



Dear Evaluator

#### Instructions for ARTES/PAMP evaluators

The aims of this evaluation is threefold

- 1) to guide the project's further studies
- 2) to give ARTES board an independent view of each project's potential
- 3) to give SSF (Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research) an independent view of ARTES conformance to SSF's objectives

The focus of this evaluation is on the scientific aspects of individual projects. We would however like to receive a brief statement of the quality and balance of the entire programme (the project's you are reviewing).

#### Project evaluation

As comments on each the project's we would like to receive

- 1) suggestions for improving the scientific work, cooperations, literature, methods etc.
- 2) relevance of the studies carried out for the real-time area
- 3) is the project's research direction heading in the proposed direction ?
- 4) is the present direction scientifically relevant ?
- 5) has the present direction a potential industrial use ?
- 6) your assessment of the project (see proposed terminology at end) with comments
- 7) your recommendation regarding the future funding of the project

As material for this part of the evaluation we submit the an overview of the project's (the web page), the applications, support letters, reports and publications. Please note that several of these publications are not published yet and may be subject to changes. We therefore ask you to use these publications only for this evaluation. The publications are made available at or linked from <http://www.artes.uu.se/project/> as soon as there are final versions.

#### Programme evaluation

To give SSF an independent view of ARTES conformance to SSF:s objectives we would like comments on the following when looking on all project's and ARTES activities together. We realise that it is difficult for you to comment on all aspects. Please, make an attempt to at least give a high level impression on the performance of ARTES for as many aspects as possible.

Has ARTES contributed to

- 1) improvement in academic research
  - by the quality of research activities
  - by improved international standing of the involved groups
- 2) improvement in research education
  - improved quality of graduate education, manifested e.g. by lowered examination age,
  - improved basic training,
  - improved multi-disciplinarity,
  - improved super-vision,
  - improved contact with industry/society at large,

- increased examination of PhD's and lic's,
- increased employment of PhD's and lic's outside academia, and
- improved gender balance

### 3) improved collaborations

- improved collaboration within academia, between various disciplines and between different universities, manifested e.g. by joint project's, joint publications
- improved collaboration between academia and industry/society at large, manifested e.g. by
- research project's, leading to new develop-ments, prototypes, products and systems; participation in graduate training/course work, supervision of research
- improved international collaboration manifested e.g. by a list of EU project's and other international project's
- 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 etc

### Evaluator's recommendations

The Foundation would appreciate recommendations regarding the future funding of the programme, incl. if and how the programme should be continued after year 5 (the termination of the current funding period).

For this part of the evaluation we submit a complementary material to the material for the project's

- Take advantage of ARTES,
- ARTES Mid term report to SSF,
- Embedded systems and the future of Swedish IT-research  
(a paper put together to support SSF:s strategic planning)

### **Proposed terminology**

In order to standardize the terminology used in the assessment of the different parts of the program, the following grades should be used:

1 - Outstanding/Excellent. Research at a very high international level; of great international interest with broad impact and with publications in internationally leading journals and/or leading conferences; the researchers are among the leading in the field.

2 - Very good. Research at a high international level; of international interest with impact within the sub-field and with publications in internationally leading journals and/or leading conferences; the researchers are among the leading in the sub-field.

3 - Good. Research at a good international level with publications in internationally well-known journals and/or conferences; the researchers have a good international reputation within the sub-field.

4 - Fair. Research that only partly is of good international standard and only partially published in well-known international journals and/or conferences.

5 - Poor. Research of insufficient quality.

Best regards

*Roland Grönroos and Hans Hansson*