

Evaluation report

Evaluated point	Grade	Comments
Scientific impact of research	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of the R& D outcomes are of good international standard, within which there are research fields in which the standard is high. • There is evidence that the majority of results generate international interest in the field, and there are some fields in which the scientific impact is considerable. • Some publications have been issued by internationally recognized publishers and journals, with a few in leading international outlets. • There is evidence of some disparity both in the volume and quality of high-level publications per research member. <p>In the absence of nationally-agreed criteria for practice-based research, the Academy has developed a set of indicators which they deem appropriate: for instance, international recognition and importance in the discipline. There is clear awareness that the evaluation period marked the beginning of a process of reflection and refinement of mechanisms that may enhance the scientific impact of all modes of research.</p>
Sustainability and potential of research	Good	<p>The organization and management of R&D are generally clear and effective and take into account the specifics of the field where possible. The Academy has a clear vision of strengths and development needs of the corresponding R&D field and the desire to strengthen the potential of the field. Measures for acquiring external funding and the composition of staff are evidence of the continued sustainability of the R&D. However, it may be necessary to implement measures to strengthen the underpinning structures for funding and the diversity within the staff base.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Academy moves to a new building shortly, which will better meet its research needs. • The Academy's specialism in C20th and contemporary art history and practice is in contrast to Tallinn University's art historical focus on earlier periods. The Academy's distinctive focus should be recognized as a nationally unique provision. • It has a well-functioning and integrated graduate school in which all students are involved, but systematic co-supervision of interdisciplinary topics is to be encouraged. • The Academy would benefit from reviewing and refining its definition of artistic research to ensure future sustainability, especially in developing its PhD programmes. • Better professional development guidance for students who combine doctoral research with a career outside the university would be beneficial.

Evaluated point	Grade	Comments
Societal importance of research	Good	<p>The evaluators were presented with a wide variety of research and creative practice, as well as examples of entrepreneurial and enterprising activity, including knowledge transfer and exchange. This was distinctive.</p> <p>The evaluators recognised that the societal impact, reach and significance of the EAA is manifest in a wide variety of ways that include: governmental, national and public recognition of the quality of the research; scholarly and creative achievements of its community and their societal and cultural engagements.</p> <p>The evaluators identified considerable concern as to the lack of any scientific criteria for the evaluation of research practices, where both the research imperatives and the outputs and outcomes of the research were not manifest in scientific journals.</p> <p>The evaluators were also presented with a wide range of scholarly texts and monographs from the research groups, focusing predominantly on art history and conservation. The quality of these outputs was also not adequately or appropriately recognized, given the lack of criteria for ranking books and monographs whether in English or Estonian.</p> <p>R&D at the Academy has had significant outreach and societal impact and the evaluators witnessed and encountered some significant examples including: the Christian Ackerman Project: ‘Tallinn’s Pheidias Arrogant and Talented’ that demonstrated effective interdisciplinary collaboration. It demonstrates the integration of research and teaching in concert with public outreach and engagement, societal and scholarly benefit in a range of fields. Collaborations included those of an intra-disciplinary nature within subjects at EAA, University of Tartu (Geography and Chemistry) and a range of national, cultural and scholarly institutions and funding bodies.</p> <p>The evaluators were also presented with research, scholarship and entrepreneurial examples where the research had developed new and innovative forms of sustainable enterprise and where the societal benefits, although not quantified, were creating societal economic benefit.</p> <p>The evaluators recognized the significant potential benefit from the integration of research, scholarship and creative enterprise, but shared concerns identified in the self-evaluation that the existing scientific criteria for evaluation obscured and rendered invisible both the scientific and the societal benefit of EAA’s integrated activities.</p>

Evaluated point	Grade	Comments
<p>Scientific basis in the field is sufficient to conduct doctoral studies. (This question should be answered only if: a) institution being evaluated is conducting doctoral studies and; b) The field being evaluated is proposed to grant positive evaluation. If these conditions are met then: a) If the level of scientific basis is sufficient for conducting doctoral studies in every structural unit being evaluated, then the answer should be „yes“; b) If the scientific basis is not sufficient in some structural units, then those units should be listed.)</p>		<p>Positive. It is welcome that the doctoral students at the Academy are part of a graduate school. The Academy has positively matched funded state support for PhD students to increase the critical mass of students.</p>

Summary assessment

Evaluated point	Grade	Comments
<p>Areas of special note as appropriate (Where necessary indicate sub-fields, assessment criteria, and/or structural units which, in the committee's opinion, were of a notably high level.)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed establishment of a network of R&D collaborators will lead to enhanced interdisciplinarity, as noted in the self-evaluation document. • The Academy demonstrates awareness of enhanced links to enterprise and business; there has been some notable success in the assessment period particularly as regards environmental issues. • The investment in new premises that will bring together all elements of the Academy in a single building will also provide the opportunity for the institution to make a more consolidated contribution to societal impact. • The effective use of resources and premises in conjunction with strong effective interdisciplinary partnerships will enable EAA to increase the engagement with its users, beneficiaries and audiences.
<p>Areas in need of improvement as appropriate (Where necessary indicate sub-fields of the field being evaluated, assessment criteria, and/or structural units which, in the committee's opinion, revealed significant shortcomings.)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressing the fragmentation of R&D activities will help to implement plans towards consolidation of the Academy's research ambitions. • A more robust framework for the intellectual and professional development of early career researchers would be beneficial for sustaining the research base.
<p>Assessment proposal to the Minister of Education and Research</p>	<p>To grant positive evaluation</p>	<p>no special comments</p>

Feedback

Evaluated point	Comments
<p>Feedback for institution (This question should be answered only if the institution asked for feedback from the evaluation committee in the self-report (about up to three specific areas of R&D which it finds to be currently important, e.g., related to its development plan).)</p>	<p>Not requested</p>
<p>Suggestions for unit, institution, state etc (As appropriate, committee can give additional feedback for the structural unit, the institution, or the State (please specify whom feedback is directed to) according to the directive assessment criteria for regular evaluation (article 7).</p>	<p>Self-Evaluation: The self-evaluation report should be redesigned in order to prioritise analysis over description. The employment of descriptors such as ‘add facts’ is counterproductive and tends to lead to an emphasis on product over process throughout. The inclusion of a final section on strategic forward planning would be a more coherent summation of the self-evaluation exercise, while also providing continuity from one evaluation exercise to another.</p> <p>Evaluation of Scientific Impact: The panel has encountered wide-spread problems concerning the evaluation of publications in the humanities. The academic community of arts and humanities clearly lacks confidence in the criteria for scientific impact as presently formulated. What is needed for a more equitable and effective evaluation is: (i) Appropriate credit should be given for research undertaken in the production of monographs, the editing of and contributions to multi-authored work. (ii) The evaluation system should take account of the scientific quality of a publication irrespective of the language in which it is written. A multi-lingual system of evaluation is a matter of balancing three variables: (1) the scope (2) the subject and (3) audience. (iii) The current system fails to capture the range of research and the various modes in which it is produced. This is particularly evident in the absence of criteria for non-text based research [‘artistic’, ‘practice-based’]. A bench-marking exercise against other European models would be useful.</p> <p>Societal Impact: The academic community requires a more lucid definition of what is understood by societal impact; this should be substantiated by exemplars drawn from a much broader range of domains than the impact of research on the economy. It is clear that enterprise and entrepreneurial approaches do not appear to be at the forefront of most institutions visited. There is also a need to outline the relationship between scientific and societal impact for research in these fields such that the criteria</p>

Evaluated point	Comments
	<p>may provide an appropriate and effective framework for quality assessment of the research.</p> <p>Doctoral Programmes: While the research base for doctoral programmes is generally satisfactory, there are widespread issues around completion rates that are linked to extremely low funding levels. The current provision in Estonian is out of line with other European countries. Many students are by necessity in full-time employment, and carrying out their doctoral research part-time.</p> <p>Academic leadership: There is a lack of strategic leadership in (almost) all institutions. In many cases, the dean of the faculty or the director of a non-university research institute have a clear vision about the future of their unit, but are not successful in conveying it to the heads of department and the (senior) researchers. Therefore appropriate professional training and development in strategic management for researchers at various stages of their career is necessary.</p>