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Dear panelist,

Once again, thank you for accepting the task to participate in Lund University’s comprehensive research evaluation exercise, RQ20. We are most grateful to you for taking the time to share your expertise.

This document provides instructions regarding your task as an external advisor, as well as a general overview of the University. Chairpersons, who will responsible for coordinating the panel work, will be further informed about the panel work at a meeting in January 2020.

On the next few pages, we refer to figures from the attached PowerPoint presentation entitled 191112 RQ20 OVERVIEW, which was presented to university employees in September 2019. Where relevant, references are made to figures (page numbers) in this presentation.

In addition, all relevant documents including the instructions for the self-assessments can be found at: https://rq20.blogg.lu.se/

Finally, should you have any questions at this stage, please contact the project leaders of RQ20, professors Freddy Ståhlberg (freddy.stahlberg@med.lu.se) and Mats Benner (mats.benner@fek.lu.se), via the RQ20 Office (malin.bredenberg@fs.lu.se).
Lund University at a glance

Lund University was founded in 1666 and is consistently ranked among the top 100 universities in the world. It is a comprehensive and research-intensive university, comprising a total of eight faculties, employing more than 800 professors and 4000 members of teaching staff, researchers and doctoral students, who jointly publish 5000 publications annually, while 40 000 students attend the University.¹ Lund University has a total turnover of more than SEK 8 billion (approximately 850 million US dollars, 750 million euros), of which two thirds are dedicated to research. This makes it the largest in Sweden and second largest in the Nordic countries. Lund University is a national leader in obtaining funding from the European Union, and in national competition for large-scale and interdisciplinary programmes (Linnaeus, Strategic Research Areas). Lund therefore cherishes its interdisciplinary and ability to capitalise on the unique breadth of its research profile, as well as its international attractiveness.

The University is organised into eight faculties (areas), namely economics and management, engineering, humanities and theology, law, medicine, science, performing arts, and social sciences – and one special area directly under the vice-chancellor. Below are some key figures on the faculties (SEK 1 million is equivalent to approximately 104 000 US dollars or 94 000 euros):

Economics and management: 37 professors, 160 researchers, teaching staff and doctoral students, 3 500 full-time students. SEK 100 million in direct government funding, SEK 150 million in external funding

Engineering: 157 professors, 1 000 researchers, teaching staff and doctoral students, 6 000 full-time students. SEK 400 million in direct government funding, SEK 800 million in external funding

Humanities and theology: 66 professors, 350 researchers, teaching staff and doctoral students, 3 700 full-time students. SEK 250 million in direct government funding, SEK 120 million in external funding

Law: 14 professors, 90 researchers, teaching staff and doctoral students, 3 700 full-time students. SEK 40 million in direct government funding, SEK 20 million in external funding

Medicine: 337 professors, 1000 researchers, teaching staff and doctoral students, 2 700 full-time students. SEK 700 million in direct government funding, SEK 1250 million in external funding

Science: 143 professors, 706 teaching staff, 700 researchers and doctoral students, 1 600 full-time students. SEK 450 million in direct government funding, SEK 500 million in external funding

Performing arts: 13 professors, 120 researchers, teaching staff and doctoral students, 600 full-time students. SEK 30 million in direct government funding, SEK 10 million in external funding

¹ See figure 12
Social sciences: 50 professors, 480 researchers, teaching staffs and doctoral students, 5700 full-time students. SEK 150 million in direct government funding, SEK 150 million in external funding

University Specialised Centres: 6 professors, 20 researchers, teaching staff and doctoral students, 230 full-time students. SEK 50 million in direct government funding, SEK 75 million in external funding
Background of RQ20

RQ20 was initiated by the vice-chancellor in February 2019, as the first comprehensive research evaluation conducted in 11 years. Its predecessor, RQ08, primarily aimed to assess the overall quality of research at Lund University, and graded it according to international standards. RQ20, like RQ08, has the ambition to gauge the international standing of research at Lund University. RQ20 has a different scope compared to its predecessor though: it is primarily oriented towards assessing (and giving advice on) the preconditions for high-quality research as they are expressed in procedures, strategies, resource allocation and networks.2

To support the units’ self-assessments, the University has surveyed the financial conditions for each unit of assessment, as well as their publication and citation patterns. While this material is intended to serve as background information for both the units of assessment and the panel members, your task is not to grade the units on the basis of that data. The data is intended to shed light on the preconditions and current development of the units and showcase their financial underpinnings and publication profiles. This information should also be helpful when you assess the feasibility of their aims and strategies. The units have therefore been asked to comment and draw upon that data if and when it appears to be applicable and useful in their self-assessments.3

In summary, RQ20 is intended to support the units in their aims to develop procedures for high quality and renewal in research, and the University as a whole to realise its potential through its breadth and interdisciplinary collaboration. The analysis that the units themselves provide in their self-assessments, together with the feedback and advice from the panels, will form the basis for the panel reports. In the reports, the aim is to assess the preconditions for high-quality research among the units, to determine if resources are adequate, if the balance between education, research and outreach is viable, and if the strategic direction and scientific and societal networks are sufficient and conducive to quality.

Procedure

The University and the different faculties have been divided into 32 subject panels.4 Each panel in turn covers specific units of assessment (UoAs or research environments), in most cases, there are between 4 to 8, but there are exceptions in order to create units that are as coherent as possible.5 The units of assessment have been identified by the faculties themselves in consultation with the RQ20 secretariat. In some cases, units of assessment have been formed on the basis of departments, while other units of assessment are composed of several subjects and/or groups.

Each panel is led by a chair and comprises around 5 (the exact number depends on size and complexity of each panel) other experts. The panels will receive the self-evaluation

---

2 See also figures 2-5
3 Figures 17-18
4 Figure 10
5 Figure 9
reports from each unit of assessment, and these will form the basis of the panel reports together with impressions from the site visits.

The self-evaluation reports draw primarily on a qualitative analysis done within the unit of assessment, and the units have been instructed to report how they conducted their work. In most cases, they also reflect upon the data provided in the financial and bibliometric analyses – and these analyses will be attached to the self-evaluation reports.

Consequently, each unit of assessment should be analysed and assessed on its own terms, and not be compared to others – neither in the panel nor in the University as a whole (or beyond that). It is the preconditions (including their funding and publication profiles) of the units of assessment, and how they are acted upon, that serve as the reference for the evaluations.
Instructions for subject panel reports

Overall report size: around 7,000-10,000 words, depending on size and complexity of the panel. Please use Microsoft Word, Times New Roman, 12 pt.

Submission deadline: June 30, 2020. The units of assessment will then be given the report to comment on potential factual errors before the final report is submitted 2 weeks thereafter.

Style and content: Each unit of assessment has been instructed to be transparent and self-critical in their reports. Hence, they expect to be advised (and assessed) on the basis of their capacity to formulate their strengths and weaknesses, how well they are articulated, and how well they describe possibilities and limitations in addressing these. As always in collegial matters, be respectful yet frank in your communication and provide advice and recommendations that the units can act upon.

We expect the level of transparency and honesty, as well as the capacity to formulate measures, to be reflected in the panel reports, without panels hesitating to indicate if and when the self-assessments seem to deviate from what outside observers may have noted.
Proposed report structure:

**Executive summary** – the panel sums up its main findings in a brief statement, maximum half a page.

**Introduction** – the panel sums up its mode of operation, its composition and some general reflections on the preconditions for making the report (formation of units of assessment, background material, site visits and similar). About one page should be dedicated to this.

**Observations** – the panel reports on its analysis based on the self-evaluation template. This should form the main part of the report, comprising around 10 pages.

**Leadership:**
In this section, please provide a critical analysis, with a summarising list of strengths and weaknesses, of the units’ leadership and organisation, in the following areas:

- Priority setting, including goals for external research funding
- Recruitment, promotion and succession
- Publication patterns
- The balance between activities in research, education and external engagement
- The overarching research strategy

**Collegial culture:**
In this section, please provide a critical analysis, with a summarising list of strengths and weaknesses, of the units’ mechanisms to enhance research quality, both with regard to current conditions and future potential. Please comment specifically on how the units work with:

- Opportunities for early-career researchers to develop their originality and independence
- Sustainability and renewal of research strengths
- Academic networks and collaborations outside the unit
- Diversity, integrity and ethics
- Quality in applications and publications

**Quality ecosystem:**
In this section, please provide a critical analysis, with a summarising list of strengths and weaknesses, of how the units align other tasks with research. Please comment specifically on how the units work with:

- Research strengths and how these are reflected in the educational portfolio
- How external research collaborations (with e.g. industry, governments and states, county councils, municipalities and non-governmental organisations) influence the quality of research
- How the unit deals with integrity and ethics, including potential conflicts of interest, in relation to collaboration
• How the unit uses and capitalizes on available research infrastructure, in Lund and elsewhere
• If the unit is aligned with any of the University’s strategic research areas (SFOs) or any other strong and broad research area, how opportunities from such connections are utilised.

**Recommendations** – in this section, the panel is asked to provide a list of recommendations and advice for each unit of assessment. This should be around 5 pages in total (for all units of assessment).

You are asked to indicate issues that call for immediate attention as well as issues that need to be addressed in the long term (5-10 years), and how. Please refer back to the self-assessment to clarify the connection between observations and advice.

In addition, please also highlight things to be commended, rather than corrected.

If relevant, please indicate issues that should be addressed and resolved at other levels of the University, such as at the faculty level and/or by the central university management.

Finally, please indicate if the panel was missing any relevant material to make observations and recommendations, or if any other relevant matter was omitted.