

## Evaluation report

Evaluated point	Grade	Comments
Scientific impact of research	Satisfactory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The R&amp; D outcomes are in general of satisfactory academic standard.</li> <li>• There is evidence that research generates international interest in certain fields.</li> <li>• Publications have been issued by domestic publishers and/or in domestic-recognised journals, some in internationally-recognised publishers and journals.</li> <li>• Research staff members are actively engaged in the publication and dissemination of research, but there is evidence of some unevenness both in the volume and quality of high-level publications per research member.</li> </ul> <p>The issue of research capacity has to some extent been overcome in the period through significant international collaboration. But other challenges continue to prevent the realisation of potential in terms of scientific impact: the absence of appropriate criteria for non-textual outputs (exhibitions and visual material), the difficulty of finding a balance between the production of academic outputs for an international readership, and publications addressed to the general public. The latter reflects a broader contextual problem which the unit is working to address: how to develop research capacity and produce research that is internationally excellent, while also implementing the various activities and functions of a national museum.</p>
Sustainability and potential of research	Satisfactory	<p>The Museum has a clear vision of the changing role of museums and of their organizational structures. It has adopted and implemented new views on how to communicate in new ways with its visitors. However, the research management lacks focus for sustainable R&amp;D.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Museum faces challenges in order to situate itself realistically in the research landscape.</li> <li>• It has a small research staff base, which has to fulfil many different tasks besides research, including preservation and digitalization.</li> <li>• It shows evidence of good international cooperation, but collaborative research projects with other national institutions, international universities and national museums with an R&amp;D function could all be enhanced.</li> <li>• The Museum could attract more external funding, PhD students and postdoctoral researchers if it defines its specific objectives and positions more clearly.</li> </ul>
Societal importance of research	Very good	<p>The societal impact of the Museum is manifest in the planning and presentation of its new premises and its summation and presentation of the work of hundreds of</p>

Evaluated point	Grade	Comments
		<p>Estonian researchers and scholars nationwide. The opening of the new museum building and the rethinking, reformation and physical transformation of the Museum itself as an organisation to include contemporary research facilities, new ethnological and museological models are yet to be fully tested and evaluated.</p> <p>The evaluators recognize the significant achievement in rethinking the communication of research and its public and societal benefits through the curation, planning, scholarship and research for exhibitions in concert with its role in representing and communicating Estonian culture for public consumption. The opportunities afforded by the new environment provide an excellent springboard for future museological experiments, research innovations and international collaboration.</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 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>N/A</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"> <li>• The potential offered by the impressive new physical infrastructure will further enhance its international status.</li> </ul>
<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"> <li>• A more strategic approach to R&amp;D capacity of the Museum would help ensure that its scientific research matches the quality of its exhibits and archival holdings.</li> </ul>
<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&amp;D which it finds to be currently important, e.g., related to its development plan).)</p>	<p>The institution asks what recommendations of the evaluators concerning the sustainability of their R&amp;D activities, given that consolidations and overlaps between research institutions should be avoided.</p> <p>The Museum should first of all develop a realistic vision of its position in the Estonian research landscape, define its relationship between basic and applied research more precisely, and devise its research strategy accordingly. Only if the Museum defines its niche in relation to its core competence and implements it, will it become an attractive partner for other institutes, including universities and national museums abroad. The Museum has to avoid the impression that it duplicates the research that is being done better elsewhere.</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</p>

Evaluated point	Comments
	<p>societal impact for research in these fields such that the criteria 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>