objectives stipulated in the contract with SSF
- 1.4 The start-up process. Have there been delays? If so, for what reasons?
- 1.5 The basic organization, programme board, program director, advisory committees etc.

2. The research of the programme

A description of the research of the programme and its different sub-projects - its results so far and its future plans. Compare the results so far with the objectives, milestones, and deliverables in the programme plan. The following aspects are relevant:

- 2.1 Participating researchers (senior researchers, postdocs etc.)
- 2.2 A brief description of the scientific results of the programme and of each project. Enclose a list of publications (books, articles in refereed journals, papers presented at conferences, reviews, other publications), awards to participating researchers, etc.
- 2.3 Future research plans for the remaining years of the present five-year period. These should be related to the objectives of the programme. All changes in relation to the programme plan should be noted.
- 2.4 Short-term and long-term relevance of the research programme for industry and society at large. Enclose a list of any innovations, patents registered and exploited; spin-off companies founded or contemplated etc. How is the industry involved in the research?
- 2.5 Interdisciplinarity. How is it organized, assured, monitored? Problems and results.
- 2.6 The programme's internal routines for quality assessment. How do these work?
- 2.7 What is the "added value" of the programme (apart from increased funding to the area, and that could motivate the costs of the programme structure)?
- 2.8 Has the programme improved academic research? If so, how? Try to compare the research carried out within the programme with previous and parallel research. What are the advantages and disadvantages? How would you like to further improve your research programme?

3. The graduate training of the programme

A description of the graduate training of the programme. Compare the results so far with the objectives, milestones, and deliverables in the programme plan. The following aspects are relevant:

- 3.1 Recruitment of PhD students. What selection procedure is used? Where have the positions been advertised? Have the students previously been connected to a department involved in the programme? Have students with support from other sources been accepted into the graduate school or its courses? Enclose an updated list of students and their project titles (Include a standard SSF table – to be released – for each year of the programme), and discuss any changes that have occurred.
- 3.2 Organization of the graduate training, intellectually and geographically, with regard to (a) course work and (b) research. Describe the forms of supervision, the involvement of industry in the graduate training, the networking, summer schools, mentors, visits, etc
- 3.3 List of new courses developed (and to be developed) specifically for the programme. Describe their characteristics compared to previously available courses
- 3.4 List of degrees (licentiates and PhDs) awarded per March 31 and expected within next 4 months
- 3.5 Routines for quality assessment

3.6 What is the "added value" of the graduate school (if any) as such? How would you like to further improve the graduate school?

3.7 Has the programme contributed to an improved graduate training. If so, how? Compare the graduate training within the programme with previous and parallel graduate training. What are the advantages and disadvantages? What are the main difficulties concerning the graduate training? How would you like to further improve it? What are your visions for the future?

The Foundation has – in parallel to – the mid-term assessment, decided to perform a separate comparative study of its graduate schools. This study starts already in 1999, and might require part of the information requested here, as well as additional information earlier. We hope that this will not cause any insurmountable problems for the programmes concerned.

4. Collaborations

A critical comparison of the improvements in collaboration attained so far with the objectives stated in the programme plan. Compare the programme in this aspect with previous and parallel forms of research and graduate training. Describe and where possible quantify the objectives, the forms, the extent and the contents of the following types of cooperation:

4.1 Scientific collaboration between different disciplines and departments (shown in joint subprojects, publications etc.)

4.2 International collaboration, including participation in EU projects (shown in mutual projects, regular exchange of researchers, shorter visits etc.)

4.3 Cooperation between the universities originally involved in the programme as well as with other universities (both scientific and administrative aspects)

4.4 Cooperation with other SSF programmes (joint courses, meetings, projects, etc)

4.5 Collaboration with industry and other parts of society (supervision, mentoring, contracts for joint projects, innovations and prototypes based on research performed within the programme, etc.)

4.6 How would you like to further improve the collaborations?

5. Management and organization of the programme

A description of the organization and management of the programme. What advantages and disadvantages characterize the programme structure compared to other organizational forms of research and graduate training? How does the programme board work? Is there a code of procedures for the board? Have there been special working groups within the programme? Advisory groups? Results of work in these groups? What is the position of the programme in the university organization? What is the role of the programme director? How is the programme organization perceived by scientists and PhD students? How is the monitoring of the programme through the vision, the long-term goal, objectives, reporting routines etc introduced and accepted? How is the quality of the programme at large ascertained?

6. Handling of intellectual property rights

What are the methods of handling immaterial rights and what are the experiences? Describe the agreement between the programme participants concerning intellectual property rights. Has the programme contributed to improvements in the handling of immaterial rights at the

universities? Have the universities developed a policy for this? If so, has this been of use to the programme? If not, has this been a drawback?

7. Continuation of the programme's activities

A description of the expected organization of the activities within the programme after the SSF funding expires. What other funding could be expected? Which parts of the programme do you consider your most valuable contributions to the total research system in Sweden?

8. Budget and financing of the programme

An **economic report** for the first years, i.e. up until the end of 1999, a **finance plan** including all expected contributions and a **budget** for the coming three years (2000-2002) should be submitted. (The usual form for the annual economic report – in its current version – should be utilized for this report.)

9. External information and other activities

What efforts have been made to disseminate information about the activities of the programme? Describe other activities within the programme, e.g. conferences, seminars etc. Describe the principal outline of the web site of the programme.

10. SWOT analysis

Include an analysis of the programme's perceived Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. Strengths and weaknesses refer to the **internal** capabilities of the programme, i.e. are under its control, and should be regarded relative to competitors, whereas opportunities and threats are found in the **external** environment, usually outside the control of the programme.

Enclosures:

1. Criteria for the assessment of programmes.

The Board of the Foundation, meeting on October 10, 1996, identified the following criteria to be used when monitoring progress and subsequently evaluating SSF programmes.

Criteria for the assessment of programmes

(Whenever possible, the answers should be quantitative)

To what extent has the programme contributed to accomplishing:

- **Improvement in academic research**

improved research environment, manifested e.g. by the quality of new research activities and improved international standing of existing groups

- **Improvement in research education**

improved quality of graduate education, manifested e.g. by lowered examination age,
improved basic training,
improved multi-disciplinarity,
improved supervision,
improved contact with industry/society at large,
increased examination of doctors and licentiates, and
increased employment of doctors and licentiates outside academia,
improved gender balance

- **Improved collaborations**

improved collaboration within academia, between various disciplines and between different universities, manifested e.g. by a list of joint projects, joint publications

improved collaboration between academia and industry/society at large, manifested e.g. by a list of joint research projects, leading to new developments, prototypes, products and systems; participation in graduate training/course work, supervision of research

improved international collaboration manifested e.g. by a list of EU and other international projects

improved mobility between universities and between academia and industry/society at large

improved handling of immaterial rights at the university, manifested e.g. by patents registered and exploited; number of spin-off companies (generated on the basis of programme work) etc