

Evaluation report

Evaluated point	Grade	Comments
Scientific impact of research	Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The R&D outcomes are in general of a satisfactory international standard and display evidence of international interest in certain areas, with a particular strength in musicology. • Publications have been issued by appropriate international and domestic publishers. • Researchers are active in the publication of their research findings, but the level publication is uneven across staff members. <p>The Academy's research infrastructure is robust, but it recognizes that some of its research groups are very small which weakens its competitiveness for grant funding. The Academy is also aware that stronger collaboration between national and international institutions would further enhance the quality of its research outputs. Its research governance model might be usefully refined in order to better support researchers across all its research activities.</p>
Sustainability and potential of research	Good	<p>Traditionally, the Academy's research was only in musicology, but it now covers more fields including theatre. Currently, the research management is representational for all disciplines, including artistic research, but management structures have only recently been created. Strategic planning has clearly become more important, but in practice planning is rather vague and reactive. The remit of the research committee is to discuss policies and procedures such as digitalization, but it appears to lack decision-making powers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The musicological unit of the Academy receives relatively little external funding and it has chosen to fund research activities from its own budget. • The Academy has become part of the Centre of Excellence of Estonian Studies, which will attract more external funding. • The Academy appears to have little idea of research planning, although the research committee meets once each semester and formally approves grant applications. • The Academy would benefit from reviewing and refining its definition of artistic research to ensure future sustainability, especially in developing its PhD programmes. • The doctoral programme is adequate and effective, but better plans for the career development of PhDs would be beneficial.

Evaluated point	Grade	Comments
Societal importance of research	Good	<p>The evaluators recognise the significance and heritage of the Academy and noted that it addresses some, but not all, aspects of societal impact that might have been anticipated. Given that, in addition to University level scholarship and research, a significant element of the Academy's remit is performance based, the evaluators anticipated a greater degree of outreach, evidence of societal impact and contribution to Estonian cultural heritage.</p> <p>There may need to be some rethinking of the interrelationship between scientific research and activities that contribute to societal impact, such that the two aspects are planned and conceived more holistically, and make better sense to the academic and PhD community. This may be facilitated with the addition of the newly planned concert hall and 'black box' theatre space, which will provide new 'state-of-the-art' public spaces for recitals and performance, and augment the potential for impact.</p> <p>The evaluators noted several societal impacts, particularly those related to their role in the AIRS project related to singing, health and wellbeing, and the EAMT's contribution to the UNESCO list of intangible cultural heritage. In addition, the most notable outreach with a bearing on societal and public impact are the c. 200 public events organised by the EAMT. A number of these performances are closely linked to research within the academy, including Allan Vurma's engagement in World Voice Day and the development of doctoral research practice where students present a series of four concerts as a core element of their doctoral training.</p>
<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</p>		<p>Positive.</p> <p>The Academy takes care of its PhD students, and most of them seem to be on schedule for completion. The Academy organizes weekly seminars for musicology PhD students, in which they present their work. The organisation of doctoral studies in theatre studies is weaker, since there are very few students involved in this programme and therefore their meetings are less regular. In general, students are not involved in larger research projects of the Academy.</p>

Evaluated point	Grade	Comments
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.)		

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"> • Significant international collaboration has helped to raise the research profile of the Academy in the assessment period. • Research in musicology within the Academy was particularly impressive.
<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"> • The development of theatre studies as a strategic priority would help to balance the quality of scientific research across the Academy. • The plans to enhance the physical infrastructure of the Academy will address the perceived shortcomings that limited scientific and societal impact in the assessment period.
<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>