RESEARCH EVALUATION FOR DEVELOPMENT 2019
EXPERT PANEL REPORT

Faculty of Arts

Introductory Remarks

Panel:

Sharon Rider (Chair), Uppsala University

Annelie Bränström-Öhman, Umeå University

Per Ditlef Fredriksen, University of Oslo

Frans Gregersen, University of Copenhagen

Johnny Kondrup, University of Copenhagen

Mathilde Skoie, University of Oslo

In preparation of the site visit, the chair and some of the panellists submitted preliminary reflections and/or questions to bring to the table. The RED19 project group aided the panel's work with the greatly appreciated support of Rangnar Nilsson, who meticulously documented all written and oral comments throughout the process, and skilfully synthesised them into the template. Various versions of the present report have been circulated between the panel members since the site visit, to ensure that each member had the opportunity to make the emendations that s/he deemed necessary, to which the other members could respond. The panellists' original remarks, as well as the ensuing discussion both during and after the site visit (the latter conducted by email), reflected substantial disagreement on certain issues between panel members. Thus, the report contains analyses and recommendations that are at times in conflict with one another. The report has been constructed so as to communicate all the perspectives represented in the panel on those issues. The panel chair integrated the panellists' editorial comments, revised the report, and disseminated it to all members of the panel for approval before submission.

The Faculty of Arts has submitted a coherent and balanced self-evaluation report, which insightfully confronts the challenges it faces. Unlike many of the self-evaluations from other levels of the university that members of this panel have evaluated during the RED19 process, the Faculty of Arts did not emphasise organisational and financial questions at the expense of reflection over what the university is for. The panel commends the Faculty of Arts for this, and recognises that the faculty is in a particularly difficult position regarding the negotiation between the demands of the university as an organisation in the service of stakeholders, on the one hand, and as a collective of teachers, researchers and students concerned with cultivating and sustaining professional norms, on the other.

That having been said, there were panel members who expressed the view that the Faculty Board should demonstrate more vision and strategic leadership in working toward common goals based on shared principles and ideals through collegial decision-making processes. Other panellists found the model of minimal interference from the faculty in departmental matters of strategy and decision-making promising and propitious. Nonetheless, there was general agreement in the panel that both overview and coordination are needed to ensure the quality of research development throughout the faculty. This calls for both careful analyses of the future challenges facing the humanities at the University of Gothenburg (UGOT) enterprising new ideas and practical, concrete measures. However, decisions must be grounded in dialogue with the aim of achieving a broad consensus, while also ensuring a transparent process and that the status and import of decisions made are clear and straightforward.

Report: Observations and Analysis

Section A – Background and Research Standing

A1. Background

Many of the departments' self-evaluations and site visits involved discussions about the re-organisation of the faculty in 2009, when current departments were formed. In most cases, it appears quite clear that the process of consolidating the new departments is still ongoing. Similarly, the faculty is not quite consolidated either. This is an issue that the faculty has to keep working on in the years to come, both in itself and in support of the departments. The move to the new Humanities Centre could be considered a golden opportunity also in this respect. The grounds for and justifications of planned activities should be made explicit, and serve as the governing principle according to which the day-to-day tasks of research and teaching should be organised. The current organisation and structure of the faculty still requires long-term pro-active efforts to optimise its functioning.

A2. Research standing

The Faculty of Arts recognises that research initiatives should grow organically, and thus refrains from drawing up top-down research plans. This is a wise strategy, which should be maintained. But it must be balanced by bodies that can secure overview, coordination and quality.

Coordination and overarching bodies must be transparent, and the reasons for priorities and strategic decisions should be clear to all faculty members. Transparency regarding the use of strategic funds, for instance, is important. Knowing how money is being used is essential for understanding what the leadership's priorities are, what it is doing and why. For the same reason, the vision and goals of the faculty should be clearly formulated, and the process leading up to that formulation should be unambiguous.

In their self-evaluation, the faculty wrote: "*One possible internal strategy could thus be to stimulate research towards these goals by financial incentives, e.g. to strategically promote certain types of publications or collaborations.*" While this strategy does not necessarily conflict with the promise not to "*develop a hands-on policy with the aim of promoting certain research areas or research profiles*", there is a risk that it is perceived by staff as doing just that through "soft power".

The ambition to establish a system that will allow teachers to plan for concentrated periods of research is commendable, but not easy to realise. The faculty should work together with the departments to devise guidelines that are flexible enough to allow for variation between departments depending on "local" conditions, while sufficiently coherent so as to constitute some kind of transparent, predictable and effective strategy.

The panel suggests that the faculty take a closer look at the reward system in its entirety, and seek a faculty-wide system for crediting substantial contributions to public discourse and interchange over disciplines, professions and specialisations ("samverkan").

Section B – Leadership

B1. Leadership

B1.1 Faculty leadership

Strengths

- The panel has full confidence that the faculty leadership is ambitious in its efforts to address the existing issues and problems.

Weaknesses

- Some panel members consider the structure of responsibilities and decision-making powers, especially the relationship between the Dean and the Vice-Deans, on the one hand, and the Faculty Board, on the other, somewhat unclear.

Recommendations

- If the panel is in doubt, there is some risk that employees at UGOT are as well. We recommend that the faculty work on clarifying the delegation of responsibilities to different bodies and functions within the faculty and communicate the organisational structure on its webpage.
- Multidisciplinary projects or programmes have been described as part of the vision of the faculty, both in relation to the new Humanities Centre, and as part of the strategy to consolidate the structure of the faculty's organisation. If this is the case, the faculty should have an explicit policy with regard to such initiatives. Multidisciplinary efforts could be provided with substantial seed money through a collaboration between relevant departments, for example.

B1.2 University level leadership

Weaknesses

- Some panel members expressed the view that the structure of decision-making and the allocation of responsibilities between UGOT's central management and the leadership of the faculties in the new line organisation is not entirely clear.
- Some panellists suspect that the difficulty in ambitious, long-term strategy in decision-making is an effect of the far-reaching decentralisation of the decision-making structures at UGOT. In the opinion of some, the process of decentralisation at UGOT seems to have been implemented too strictly, and thus to have led to an incumbrance to leadership and accountability at different levels. Other panellists have expressed concern that the current model runs the risk of encouraging micromanagement on the part of leadership. On this view, decentralisation can be seen as a positive development, and a promising way to structure the organisation of research and higher education.

- It is mentioned in passing under B1.2 that the initiative "*to stimulate new, cross-disciplinary constellations with the power to address great societal challenges*" has led to more funding being awarded to already established groups/profiles/centres. While the faculty may be applauded for its good intentions, it is clear both from its self-evaluation and that of University Management that one of the consequences of the Matthew Effect (more resources to those who already have a great deal) is that it creates hindrances for multidisciplinary or cross-disciplinary work. And the Matthew Effect cannot be avoided as long as top-tier journals are discipline-oriented, a state of affairs that no faculty or university leadership can control. Furthermore, studies have indicated that top-ranked journals are becoming more homogeneous in both form and content, rather than moving toward heterogeneity. Thus, there is reason to think that the conflict between rewarding publications in journals with high JIF and encouraging multidisciplinarity will not disappear any time soon.

Recommendations

- The details of the division/distribution of responsibilities through the "University of Gothenburg Renewal model" are currently under review by the Vice-Chancellor. The faculty leadership is encouraged to lend its support to this work, and, in consultation with central management, to strive to ascertain what is or is not within the remit of the Faculty Boards.

B2. Recruitment

Please see strengths/weaknesses for B3 below.

Recommendations

- The faculty should have unambiguous guidelines for the departments regarding mid- or long-term (5-10 years) recruitment plans. The extent to which departments may recruit new members of staff without these appointments being anchored in such a plan must be discussed. Similarly, the faculty might consider to what extent it should be involved in the recruitment process at the departmental level. The outcome of these considerations should be made explicit in a faculty strategy document, which ought also to include gender equality goals and plans. Of particular interest is a plan for the recruitment of promising early-career researchers, whether they are identified at UGOT itself or through applications in open calls. This will require routines for helping these researchers adjust and be integrated in the university. Such routines are best anchored at the faculty level.

B3. Career structure

Strengths

- The faculty wholeheartedly endorses the system of personal promotion from reader to professor ("*an important career step offered by the University of Gothenburg*", p.13). Some of the panellists agree that this is fruitful. The security offered by promotion can lead to very successful and daring initiatives on the part of promoted professors, resulting in eminent international and interdisciplinary research networks, large research grants from funding

agencies, publication in leading journals and research-based teaching in inventive new programmes of study. At the same time, there is also a risk that remaining throughout one's career at the same department leads to an "institutionalising" of the research conducted. But it is by no means the case that internal promotion and renewal are necessarily at odds with one another. Like any other instrument, the possibility of promotion can be very useful, if it is applied carefully.

Weaknesses

- Other panellists find this system of personal promotion highly problematic. In their view, the system promotes career security, predictability and loyalty among the present staff, and it makes it possible to attract senior lecturers without giving them more than 10% research time (since they can look forward to promotion). Seen from the point of view of attracting the best candidates, the personal right to promotion is infelicitous, since it means that many professorships are filled without competition. Potential consequences include decreased mobility, and impeded strategic planning in the distribution of professorships between departments and disciplines within the faculty. There is also a risk that some see the professorship as a personal reward for earlier achievements, rather than as a platform for taking on new responsibilities and projects. Thus, some panellists view the personal right to promotion as a threat to renewal in the academic environment and to the quality of the research conducted.

Recommendations

- The faculty needs a clear and consistent policy for the balance between personal promotions and open calls; the panel is in agreement in recommending that open calls be used significantly more than they are at the moment. At the same time, it should be kept in mind that it will be difficult to attract highly-qualified senior lecturers if the right to promotion is abolished without revising the formula for the allocation of research time.
- Should the system of personal promotion be restricted to favour open calls, the faculty should make sure to follow up on the risk of gender bias in the recruitment process, as men tend to be more successful than women in open calls.
- All things considered, some panellists recommend as the best way forward that the faculty retain the possibility for promotion to professor for lecturers and readers, provided that i) the department and faculty see the need for or desirability of a professorship in the applicant's area of expertise as part of its overall strategy, and ii) the standards set for promotion to professor are high and maintained through a stringent peer-review process. The aim should be that every member of the academic staff has his or her position as a result of an open call and an explicit and rigorous process of evaluation, which means that the faculty needs in the first instance to make sure that the positions of reader/lecturer are always filled on such a basis and no other.

B4. Funding

Weaknesses

- The faculty emphasises that increased external funding is of the utmost importance in light of its "current fragile economic situation". Researchers in some departments, however, report that if a teacher secures external funding for research, the department cannot recruit a substitute. This is a problem that needs to be addressed. Another risk attached to the emphasis on grant capture is that a disproportionate amount of time is devoted to preparing applications, of which only a handful will be successful. Thus, one consequence of this model is that what little research time is available to readers is spent on the application process itself, rather than research or scholarship. This issue is related to a reflection made in the faculty's self-evaluation with respect to the use of resources, especially faculty members' time, for administration. If the core activities of the university are teaching and research, one gets the impression that the university's current organisational model is an inefficient use of the funds available.

Recommendations

- The self-evaluation states that the faculty is currently reviewing the model for allocating funds to the departments. The faculty should conduct an analysis of the consequences, in the long and short term, before any decision is made.
- The model considered is a reinforcement of the Matthew Principle, insofar as it amounts to more resources to those who are already funded. The motivation for this is understandable. But there are risks involved. For one, it means that the faculty may find that it has put all its eggs in one basket, which constrains their capacity to maintain a diverse profile of potentially innovative research orientations. The model also entails that the responsibilities of the future course of the research at the faculty is de facto outsourced to the funding agencies. Another danger is that funding tends to pile up around certain successful networks and individuals, which may mean that the money is not being put to work in the optimal way. However difficult and complex the challenge of balancing the advantages and disadvantages may be, any plan of action that is developed and implemented must be preceded by prudent deliberations as well as ambitious aims.
- The faculty might consider earmarking funding for successful individuals and groups for proposals on how to bring in other colleagues from the faculty whose areas of competence are germane. Another suggestion would be to earmark the extra funding for "master classes" for advanced level and PhD students in the research area in question, out of which new research initiatives could emerge. This would also contribute to strengthening the link between research and teaching.
- The faculty could also consider the possibility of co-funding mainly externally funded PhD students (since funding agencies are often unwilling to finance the year of course work) as a strategy to bring more PhD students into the system.
- To the extent that money is reserved, whether at the level of the UGOT central administration or at the faculties, it is important that the use of these funds and the reasons for the investments made are transparent, i.e. that they are not perceived of as ad hoc, but understood as an organic part of an overall vision. It is thus crucial that the budget model be accessible and unambiguous to the staff. They need to know what is being prioritised and to what ends, where resources are going and when. Ensuring this understanding is key to the legitimacy of collegial bodies. It has a powerful effect on incentive, and, in the long run, on research and teaching activities as a whole.

- Regarding reports that external funding creates a need for temporary staff to take on the teaching load of the grantee, the faculty might consider a buy-out system, such as exists in Norway, which entails that personnel costs for the staff who move from teaching to research are used to cover the expenditures of recruiting temporary teacher replacements.

B5. Feedback and evaluation

Recommendations

- We endorse the faculty's wish for a central system provided by the university for the collection and processing of information about research output, collaborations etc. At the same time, such a system should be a support to the staff, not another administrative burden.

Section C – Complete Academic Environment

C1. Collaboration

C1.1 Collaboration and networks within the University of Gothenburg, with other Swedish universities, and internationally

Recommendations

- The allocation of SEK 500,000 per year to each department for bringing in international guest researchers is a good instrument, but perhaps a bit extravagant in a context of strained finances. The money could be used for other purposes – e.g. for supplementing PhD stipends, or creating a fund for sabbaticals abroad (see below ad C3.2).

C1.2 Collaboration with external stakeholders

Recommendations

- UGOT has an impressive tradition of public outreach. This tradition has been strengthened by some of the strategic initiatives taken by the faculty, notably, the Centre for Critical Heritage Studies. While building local and national support for the continuation of this tradition in the humanities is important, such efforts must also figure in the workload of employees. Outreach activities should be internally documented, made externally visible, and be rewarded. "Outreach" should be defined broadly to include dissemination of new knowledge to active teachers through focussed courses or thematic days.

C2. Relevance and impact on society

Strengths

- The faculty enjoys a strong position in this area. Many staff members have developed local, national and international networks and research collaborations with a variety of external stakeholders.

Weaknesses

- This strength does not seem to be integrated into the faculty's reward system, presumably because the impact of outreach in the humanities is difficult to measure in terms of practical applications. But difficulty is not the same thing as impossibility. The faculty self-evaluation states the need to "revise the meaning of impact". The panel agrees.

Recommendations

- It is in the faculty's own interest to address, in an articulate, active and innovative way, the importance of "*samverkan*" and the value of the staff members' eminence in this area. In short, the faculty is encouraged to find ways of accounting for the value of the work being done without relying solely on quantitative measures. A first step might be to gather a number of good examples of outreach that have brought attention to the faculty's research outside of UGOT.

C3. Research-teaching linkages

C3.1 Undergraduate and master's education

Strengths

- That UGOT is so focussed on education is a strength insofar as research has an immediate impact on society through teaching at all levels.

Weaknesses

- At the same time, teaching threatens to devour working hours, which must be seen as a weakness if teachers have no time to maintain or broaden their expertise or improve upon their teaching. This is a general problem for the humanities, but seems to be particularly pronounced at UGOT.
- Similarly, diminished student enrolment is a serious threat to the humanities and it is difficult to see how increased focus on publications, often of a technical nature, in international subject-specific outlets, aids student recruitment. This potential dilemma between the incentivising structures at work and the articulation of one of the core challenges of the faculty should be discussed both at the departmental and faculty levels until some sort of modus vivendi and plan of action can be reached.

Recommendations

- The policy that *all teachers shall have research experience*, not only as a prior achievement (in the form of a PhD), but *also in their current employment*, is commendable. For this reason,

the panel recommends that the model for the allocation of research time be revised so that senior lecturers have more than 10%. In addition, the faculty might consider how they can ensure that teaching faculty have access to a period of research, such as a term of sabbatical. The faculty should also discuss how research results can best be disseminated.

C3.2 Doctoral education

Weaknesses

- Major weaknesses at the doctoral level appear to be due to structures arising out of the current financial model at UGOT. The main problem is the lack of funding for PhD students in many subjects. Insofar as postdoctoral programmes are dependent on external funding, small disciplines run the risk of losing their accreditation or simply evaporating when senior staff retire. It should be the responsibility of the faculty to play an active role in deciding which disciplines and areas of research and teaching are vital to the humanities and which are not, and not simply allow present economic conditions to determine the future course of research and scholarship. This is a system failure that needs to be adjusted.
- It is also worrying that many departments' PhD programmes consist largely of independent studies ("*läskurser*"). This is not a satisfactory state of affairs, as it deprives graduate students of a solid academic and collegial research environment.

Recommendations

- Earmarked allocations to safeguard PhD programmes should be part of the financial planning of UGOT both centrally and at the faculty level. To expect the humanities to survive through external funding is not realistic; to expect them to thrive under such conditions is even less so.
- The faculty should consider working out a plan for enhancing the "employability" of PhDs in the humanities outside of the academy, and for mobility within it. Such plans might include courses in popular science writing, research administration etc, but they should not detract from the disciplinary substance of the PhD programme.
- The plans for a framework for shared faculty-level courses may be a viable solution to both the problem of small and unstructured PhD programmes at the departments, and to the problem of employability, if it is well devised. The faculty is encouraged to seek examples of similar attempts at comparable universities that seem to have accomplished their aims.

Section D – Academic Culture

D1. Academic culture

Recommendations

- The decision to terminate two of the three networks and centres initiated in 2015 (Medical Humanities and Environmental Humanities) in order to concentrate on the Centre for Digital

Humanities is not questioned; nonetheless, regret has been expressed at the departmental level that a great deal of time and effort was lost or made invisible in that process. The faculty should have a policy for securing the continuation of achieved competences and invested work, if a similar termination of other short-term initiatives should become necessary.

D2. Publication strategy

Recommendations

- The faculty takes a wise approach to publishing research insofar that it sees value in working in both English and Swedish, and in writing journal articles as well as monographs. Such a strategy is not only beneficial to the societal impact of the faculty, but also contributes to safeguarding the use of Swedish as an academic language and preventing domain loss. Yet at the department level, where the same approach is taken, one hears the opposite view, i.e. that the allocation system of the Faculty of Arts tends to reward publication in international journals, which makes it difficult to support the publication of books and articles in Swedish. This issue should be resolved, and the resolution should be clearly communicated and implemented at the faculty level. [See also A2]
- To some extent, the issue may be linked to the direct import of the "Norwegian list" for evaluating publications and their value and/or impact. The panel does not see why UGOT has not adapted the Norwegian list to support publication in Swedish. That foreign languages other than English are mentioned as important publication languages in the future is to be commended.
- The panel recommends that the faculty continue to reward publications both in international channels, and in national ones in Swedish. The Norwegian system should be fine-tuned to the needs of UGOT, in order to balance international and national publications, as well as to the various needs of the different disciplines. This could be done as a UGOT system that integrates the most relevant features of the Danish version of the Norwegian system and the European systems used elsewhere. In any event, the mechanisms should be made better known throughout the faculty.
- While several panellists think that bibliometrics primarily measure productivity, others stress that in many areas in medicine and the natural and social sciences, but increasingly even in certain humanist disciplines, Journal Impact Factor and citations are the relevant bibliometric indices; thus, while bibliometrics do quantify output, they do so in terms of evaluation rather than productivity. Nevertheless, the panel as a whole agrees that bibliometrics cannot measure quality as such in the humanities; in particular, research falling outside of the mainstream and its publication channels is disfavoured, which means that reliance on bibliometric measures can have a homogenising effect on the kind of research encouraged and produced.
- The faculty has taken an active part in the *Kriterium*-initiative, in which UGOT has played a leading role. *Kriterium* provides a structure for peer-review and open access for publications in both Swedish and English, and is seen by many as a model for how the humanities can take a proactive rather than merely reactive role in response to the challenges of digitalisation, bibliometrics, etc. But the faculty should also have a policy regarding open access in general, ideally one based on national or international alliances with other universities, especially given the new requirements of the research councils.

D3. Facilities and research infrastructure

Recommendations

- It is not clear to the panel (and apparently not even to some key staff members) where the policy for data management at the faculty is drawn up. This matter must be clarified. Perhaps a faculty-level infrastructure council should be formed.
- Even though the new master's programme in Digital Humanities at the Department of Literature, History of Ideas, and Religion is expected to build a bridge between the department and the Centre for Digital Humanities, we recommend that further efforts are made to integrate research at the department and the centre, where it is relevant, and thereby secure the continuation of the centre.

D4. Transverse perspectives

D4.1 Equal opportunities and gender equality

Recommendations

- In many humanist disciplines (literature, art history, gender studies) there is an increasing dominance of female students, indicating a risk of a substantial gender imbalance within the faculty over time in the recruitment of doctoral students and, eventually, faculty. Current approaches to gender equality might need to be reconsidered in light of new conditions in the not so distant future. We may also add that equal opportunity is not strictly a question of gender equality. It goes without saying that also other forms of discrimination and/or harassment, not mentioned in the RED19 form (against handicapped/disabled, non-native ethnic groups, sexual minorities, etc.), have to be taken into account and addressed.

D4.2 Internationalisation

Recommendations

- The allocation of SEK 500,000 per year to each department for bringing in international guest researchers is a good instrument, but perhaps a bit extravagant in the context of strained finances. The money could be used for other purposes – e.g. for supplementing PhD stipends or stipends for people wanting to spend concentrated time for research abroad (see above and C3.2).
- The climate issue must be considered, and the benefits of internationalisation should be weighed against the environmental consequences of increased long-haul travel.

Section E – Support

E1. Internal research support

The panel has not separately addressed this question.

E2. University-wide support

Recommendations

- The panel is pleased to note that the faculty is quite satisfied with the support it receives from the university-wide office for research applications to the European Research Council. This form of support could be used as a model for supplementary support at the faculty level for cross- or single-discipline applications to the Swedish Research Council (VR) and the Swedish Foundation for Humanities and Social Sciences (RJ), since such applications cannot be supported without in-depth knowledge of the humanities nor financed by the departments themselves.

Section F – Other Matters

F1. RED10 evaluation

It is not within the remit of the faculty to make decisions regarding the size of research groups. Thus, the faculty cannot and indeed should not take it upon itself to reduce the number of highly specialised, 'under-staffed' groups. Research groups should not be judged merely by the number of their members, but also by their ability to engage in fruitful collaboration with like-minded scholars abroad and at other Swedish universities.

Concluding Recommendations

We recapitulate below a number of the panel's main recommendations.

Recruitment: The faculty should have unambiguous guidelines for the departments regarding mid- or long-term (5-10 years) recruitment plans. The extent to which departments may recruit new members of staff without these appointments being anchored in such a plan must be discussed. Similarly, the faculty might consider to what extent it should be involved in the recruitment process at the

departmental level. The outcome of these considerations should be made explicit in a faculty strategy document, which ought also to include gender equality goals and plans. Of particular interest is a plan for the recruitment of promising early-career researchers, whether they are identified at UGOT itself or through applications in open calls. This will require routines for helping these researchers adjust and be integrated in the university. Such routines are best anchored in the faculty level.

The faculty needs a clear and consistent policy for the balance between personal promotions and open calls. The panel is in agreement in recommending that open calls be used significantly more than they are. At the same time, it should be kept in mind that it will be difficult to attract senior lecturers if the right to promotion is abolished without revising the formula for the allocation of research time. Should the system of personal promotion be restricted to favour open calls, the faculty should make sure to follow up on the risk of gender bias in the recruitment process, as men tend to be more successful than women in open calls.

Funding: The faculty might consider earmarking funding for successful individuals and groups for proposals on how to bring in other colleagues from the faculty whose areas of competence are germane. Another suggestion would be to earmark the extra funding for "master classes" for advanced level and PhD students in the research area in question, out of which new research initiatives could emerge. This would also contribute to strengthening the link between research and teaching. The faculty could also consider the possibility of co-funding mainly externally funded PhD students (since funding agencies are often unwilling to finance the year of course work), as a strategy to bring more PhD students into the system.

To the extent that money is reserved, whether at the level of the UGOT central administration or at the faculties, it is important that the use of these funds and the reasons for the investments made are transparent, i.e. that they are not perceived of as ad hoc, but understood as an organic part of an overall vision. It is thus crucial that the budget model be accessible and unambiguous to the staff. They need to know what is being prioritised and to what ends, where resources are going and when. Ensuring this understanding is key to the legitimacy of collegial bodies.

Outreach, societal impact and collaboration: UGOT's impressive tradition of public outreach has been strengthened by some of the strategic initiatives taken by the faculty, notably, the Centre for Critical Heritage Studies. While building local and national support for the continuation of this tradition in the humanities is important, such efforts must also figure in the workload of the employees. Outreach activities should be internally documented, made externally visible, and be rewarded. "Outreach" should be defined broadly. It is in the faculty's own interest to address, in an articulate, active and innovative way, the importance of "*samverkan*" and the value of the staff members' eminence in this area. The faculty is encouraged to find ways of accounting for the value of the work being done without relying solely on quantitative measures. A first step might be to gather a number of good examples of outreach that have brought attention to the faculty's research outside of UGOT. The panel suggest that the faculty take a closer look at the reward system in its entirety, and seek a faculty-wide system for crediting substantial contributions to public discourse and interchange over disciplines, professions and specialisations.

Research-Teaching linkages: the panel recommends that the model for the allocation of research time be revised so that senior lecturers have more than 10%. In addition, the faculty might consider how

they can ensure that teaching faculty have access to a period of research, such as a term of sabbatical. The faculty should work together with the departments to devise guidelines that are flexible enough to allow for variation between departments depending on "local" conditions, while sufficiently coherent so as to constitute some kind of transparent, predictable and effective strategy.

Doctoral programmes: Earmarked allocations to safeguard PhD programmes should be part of the financial planning of UGOT both centrally and at the faculty level. To expect the humanities to survive through external funding is not realistic; to expect them to thrive under such conditions is even less so.

The faculty should consider working out a plan for enhancing the "employability" of PhDs in the humanities outside of the academy, and for mobility within it. Such plans might include courses in popular science writing, research administration etc, but they should not detract from the disciplinary substance of the PhD programme.

Publication strategy: The panel recommends that the faculty continue to reward publications both in international channels and in national ones in Swedish. The Norwegian system should be fine-tuned to the needs of UGOT in order to balance international and national publications, as well as to the various needs of the different disciplines. This could be done as a UGOT system that integrates the most relevant features of the Danish version of the Norwegian system and the European systems used elsewhere. In any event, the mechanisms should be made better known throughout the faculty.