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Summary

The panel was struck by the considerable diversity of the institutional landscape in which research is carried out. It ranges from large universities, with large numbers of researchers and substantial time for research, to small teaching colleges with fractions of that time.

At the majority of institutions, researchers enjoyed good or excellent support for their research in terms of the time earmarked for research, financial support for research and research leave. PhD students are well funded. Indeed, such was the institutional level of support that there was little incentive for some researchers to seek external funding for individual projects.

At the same time, the panel was struck by the considerable variety in the levels of support. At some smaller institutions, members of staff had a mere 10% of their time earmarked for research. At some of the new universities, lecturers with a research orientation co-existed with teachers without a PhD or without research time.

The development of research projects and applications for external funding should be encouraged further in future, but this also means that institutions need to provide adequate support for such initiatives (and to the scholars leading them). Such support should extend to preparing publications in English or other foreign languages at an academic level. Some English-language publications the panel saw were written in poor or ungrammatical English.

Institutional recruitment and research development is highly uneven across Norway. Some institutions have PhD schools, while others do not. Some institutions have introduced systems whereby a successful PhD student is funded for a fourth year to assist career development and acquire some teaching skills. Other institutions have no schemes for progression or ongoing training of their research staff. This is a risk, because it leaves some institutions vulnerable to generational change, with successful research leaders leaving behind a vacuum when they retire. There is also variety in terms of the recruitment of international scholars.

In terms of publications, the areas of History, Archaeology and Cultural Studies reveal significant differences. In sum, historians produced a slightly higher than average number of publications, while archaeologists published slightly below the average. While History has the largest number of publications in both absolute and relative terms, only 16% of History publications are ranked at Level 2. In contrast, the corresponding figures for Archaeology and Cultural Studies are 23% and 21%, respectively. The average for Humanities is 23%. Similarly, in terms of journal articles, only 38% of publications listed for History appeared in academic journals, compared to 61% in Archaeology and 21% in Cultural Studies. The average in all the Humanities is 23%. Historians disproportionately publish book chapters: 56% of all History publications are book chapters, compared to 37% in Archaeology and 41% in Cultural Studies, with a national average in the Humanities of 47%. Contrary to the popular idea that historians mainly publish books, only 7% of History publications were monographs, while for the Humanities in general, the figure is 5%.

Cultural Studies and Archaeology show a fairly healthy gender balance – 54% and 42% of publication points are generated by women. In History, however, the female proportion of publication points is a mere 24%, which should give cause for concern. The average in the Humanities as a whole is 36%. It should be noted here that women make up 43% of all researchers within Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies.

To summarise the analysis of the NIFU publication data, at their very best, a few Norwegian researchers succeed in placing their publications in top journals or with leading international
publishers. However, this is a small minority, and the absence of publications in leading peer-reviewed journals or with eminent publishers suggests that there is room for improvement in terms of the international quality, visibility and impact of publications by researchers at Norwegian institutions. The bulk of publications appear in Norwegian outlets or in channels that do not reach publication Level 2. The majority of researchers who publish actively should be encouraged to be more selective and strategic, and to direct their energy towards publishing fewer pieces in better places. It should also be noted that one in four researchers currently do not publish at all.

**History**

The panel was impressed by the range and quality of research undertaken in many institutions. At its best, historical research in Norway is of international quality. The panel especially noted lively and productive research on the history of childhood, migration and material resources. Political history more generally seemed to be less popular and more marginal.

The panel felt that it would be wrong to see research groups and individual research as mutually exclusive models. Both deserve support. High-quality research is carried out by individuals as well as by groups. At the same time, a completely laissez-faire approach to research that leaves everything to the individual is not a tool for strategic development. Research group or no research group, research in the Humanities needs to be clear about emerging questions and methods that it feels should be cultivated. There was a lack of strategic focus in several institutions.

The panel’s diagnosis is that many institutions were trying to do too much, pursuing too many particular topics, instead of prioritising and focusing on a smaller but better defined group of subjects. This is particularly important for institutions with limited resources. Institutions should be encouraged to be more selective. Research groups are one way of developing priority themes and generating added value.

Where institutions had established thematic priorities, these often tended to have a regional focus. This is a merit, and a good and interesting way for institutions to exploit their own regional strengths, and it should be continued.

On other occasions, however, the panel felt that the regional interests came with a more inward-looking methodological and historiographical outlook. The panel thought more could and should be done to tease out findings and implications of a general nature and to explain their significance for historians working on related topics outside Norway. Doing so should involve publishing more research in international journals. And it should involve more comparative and transnational work. This would enable scholars to tie their research more closely to international debates, and indeed help shape these debates.

In some institutions, History units feel threatened or peripheral. The abolition of departments in some of the mergers has led to added problems. Elsewhere, the promotion of interdisciplinary work has led to questions about the future purpose of History. University administrators and historians should discuss the future role of historical research and the contribution it can make to the understanding of past and present developments. As noted above, greater attention to comparative and transnational phenomena and methods is one way of doing so.

**Archaeology**

The panel received submissions from both university departments and museums. It saw clear evidence of excellent research being carried out in both, notwithstanding their different size,
organisation and mission. The panel was impressed by the creative synergies between some museums and universities, including in their impact case studies.

The focus of research was predominantly on Norwegian Archaeology and less on comparative or outward-looking projects. The panel felt that some of the regionally oriented research was selling itself short. In their publications, it was mainly senior scholars who managed to create links to international research. The best research took place as part of international networks, but such international collaboration was less visible in the publications submitted, with a few exceptions such as the Homo Sapiens group.

The panel was impressed by the strength of several research groups managed by highly talented individuals. In terms of methodological innovation, however, the panel also felt that more could be done to tease out and communicate the relevance of research currently being done in Norway to the discipline as a whole.

Archaeology is currently well resourced and researchers benefit from good or excellent conditions. At the same time, the panel sees major potential challenges to that research infrastructure lying ahead. In light of new technology and costs, existing research infrastructure will need to be renewed. Technology is becoming more expensive. Comparatively speaking, Norway has a high ratio of basic funding in relation to external funding. To remain at an international level of research, Archaeology will need additional investment in laboratories and research infrastructure. The panel believes that this is not a challenge that institutions can tackle individually. It requires a national plan and coordination.

Early-career researchers benefit from a shared Scandinavian PhD training system. The panel saw very good evidence of research training, exchanges and mobility in the university sector. A lot of very good or excellent research is carried out by museum staff, however. These researchers also have a need for life-long training and research development, including support for writing applications for external funding.

Cultural studies
The panel received some submissions under this category but did not see a lot of the work that is currently being carried out in the field of Cultural Studies (e.g. memory, identity, cultural theory, ethnology and cultural politics). Research within the fields of Museology and Cultural History are strong at the major institutions.

Some of the work submitted was excellent, but it was not extensive or representative enough to enable the panel to offer observations on the state of Cultural Studies in Norway.
1 On the evaluation

One of the duties of the Research Council of Norway is to conduct field evaluations of Norwegian research, that is, evaluations of how entire fields or disciplines are performing in Norway. These have two purposes: to provide an international view and feedback on performance, and to support the development of research policy. By tradition, the evaluated field has been given an opportunity to form a committee to decide how to learn from and change practices based on the evaluation. In many cases, the RCN has then provided some funding to help implement measures proposed by the committee.

The practice of field evaluation is long established in Norway. In the past, such evaluations have confined themselves to one or a small number of individual disciplines, such as Philosophy and the History of Ideas, Law or History. In 2011, the RCN published a wider evaluation of Biology, Medicine and Healthcare. In 2015, it published an evaluation of the fundamental Engineering Sciences. In 2016 it launched this evaluation of the Humanities as a whole and it has more recently started a similar evaluation of the Social Sciences. This evaluation of the Humanities could potentially spearhead a new and even broader field evaluation practice.

1.1 Terms of Reference

The task of this evaluation is to

- Review the scientific quality of Norwegian research in the Humanities in an international context
- Provide a critical review of the strengths and weaknesses of the fields of research within the humanities – nationally, at the institutional level and for a number of designated research groups
- Identify the research groups that have achieved a high international level in their research, or that have the potential to achieve such a level
- Investigate the extent of interdisciplinary research at the institutions and in the research groups
- Review the role of the Research Council of Norway in funding research activities in the humanities
- Investigate the connection between research and teaching activities
- Discuss the organisation of research activities and the role of the Humanities in the strategic plans of the evaluated institutions
- Assess the extent to which previous evaluations have been used by the institutions in their strategic planning
- Identify areas of research that need to be strengthened in order to ensure that Norway possesses the necessary competence in areas of national importance in future
- Discuss the societal impact of Humanities research in Norway in general and, in particular, its potential to address targeted societal challenges as defined in the Norwegian Government’s Long-term Plan for Research and Higher education, and the EU framework programme Horizon 2020

The government’s Long-term Plan for Research (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2014) prioritises the following areas
• The sea
• Climate, the environment and environmentally friendly energy
• Renewal of the public sector and more efficient welfare and health services
• Enabling technologies
• An innovative and flexible business sector, able to restructure as needed
• World-leading research groups

These priorities co-exist with a longer-term set of reforms aimed at increasing the quality of Norwegian research.

A recent analysis of the quality of Norwegian research as indicated by bibliometric evidence suggests that there are two dimensions to the need to improve quality (Benner, 2015). The average level of quality (measured by the field-normalised citation rate of Norwegian research as a whole) has risen to match that of Sweden, placing it among the stronger countries worldwide. However, Norway lacks research groups that publish in the most-cited 10% and 1% of articles worldwide. The Humanities are poorly served by bibliometric indicators, so Benner’s analysis may be less applicable to the Humanities than to other fields, although it appears consistent with the judgements of the panel conducting this evaluation. Nonetheless, Norwegian research policy is likely to place increasing emphasis on the need not only further to raise the average quality, but also to develop and sustain some world-leading groups (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2014) (Hatlem, Melby, & Arnold, 2017). The focus on quality in this evaluation therefore responds to an important policy need.

At the same time, in Norway – as in other countries – there is also increasing pressure for research to be able to demonstrate its societal value. Both aspects are tackled in this evaluation.

1.2 The evaluation panels

The evaluation has been carried out by eight field panels comprising international peers, each of which evaluated one or more disciplines. The composition of the panels is shown in Appendix D. Their reports are published in separate volumes.

Panel 1 Aesthetic Studies
Panel 2 Nordic Languages and Linguistics
Panel 3 Nordic and Comparative Literature
Panel 4 Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures and Area Studies
Panel 5 Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies
Panel 6 Philosophy and Studies in Science and Technology
Panel 7 Religion and Theology
Panel 8 Media Studies

Table 1 shows which panels cover which disciplines.

The chairs of the panels have formed an overall evaluation panel – referred to in the Terms of Reference as the principal committee – which is responsible for reporting on the Humanities as a whole.

The tasks of the field panels specified in the terms of reference were to

• Evaluate research activities with respect to scientific quality, and national and international collaboration. Focus on research published in peer-reviewed publications
- Evaluate the relevance and impact of the evaluated research activities
- Evaluate how research activities are organised and managed
- Submit a report with specific recommendations for the future development of research within the subject fields encompassed by the panel, including means of improvement when necessary

Table 1 Overview of the field and panel structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Panel name</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aesthetic Studies</td>
<td>Dance, Art History, Musicology, Theatre and Drama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nordic Languages and Linguistics</td>
<td>Linguistics, Nordic Language, Norwegian as a Second Language, Sámi and Finnish, Sign Language and Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nordic and Comparative Literature</td>
<td>Literature, Nordic Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Modern and Classical Languages, Literatures and Area Studies</td>
<td>Asian and African Studies, English Studies, Classical Studies, Romance Studies, Slavonic Studies, Germanic Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1.3 Methods and Limitations

1.3.1 Organisation of the evaluation

The evaluation addressed four different levels (Figure 1). At the highest level, this report evaluates the field of Humanities in Norway as a whole. To do so, it synthesises and analyses the reports of the eight discipline panels.

The division of the field of Humanities into panels was based on the established organisational structure of national academic councils (Nasjonale fagråd). There are 24 such academic councils, reflecting the historical development of research areas and teaching subjects within the Humanities in Norway. To avoid a very fragmented panel structure, the research areas of the academic councils were grouped into eight panels based on disciplinary similarities. For the purpose of this evaluation, the area of research and study covered by a specific academic council is referred to as a ‘research area’.

The panels were asked to evaluate both research areas and research groups based on the following information.

- Each participating institution was asked to provide a list of its staff working within the Humanities and to indicate the most relevant research area for each staff member. The institutions also provided a self-assessment for each of the relevant panels, with a description of their research activities and results within each research area, as well as about the interplay of research and teaching and other societal impact.

- To support the panels’ assessment of research areas, the RCN has provided a bibliometric analysis of all publications by listed researchers for each panel.

- The organisations were also invited to put individual research groups forward for evaluation within each area. The field panels evaluated them individually and also used these research group evaluations to support their area evaluations.

Note 1: Researchers in History of Ideas were in most cases submitted to Panel 5

Note 2: The national academic council for Gender research is not included as RCN is planning a separate evaluation of Gender research in Norway.
The universities and institutes have themselves decided which parts of their organisation to submit to the evaluation. The coverage of the evaluation is therefore not complete, but is likely to encompass the most significant research-active entities across the Humanities in Norway. Areas do not necessarily map directly onto organisational structures. For consistency, this evaluation refers to these submitted entities as ‘areas’.

**Figure 1 Structure of the Evaluation**

1.3.2 The data available to the panels

The data available to the panels were

- **Self-assessment reports** provided by the research-performing organisations. (The template for these is reproduced in *Feil! Fant ikke referansekilden*). There is one for each area. A self-assessment report comprises a report firstly at the level of the organisation (most often at the faculty or research institute level), and, secondly, information about an area. The organisation-level information is repeated across multiple self-assessments. So, for example, UiO’s self-assessment for the Aesthetics field will comprise an initial section about the University of Oslo as a whole and a second part about the work of UiO in aesthetic disciplines.

- A **bibliometric report** from NIFU (Aksnes & Gunnes, 2016) that provides field indicators at the national, organisational and area level

- **Funding data** from the RCN

- Examples of **scholarly outputs** from areas and groups submitted by the research-performing organisations
• **Societal impact statements** from individual areas. These have been inspired by the use of impact statements in the UK Research Excellence Framework. They are free-text accounts from the researchers of societal impacts they believe research in their area has had over a period of up to fifteen years

• **Survey data from NOKUT** about student views on teaching

*Building from the bottom*

• The assessments of individual scholarly outputs fed into the group and area evaluations
• The group evaluations fed into the area evaluations
• The report on personnel and publications (bibliometrics) was considered at the area level
• Impact statements were considered at the area level
• The area evaluations were used by the field panels to build a picture of national performance within the field covered by the panel reports
• The field evaluations are used by the main panel to construct the national HUMEVAL evaluation

Panellists met representatives of the areas evaluated in a series of one to two-hour interviews, in which they were able to check their understanding of the data submitted for evaluation.

1.3.3 **Criteria used during the evaluations**

The panels based their work on a consistent set of criteria, against which they reported their findings at the area level. These were

• Organisation, leadership and strategy
• Availability and use of resources
• Research production and quality
• Recruitment and training
• Networking with other researchers, nationally and internationally
• Impact on teaching
• Societal impact
• Overall assessment and feedback

Research group reports consider

• Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
• Research production and quality
• Recruitment and training
• Networking with other researchers, nationally and internationally
• Impact on teaching
• Overall assessment and feedback

Impact was judged in terms of the reach and significance of the impact reported.

• Reach: The extent and/or diversity of the organisations, communities and/or individuals who have benefited from the impact.
• Significance: The degree to which the impact enriched, influenced, informed or changed the policies, practices, understanding or awareness of organisations, communities or individuals.

In each case, the panels wrote full-text evaluations, which are reported in a separate volume for each panel. They also awarded scores using a series of 5-point Likert scales. These were used internally in
order to gain an overview of the many parts of the evaluation. Only the grades for research groups’ overall performance and research quality have been published (in accordance with the Terms of Reference).

1.3.4 Limitations
An exercise such as this inevitably suffers from limitations. This section briefly describes the main limitations of which the panels are aware.

Humanities in Norway does not have a strongly developed evaluation culture. There have been a number of field evaluations with a narrower scope than the present one in recent years, but Norwegian Humanities researchers are not often subject to evaluation unless they are working in an externally-funded centre of excellence. Humanities are also generally less exposed to the need for external, competitive funding from sources such as the RCN, reducing the extent to which scholars need to subject themselves to external assessment, compared with scholars in many other fields. As a result, at least parts of the community have limited experience of how to deal with an evaluation and how to communicate with the evaluators in ways that will enable positive judgements. This is particularly the case in relation to the use of impact statements, which is a novel technique everywhere. Clearly, those with a more developed evaluation culture will be better placed than others to receive a positive evaluation.

The panels worked on the basis of a limited set of data and information. The sources used were mainly

- The self-assessments of the institutions and research groups
- The (small number of) publications submitted by the institutions
- The personnel and publication analysis
- A report on the interplay of research and teaching in the Humanities
- A report on research organisation and external engagement in the Humanities
- Interviews with representatives of the institutions, and national data on publication performance and student satisfaction

The panels could not check the information provided by the institutions against information found elsewhere. Further, institutions and groups did not always specify what they saw as their contributions to knowledge in various fields, so that the panels have had to make their own decisions about the disciplines and areas to which individual research activities are relevant.

The request for self-evaluation data was not uniformly understood by the institutions, suggesting that, in future, equivalent requests could be made more explicit. The number of sample publications requested was low and the processes used to select them are not clear to the panels. Whatever process the universities used, it involves a positive bias. This is a normal feature of such evaluations and the panels regard it as unproblematic: injecting a positive bias means that it is known what sort of bias there is. However, the representativity of the publications submitted is unclear. The fact that some groups submitted publications that were not peer-reviewed was a further complication.

Universities followed different strategies in responding to the request. For example, the number of research groups submitted varied considerably. Some of the groups appeared to have been constructed artificially for the purpose of the evaluation. Others appeared to be groups of people who normally worked together. This variability makes comparisons difficult. The focus on groups also complicates the identification of individual, outstanding talent. It also does not always reflect
the way in which Humanities researchers work, since individual scholarship as opposed to group work is more normal than in the social and ‘hard’ sciences. There is significant variation among disciplines and panels in their perception of the appropriateness of using research groups as units of assessment. So the divide is as much within the Humanities as between the Humanities and the hard sciences. However, it should also be noted that most of the universities have policies in place to support research groups.

Both NOKUT and NIFU provided data to support the evaluation, based on existing statistical and disciplinary categories. As a result, they do not always match the scope of the areas or groups evaluated by the panels, so that, while they provided useful, broad indications, the panels had to treat them with some caution. NIFU’s bibliometric analyses were very helpful. However, the particular weaknesses of bibliometric approaches to the Humanities, a field in which a great deal is published outside the channels normally used for bibliometric analysis, mean that bibliometric indicators present a picture that is even more partial in the Humanities than in other fields.

Participation in the RCN’s field evaluations is optional and there are no incentives (such as an effect on funding) for participation, so that their coverage is inevitably partial. The panels are aware that some significant groups are missing from this evaluation, so that the evaluation does not cover the entire field.

It is important to note that the traditional universities in Norway, on the one hand, and the new universities and the university colleges, on the other, have different amounts of institutional research funding. In principle, in the old universities, academics have sufficient funds to split their time equally between teaching and research. At the newer universities and university colleges, the institutional funding covers a much smaller percentage of research time, typically of the order of 20%, though there is wide variation among individual institutions. Only the Norwegian Academy of Music is under 10% (7%), whereas the others are typically between 15 and 30%. Some – but not all – of these institutions actively manage research time, allocating more to some and less to others. These very different funding conditions mean that expectations of research productivity per person should not be the same for the old and the new institutions.

Disciplines and fields differ in terms of what they regard as knowledge or quality and the extent to which they make ‘progress’, so that knowledge is cumulative rather than comprising many parallel forms of knowledge. A uniform understanding of these dimensions across the whole of the Humanities would therefore not be appropriate; they must be judged within their own disciplinary contexts. The panel approach of using peers in relevant fields to make judgements addresses this issue. While this inconsistency might be regarded as a weakness, the panels regard it as a strength, because discipline-relevant criteria are used in each case in order to compare performance with an international benchmark.

These limitations mean that this evaluation is to some degree an exercise in hermeneutics and collegial advice, rather than in exact measurements and objective results. The panels based their work on an attitude of solidarity with the colleagues and institutions under review. In cases of doubt about information, a charitable interpretation of the data was chosen. The panel also tried to formulate critical feedback in as constructive a way as possible.
1.4 Those evaluated

The evaluation covered Humanities research at 36 research-performing organisations. Nineteen of these institutions participated in the panel for Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies.

Table 2 Research-performing organisations participating in panel 5 - Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University faculties</th>
<th>No of Researchers</th>
<th>No of Research Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nordland University</td>
<td>Nordland University</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>NTNU Faculty of Humanities</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Bergen</td>
<td>UiB Faculty of Humanities</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oslo</td>
<td>UiO Faculty of Humanities</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Stavanger</td>
<td>UiS Faculty of Arts and Education</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arctic University of Norway (UiT)</td>
<td>UiT Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Agder</td>
<td>University of Agder</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University museums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University faculties</th>
<th>No of Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>NTNU University Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Bergen</td>
<td>UiB University Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oslo</td>
<td>UiO Museum of Cultural History (KHM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Stavanger</td>
<td>UiS Museum of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Arctic University of Norway (UiT)</td>
<td>UiT Tromsø University Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other HE-institutions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI Norwegian Business School</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian School of Economics</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemark University College</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volda University College</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Research institutes</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni Research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Assessment at the national level

This panel has reviewed information about the research areas of History, Archaeology and Cultural Studies with considerable interest. Before commenting on each of these research areas at the national level, the panel would like to note a few general matters that apply to all of them and that should be borne in mind when reading the remarks below.

The panel was struck by the considerable diversity of the institutional landscape in which research is carried out. It ranges from large universities, with large numbers of researchers and substantial time for research, to small teaching colleges with fractions of that time. In addition, the panel assessed research carried out by museums, which are institutions that have an altogether different remit and identity than research universities in the classic sense. In brief, the panel saw different genres of research that reflected their different institutional contexts as well as different standards of quality.

Unfortunately, the panel found it impossible to give an assessment of each research area for each institution. The data, publications and self-assessment provided formed the basis for assessing each institution, but information in each category was not necessarily defined or separated by research area. Many institutions and their research groups were explicitly interdisciplinary in nature, making it inadvisable to disentangle particular research areas. Furthermore, some bodies conducting historical research, such as the Centre for Studies of Holocaust and Religious Minorities or the Centre for Technology, Innovation and Culture (TIK), both in Oslo, did not appear in the submissions made to this panel. The following general observations cannot therefore claim to provide a comprehensive or rounded picture of the state of each particular research area. They only concern the trends that were apparent to the panel from the documentation of research areas provided.

2.1 General observations

The three research areas examined by Panel 5 (History, Archaeology and Cultural Studies) exhibited certain shared structural features as regards research support, research development and recruitment. To avoid repetition, these are described here in a general section.

At the majority of institutions, researchers enjoyed good or excellent support for their research in terms of the time earmarked for research, financial support for research and research leave. PhD students are well funded. Indeed, such was the institutional level of support that there was little incentive for some researchers to seek external funding for individual projects. For most researchers, it was relatively easy to fund trips to international conferences.

At the same time, the panel was struck by the considerable variety in the levels of support. At some smaller institutions, members of staff had a mere 10% of their time earmarked for research. At some of the new universities, lecturers with a research orientation co-existed with teachers without a PhD or without research time.

Some institutions have excellent support for external research funding and applications, with administrative support, seed money, and extra leave and resources being provided for promising top scholars. Other institutions have high hopes of external funding but fail to appreciate the time and work that goes into substantial research applications. The development of research projects and

---

1 The Holocaust Centre does not report its research production to CRIStin. The TIK centre was invited to take part in the evaluation but decided not to participate.
applications for external funding should be encouraged further in future, but this also means that institutions need to provide adequate support for such initiatives (and the scholars leading them). Support should extend to preparing publications in English or other foreign languages at an academic level. Some English-language publications the panel saw were written in poor or ungrammatical English.

Institutional recruitment and research development is highly uneven across Norway. Some institutions have PhD schools, while others do not. Some institutions have introduced systems whereby a successful PhD student is funded for a fourth year to assist career development and acquire some teaching skills. Other institutions have no schemes for progression or ongoing training of their research staff. This is a risk, because it leaves some institutions vulnerable to generational change, with successful research leaders leaving behind a vacuum when they retire. There is also variety in terms of the recruitment of international scholars.

In addition to the above observations, which concern all three of the designated research areas (History, Archaeology and Cultural Studies), the panel would also like to add some views that are more specific to each of the three.

In terms of publications, the areas of History, Archaeology and Cultural Studies reveal significant differences. Publication data are available for a total of 537 researchers in these fields in Norway and outputs published between 2011 and 2015. In History, 258 people were responsible for 1,123 publications during these five years – 55% of all publications. In Archaeology, 204 people were listed by institutions with 602 publications (29% of the overall total). In Cultural Studies, 75 people were included (14% of the total number of researchers included in the three areas). They had 329 publications (16% of the total). In sum, historians produced a slightly higher than average number of publications, while Archaeology published slightly below the average. The changing rate of publications in the course of these five years reveals an interesting trend. Historians almost doubled their number of publications from 150 outputs in 2011 to 276 in 2015. Archaeology also increased its number of publications from 95 in 2011 to 149 in 2015. Cultural Studies, meanwhile, only showed a small increase, from 62 publications in 2011 to 65 in 2015.

In the case of such quantitative data, however, it is important to be aware of the considerable spectrum and differences as regards the quality of publications. An analysis of publication points – awarded to researchers who publish at Level 2, in journals, and in English – provides a snapshot of these considerable differences. While History has the largest number of publications in both absolute and relative terms, only 16% of History publications are ranked at Level 2. In contrast, the corresponding figures for Archaeology and Cultural Studies are 23% and 21%, respectively. The average for Humanities is 23%. Similarly, in terms of journal articles, only 38% of publications listed for History appeared in academic journals, compared to 61% in Archaeology and 21% in Cultural Studies. The average in all the Humanities is 23%. Historians disproportionately publish book chapters: 56% of all History publications are book chapters, compared to 37% in Archaeology and 41% in Cultural Studies, with a national average in the Humanities of 47%. Contrary to the popular idea that historians mainly publish books, only 7% of History publications were monographs, while for the Humanities in general, the figure is 5%.

Publication points are heavily clustered around the four biggest universities – UiO, UiB, UiT and NTNU. Almost half of all publication points for Archaeology and Cultural Studies in Norway come from the University of Oslo – 43% and 48%, respectively. In History, Oslo contributes 25% of all publication points, NTNU 16%, UiB 13% and UiT 11%. In contrast, the rest of the higher education sector only accounts for 28% of publication points.
Levels of active publication are highly uneven across the country and within institutions, including the largest research universities. While the above analysis might suggest a disproportionately high level of publication activity at the big universities, this would be a misleading conclusion. The high volume of publication at the big universities is a result of very large numbers of research staff, and not necessarily of a consistently high level of productivity or quality. At UiO’s Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History, for example, 25% of publications are at Level 2 and 59% are publications in English. Yet, one third of the staff in this department have zero publication points; in the neighbouring department of Cultural Studies the figure is 31%. In the Humanities as a whole, 28% of staff have no publication points. At UiT, in the Department of Archaeology, 54% of publications are at Level 2 and 91% in English, but 36% of staff have zero publication points. At UiB, in the Faculty of Humanities, 14% are at publication Level 2 and 49% of publications are in English, but a quarter have no publication points. This stands in contrast to some smaller institutions and also more specialised units. The five historians based at the Department of Economics at the Norwegian School of Economics, for example, all have publication points – with 31% of publications at Level 2 and 88% in English. At the University of Agder, all members of staff have publication points, but, here, much is published at a lower level (5% at Level 2) and less in English (only 22% in English).

In History, Archaeology and Cultural Studies in Norway as a whole, 19% of publications are at Level 2. To put it differently, four out of five publications in Norway in these areas fall below Level 2. The institutions with the highest proportion of publications at Level 2 are:

- The Department of Archaeology at UiT: 54%
- The University Museum at UiB: 38%
- UiT Tromsø University Museum: 32%.

As this suggests, excellent publications are produced by researchers in several of the museums in Norway as well as by researchers in university departments.

The lowest performing institutions with regard to Level 2 publications are:

- Nord-Trøndelag University College: 0%
- Nordland University, Faculty of Social Sciences: 3%
- University of Agder, Faculty of Humanities: 5%

In Norway as a whole, half the publications in Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies are in English, while another 4% are published in other languages. Just under half the publications appear in journals (47%). A small minority of articles appear in open-access journals – 15% in Cultural Studies, but only 4% in History and 2% in Archaeology. Most publications remain single-authored (13% of the publications in both History and Cultural Studies have international co-authors), with the partial exception of Archaeology (29% international co-authorship). Cultural Studies and Archaeology show a fairly healthy gender balance – 54% and 42% of publication points are generated by women. In History, however, the female proportion of publication points is a mere 24%, which should give cause for concern. The average in the Humanities as a whole is 36%. It should be noted here that women make up 43% of all researchers within Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies.

A few of the researchers publish in leading international English-language journals. Of the top 10-ranked History journals according to impact factor (Journal Citation Reports: JCR Impact Factor), only one is represented: the Journal of Global History, with four articles. Outside that top group, there are two publications in History & Theory, one in The Historical Journal and another in Historische
Zeitschrift. This shows that the very best Norwegian researchers are successful in participating in publications at the highest level and disseminating their work through journals with the greatest impact. Nonetheless, it is equally striking that there is a complete absence of any publications by researchers in the areas covered by this panel in the five years of 2011–15 in any of the highly rated and influential peer-reviewed journals, such as American Historical Review, Cliometrica, Comparative Studies in Society and History; Environmental History, Journal of Modern History, and Past & Present, to name just a few. A small qualification is in order here – a small number of researchers in neighbouring disciplines (Media Studies/Panel 8 and Area Studies/Panel 4) had a few publications in leading History journals – two in Nations and Nationalism and one in Memory Studies. It is fair to conclude, however, that the vast majority of journal publications are currently either in Norwegian journals or English-language journals with a more specific and limited agenda and remit.

The majority of books and book chapters in History, Archaeology and Cultural Studies are published with Norwegian publishers, led by Pax Forlag with 104 publications. The first English-language publisher is Routledge, at number eight with 37 publications. Sixteen publications are with the more reputable Oxford University Press and eight with Cambridge University Press. MIT Press, the University of Michigan Press and University of Pennsylvania State Press each have one publication. What is noteworthy is the absence of the top tier of American presses: Yale UP, Harvard UP, Princeton UP and Chicago UP.

To summarise the analysis of the NIFU publication data, at their very best, a few Norwegian researchers succeed in placing their publications in top journals or with leading international publishers. However, this is a small minority, and the absence of publications in leading peer-reviewed journals or with eminent publishers suggests that there is room for improvement in terms of the international quality, visibility and impact of publications by researchers at Norwegian institutions. The bulk of publications appear in Norwegian outlets or in channels that do not reach publication Level 2. The majority of researchers who publish actively should be encouraged to be more selective and strategic, and to direct their energy towards publishing fewer pieces in better places. It should also be noted that one in four researchers currently do not publish at all. It is not possible to establish from the NIFU data why this considerable degree of inactivity exists. Since the publications submitted by institutions and research areas are self-selected and only showcase researchers who actively publish, the qualitative analysis of the information that follows in this report is also unable to offer a diagnosis. Still, institutions and departments should be encouraged to examine the situation and review their strategies with a view to creating an environment that leads to more active and high-level publishing among its researchers.

2.2 History

The panel was impressed by the range and quality of research undertaken in many institutions. At its best, historical research in Norway is of international quality. The panel especially noted lively and productive research on the history of childhood, migration and material resources. Political History more generally seemed to be less popular and more marginal.

Several institutions had developed research groups with an evolving research agenda or methodology that carve out new areas of research and train younger scholars in the process. In other institutions, especially those without departmental structures, research groups function more as a series of seminars, giving historians a chance to meet and exchange ideas on a wide range of topics. In a third group, institutions were highly sceptical about an orientation towards research groups,
stressing how their scholars had developed their own individual international networks. The panel felt that it would be wrong to see research groups and individual research as mutually exclusive models. Both deserve support. High-quality research is carried out by individuals as well as by groups. At the same time, a completely laissez-faire approach to research that leaves everything to the individual is not a tool for strategic development. Research group or no research group, research in the Humanities needs to be clear about emerging questions and methods that it feels should be cultivated. There was a lack of strategic focus in several institutions.

The panel’s diagnosis is that many institutions were trying to do too much, pursuing too many particular topics, instead of prioritising and focusing on a smaller but better defined group of subjects. This is particularly important to institutions with limited resources. Institutions should be encouraged to be more selective. Research groups are one way of developing priority themes and generating added value.

Where institutions had established thematic priorities, these often tended to have a regional focus. This is a merit, and a good and interesting way for institutions to exploit their own regional strengths, and it should be continued. At its very best, research concerned regional matters that contained or affected larger themes. Work on the Arctic, for example, speaks to global questions of conflict and coordination (if framed appropriately). On other occasions, however, the panel felt that the regional interests came with a more inward-looking methodological and historiographical outlook. This is unfortunate, the panel concluded, because it means that potentially interesting findings on topics where researchers had developed rare regional expertise did not find their way into international scholarly exchange. Put simply, because a topic of research concerns Norway, that does not mean it might not contain insights of a broader methodological or conceptual nature that could also be of interest to scholars working on related topics in entirely different countries and regions. The panel thought more could and should be done to tease out findings and implications of a general nature and to explain their significance for the historical field at large. Doing so should involve publishing more research in international journals. And it should involve more comparative and transnational work. This would enable scholars to tie their research more closely to international debates. In brief, the panel felt that some of the regionally oriented research was selling itself short.

In some institutions, History units feel threatened or peripheral. The abolition of departments in some of the mergers has led to added problems. Elsewhere, the promotion of interdisciplinary work has led to questions about the future purpose of History. University administrators and historians should discuss the future role of historical research and the contribution it can make to the understanding of past and present developments. As noted above, greater attention to comparative and transnational phenomena and methods is one way of doing so.

### 2.3 Archaeology

The panel received submissions from both university departments and museums. It saw clear evidence of excellent research being carried out in both, notwithstanding their different size, organisation and mission. The panel was impressed by the creative synergies between some museums and universities, including in their impact case studies.

The focus of research was predominantly on Norwegian Archaeology and less on comparative or outward-looking projects. The panel felt that some of the regionally oriented research was selling itself short. In their publications, it was mainly senior scholars who managed to create links to international research. The best research took place as part of international networks, but such
international collaboration was less visible in the publications submitted, with a few exceptions such as the Homo Sapiens group.

The panel was impressed by the strength of several research groups managed by highly talented individuals. In terms of methodological innovation, however, the panel also felt that more could be done to tease out and communicate the relevance of research currently being done in Norway to the discipline as a whole.

Archaeology is currently well resourced and researchers benefit from good or excellent conditions. At the same time, the panel sees major potential challenges to that research infrastructure lying ahead. In light of new technology and costs, existing research infrastructure will need to be renewed. Technology is becoming more expensive. Comparatively speaking, Norway has a high ratio of basic funding in relation to external funding. To remain at an international level of research, Archaeology will need to see investment in laboratories and research infrastructure. The panel believes that this is not a challenge that institutions can tackle individually. It requires a national plan and coordination.

Early-career researchers benefit from a shared Scandinavian PhD training system. The panel saw very good evidence of research training, exchanges and mobility in the university sector. A lot of very good or excellent research is carried out by museum staff, however. These researchers also have a need for life-long training and research development, including support for writing applications for external funding.

2.4 Cultural studies

The panel received some submissions under this category but did not see a lot of work currently being carried out in the field of Cultural Studies (e.g. memory, identity, cultural theory, ethnology and cultural politics). Research within the fields of Museology and Cultural History are strong at the major institutions. The panel also identified work of an excellent international standard in some distinctively interdisciplinary research groups, for example the History of Knowledge group at UiO, but it did not find much reason to evaluate this work as part of the field of Cultural Studies research. Some of the work submitted was excellent, but it was not extensive or representative enough to enable the panel to offer observations on the state of Cultural Studies in Norway. In this evaluation, the panel has only been able to assess the submissions and publications that were self-selected by institutions and submitted to this panel under the category of Cultural Studies. Assessments of the publications and data submitted are featured under specific institutions and research groups.
3 Assessment of institutions

3.1 Nordland University (UiN)

Nord University (UiN) was formed in January 2016 when the University of Nordland merged with the two University Colleges in Nord-Trondelag and Nesna. The Faculty of Social Sciences (FSV) is one of seven faculties, and consists of ten different research groups. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of FSV decreased from NOK 5.1 million (2013) to NOK 3.6 million (2015). The share of external funding of the total expenditure also decreased from 59% to 28% in the same period. Public Norwegian sources are the most important sources of external funding, followed by funding from the RCN. Some funding from private Norwegian sources is also documented.

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, eleven researchers were listed for HUMEVAL in one research group (History). The following data were submitted by the institution: one impact case study but no research area publications. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy

History is a research group within the Faculty of Social Sciences, which is one of seven faculties at Nord University. This is the result of restructuring in 2016. There is a clear description of the leadership structure, including the allocation of tasks and decision-making, although no indication is given of the structures through which this is coordinated. The SWOT analysis indicates a concern with ‘ownership’ of the administration. The research group for History concentrates on urban history, fisheries, and regional history, as well as the Sámi people. While the first two fields lack a clear focus, the latter two areas are more specific. Given the limited number of staff, the institution should be encouraged to focus on the history of fisheries, coastal areas and the Sámi, not least because dissemination strategies concentrate on these fields of regional history, as the impact case study demonstrates.

Resources

The university library is the only main research infrastructure for the research group. The library has nine branches on the different campuses, where the library in Bodø is the closest to the researchers in this field. It offers access to relevant literature and extensive databases within the field of research.

Expenditure on R&D fell significantly from 2013 to 2015. Core funding from the government has increased, but external funding has decreased. The number of senior researchers is inadequate for an ambitious programme, although research leave is provided for.

Research production and quality

Between 2011 and 2015, the 11 researchers at Nordland University (UiN) listed for this panel reached 60 publication points – 55% of them had at least four publication points, while 9% had no publication points; 3% of publications were at Level 2, 16% in English and 34% were journal articles (for the
Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

The research group History has contributed to regional knowledge production through three recently published books on the history of Nordland County and the city of Bodø. The normal allocation of research time is followed.

**Recruitment and training**

One of the professors at UiN is going to be the next Norwegian member of the International Commission for the History of Towns, whose aim is to establish contacts and facilitate the coordination of research between specialists in all branches of the history of towns. The Commission organises colloquiums dedicated to a particular theme, publishes an information bulletin (‘Nouvelles’/’Newsletters’), sponsors the publication of urban bibliographies by country and of selected urban history texts (Elenchus), historic atlases of towns etc., and supports all other kinds of study and research in urban history. In addition to this, the same professor at UiN has been involved in an international network of interdisciplinary memory studies, resulting in two anthologies.

The research group in History has participated in the North Atlantic Fisheries History Association (NAFHA), which has published two large volumes about international fisheries history and organised conferences almost every year since 1996. In the period 2003–2009, Professor Alf Ragnar Nielssen was secretary of the group and one of the regional editors of Volume I (2009). Nielssen was also one of the board members for the project ‘History of the West Nordic countries’, which held several conferences and published the book *Naboer i Vestnorden (Neighbours in the West Nordic countries)* in 2012.

Staff at UiN take part in two networks that are partly funded by Fritz Thyssen Stiftung and Humboldt University’s Excellence initiative. These networks have resulted in books with the participation of scientists from several countries. Another network takes Albert Kahn’s worldwide film and photo archives from the early 1900s as its starting point. UiN staff also include a professor with expertise in the First World War and European Economic History, publishing extensively in international historic journals.

FSV facilitates visits to enable researchers to spend time abroad and be affiliated to international projects and research. Students have good opportunities to go on exchange visits abroad, and FSV facilitates coordination with students’ academic calendar.

While there is information on individual appointments, there is no discussion of recruitment strategy in general, although PhD students are mainly recruited through projects with external funding. It is not entirely clear how staff are allocated to History. The institution has recruited 14 PhD students since 2013. Eleven of them are female, and there is thus a gender imbalance. The doctoral programme is small, is likewise said to be suitable only for a small number of students – the research environment is therefore limited.

**Networking**

Nord University supports and funds international collaboration. There are a number of international research networks, but information about this is general. Networking is clearly dependent on the energy, interests and capacity of individuals, as one would expect of a research group of this size.
Impact on teaching
MA students in History are engaged in ongoing research projects. The History research group develops new courses based on ongoing research projects and research results.

One main obstacle is that the PhD programme in Social Sciences is suitable for only some of the MA students in History and some of main topics of the History group. Some PhD students in History are admitted to other institutions with a PhD programme in History.

The findings and insights of the members of the History research group feed into teaching. Moreover, they encourage MA students to participate in the group's research. No specifics are given, however.

Other societal impact
Societal impact seems to be limited to the group investigating the history of Nordland County. There is close collaboration with the regional administration, museums, archives and local communities. Research seems to have an impact on exhibitions. This is certainly a strength of the institution.

Overall assessment
The panel acknowledges the institution's research programme and its impact on teaching. It particularly applauds the group on the History of Nordland County for its efforts and achievements in the dissemination of knowledge. Research production and quality need to be improved, however. Similarly, the societal impact is rather limited.

Feedback
The panel urges the institution to develop a realistic overall research strategy, within the limits of its staff and resources. It is advisable to focus the projects and reduce the number of research fields in order to achieve higher international and societal impact. In particular, the regional focus is an asset that the institution should take advantage of.
3.2 Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Faculty of Humanities (NTNUHF)

The Faculty of Humanities at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNUHF) is currently undergoing a merger, which, by 2017, will make NTNUHF one of eight faculties at NTNU, comprising six departments of varying size. According to the institutional self-assessment the total expenditure of NTNUHF decreased from NOK 176 million (2013) to NOK 163 million (2015). The share of external funding of the total expenditure increased, however, from 32% to 34% in the same period. The RCN is the most important source of external funds, followed by other private Norwegian sources. Moreover, funding from the EU constitutes a relatively sizeable share of the total external funding (NOK 7 million in 2013 and NOK 8 million in 2015).

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, 54 researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The following data were submitted by the institution: one research group (The Fate of Nations (FATNAT), Natural Resources and Historical Development in the Global Economy), seven impact case studies and three research area publications. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy
NTNU has a clearly defined strategic vision and leadership, which in the last few years has prioritised the creation and cultivation of research groups. There is impressive institutional support and financial incentives for new research groups, including seed funding and support for international collaboration, conferences and research grant funding applications. It offers particularly strong support for early-career research fellows and career development. The self-assessment notes that ‘societal changes have made basic research more difficult’. It also notes that some research remains individualistic and fragmented. The institution’s response to these challenges is not entirely clear. Some very original basic research is done by individuals, and not always in research groups. What support is given to those researchers? Overall, however, the organisation and strategy are excellent, including support for interdisciplinary work and the use of external peer reviewers in the selection of funding priorities.

Resources
The Faculty of Humanities has the following research infrastructure:

* The Language Acquisition and Language Processing Lab. This is a lab designed for investigations into the language skills of children and adults, more specifically experimental research on language acquisition (first language acquisition in children and second language acquisition in adults) and language processing (for instance comprehension and categorisation).

* The Phonetics Laboratory for use in research and education, containing basic phonetic equipment, PCs and software.

* A lab designed for a new tenure-track researcher, including EEG and eye-tracking equipment.

* A black box theatre with audio equipment, lights and stage properties.

* A white box with workshop and storage rooms, costume stock and wardrobe.

* Four film production labs with film cameras, technical equipment, PCs and special software.
* One recording studio with equipment, PCs and software for music recordings.

* Seven recording studios and six control rooms with equipment, Mac Pros and software for music recordings. In addition, four rooms that can be used as recording studios, including an organ hall, with connections to the control rooms.

* Three music labs with iMacs and sound cards.

* The following libraries are maintained by the faculty: Classical Studies, Middle Ages Research, African Studies, and Philosophy and Religious Studies.

The faculty's researchers have access to the Special Collections at the Gunnerus Library, which is maintained by NTNU. The Collections consist of the Rare Books Collection, the Heraldic Collection, the Historical Archives, photographs, manuscripts, maps, the Music Collection, UNESCO’s Memory of the World Register – Norway, and the Theatre Collection.

The investments in the faculty's infrastructure in the last 5–10 years average NOK 2 million per year. All the funding stems from NTNU's own infrastructure funds, since the RCN's National Financing Initiative for Research Infrastructure has a lower budget limit for applications than the amount necessary for NTNU to maintain its entire infrastructure.

Overall, the panel found that the resources available were excellent, especially for research groups and early-career researchers. On the other hand, resources and specific support for particularly promising scholars pursuing individual projects appear to be limited, with the exception of sabbaticals.

**Research production and quality**

Between 2011 and 2015, the 54 researchers at NTNU reached 212 publication points – 50% of them had at least four publication points, while only 31% had no publication points; 26% of publications were at Level 2, 61% in English and 41% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

The submitted publications include a revisionist piece on international history, which, based on original sources, argues that oil was a subordinate interest to the USA and UK during the first oil crisis; a methodologically informed analysis of gender roles and how Austrian deserters combined different types of masculinity with the hard ideal of Nazi masculinity; and an original archaeological history inquiry into the erasure of physical traces of the many Nazi PoW camps in Norway after 1945. The three publications submitted are evidence of the area’s methodological range, lively research culture and dialogue with international historiography.

**Recruitment and training**

The faculty's policies for mobility and career paths are covered by an international plan of action and a publication strategy. As part of the follow-up of NTNU’s international plan of action, the policy for research leave has been changed. A main objective of this policy is now to increase researcher mobility. As of today, about 5% of permanent academic staff stay abroad for longer periods. The goal is 10%. About 40 % of postdoctoral fellows at the Faculty of Humanities have spent extensive time abroad in the last three years and each year 10–15% of the PhD candidates employed at the faculty reside abroad for longer periods, often funded by the Faculty of Humanities or by RCN-funded research projects.
As regards recruitment from other Norwegian institutions, NTNUHF only provides statistics for PhD candidates. In the past five years, about 23% of PhD candidates employed by the faculty have had an MA degree from a different Norwegian institution than NTNU, and about 11% have had a degree from abroad. The number of PhD candidates with MA degrees from abroad has risen in the past few years. About 41% of the faculty’s current postdoctoral fellows do not have their doctorate from NTNU; they mostly have an international background.

In the past five years, about 23% of PhD candidates who have successfully defended their theses at the faculty have been non-Norwegian nationals.


NTNU has made a sustained effort to recruit staff from outside the institution, including an increasing proportion of international scholars. Interestingly, the share of foreign-trained scholars rises with the seniority of positions. Could there be opportunities to use the international level of scholarship and experience to also attract a greater number of PhD students from outside? The panel would have appreciated more information on the training of PhDs, support for postdocs and overall support for and processes relating to career development

**Networking**

The Faculty of Humanities has entered into collaboration agreements with the Falstal Centre, the Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation (NRK), the 22 July Centre, the Regional Health Authority and the Norwegian Fritt Ord [Free Word] Foundation. It will also establish close collaboration with the newly formed ‘University-School Collaboration’ – an initiative involving NTNU and two Trondheim schools, as part of the ‘NTNU Teaching Excellence’ initiative.

In 2015, NTNU established an office in Brussels as part of its focus on increased participation in the Horizon 2020 programme. This involvement has paid off in the form of research groups from HF having become involved in ongoing application processes.

The creation of international networks is one of the criteria used in the selection and promotion of research groups. NTNU has an International Action Plan for 2014-17. However, the institution did not provide sufficient information about its own networking strategy. It is unclear what criteria the institution uses to assess the value of potential networks in different research groups and disciplines. In spite of this, some excellent international networks have been established.

**Impact on teaching**

The faculty’s education portfolio is research-led, i.e. the curriculum includes topics from previous and current research activities at all educational levels. In some cases, MA students are invited to participate in existing research projects or to attend conferences – individually or in smaller groups – related to their MA projects. Several MA students have written their theses on topics related to research projects. Moreover, all programmes of study offer the possibility of writing a BA thesis, which can be research-oriented. The Faculty of Humanities’ arts-based and interdisciplinary research is also characterised by student engagement in research activities.

At NTNU, teaching excellence is an integrated and wide-ranging initiative aimed at helping NTNU to achieve its goal of providing international-level, high-quality education. The main objective of the instrument is to improve students’ learning outcomes. HF is participating in three development projects in 2015–2016.
NTNUHF notes that one fundamental challenge as regards the interplay between teaching and research is that most research projects within the Humanities are individual projects. Thus, having a research-based portfolio does not mean that there are always very strong, explicit and concrete links between individual projects and the various topics covered in the portfolio. The faculty is also concerned that students’ academic level, confidence or interests sometimes act as an obstacle to achieving a satisfactory research/teaching interplay, preventing the desired involvement of students in the different departmental research areas.

NTNU has clearly made efforts to integrate MA and PhD students in the research projects. Less is said about how knowledge acquired during the course of research has been used to enrich teaching and learning for students.

**Other societal impact**

The panel observed an exceptionally high and deep impact in the form of advising the government on the need for greater coordination of policies in relation to the EU; and on developing lessons and guidelines for forensic psychiatry from long-term research, including the establishment of a new archive. Two other case studies involve public exhibitions (on shifting memory after the terror in 2011; and on Organisation Todt): the latter is still in process and thus has no demonstrable impact to report as yet, while the former does not present or evaluate the specific types and aims of its impact other than creating public awareness. A fifth case shows how the study of management of risk on the high seas has led to greater historical and self-awareness in one leading organisation (DNV), although it would have been useful to learn more about the benefits of this from DNV.

**Overall assessment**

This is an exceptionally active, productive, ambitious and well-organised research organisation. It produces high-level, internationally significant research and publications, drawing on a range of methods. The support for research groups, in particular, is excellent and draws on a strategic vision of developing clusters of research topics and involving early-career researchers.

**Feedback**

While the panel was very impressed by the sustained and strategic support for new research groups and initiatives, it did wonder whether a role does not remain for individual research (and its support) in particular fields and research areas. The panel sees further potential for the integration of research and teaching. The panel notes that the institution submitted five impact case studies but only three publications. The panel believes that the evaluation of research quality at NTNU and other institutions would be helped by making it possible for institutions to submit a larger number of publications and assess the spectrum (rather than provide a single average grade).
3.3 University of Bergen, Faculty of Humanities (UiBHF)

Established in 1948, the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Bergen (UiBHF) has five departments and two inter-faculty centres. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of the Faculty of Humanities increased from NOK 206.1 million (2013) to NOK 234 million (2015). The share of external funding of the total expenditure also increased from 21.7 % to 22.9 % in the same period. The RCN is the most important source of external funding, followed by private Norwegian sources. Some modest EU funding is also documented throughout the period (NOK 4.8 million per year on average).

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, 68 researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The following data were submitted by the institution: five research groups (Health & Welfare, Homo sapiens, Medieval history, Middle East & Africa, and Transnational History & Cultural Encounters), three research area publications and five impact case studies. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

**Organisation, leadership and strategy**

UiBHF has a clear organisational structure and leadership. Strategic plans are decided at the faculty level, with research priorities being decided at the department/centre level. Recommendations from previous reviews on strengthening History and Philosophy have been followed through, and the effects are reflected in research quality in these areas.

**Resources**

Extensive archives and collections of linguistic, ethnographic, historical, musicological, theatre-historical and philosophical materials have accumulated in the various departments over the years.

The faculty established a committee for archives and collections led by the Vice-Dean of Research, which will serve as an advisory body to the Faculty Board. The committee’s mandate is to improve the coordination, administration and further development of the archives and collections. The committee is further mandated to seek external funding for developing these resources and to convey issues and needs to the Committee of Infrastructure.

An extensive programme of digitisation is underway. This represents a significant investment in research resources.

**Research production and quality**

Between 2011 and 2015, the 68 researchers in the area reached 239 publication points – 35% of them had at least four publication points, while only 25% had no publication points; 14% of publications were at Level 2, 49% in English and 47% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

**Recruitment and training**

All vacant positions are advertised internationally through standard announcement channels such as EURAXESS, local and nationwide newspapers, UiB’s website, NAV Job Database, as well as in professional journals and existing academic networks. There has been a significant increase in the number of overseas applications in recent years, both from European nationals and other nationalities. As a result, appointments of foreign nationals to the staff of the faculty have increased.
The number of international applications and appointments vary between the different disciplines and categories of positions. The largest increase is found among PhD candidates, where approximately 50% are now foreign nationals.

UiB has increased its focus on international mobility by establishing a Centre for International Mobility and it has strengthened its efforts to support candidates, in particular through its Research Department. The local research leaders give special attention to advertising the benefits of a research stay abroad. In addition, the faculty has expanded its administrative support functions, advising outgoing researchers on a case-to-case basis so as to avoid potential pitfalls relating to social security and tax issues.

Although a growing number of PhD candidates are expected to find career opportunities in other sectors of the job market, systematic procedures for providing information about such opportunities have not yet been developed. Job appraisal interviews are conducted consistently with each PhD candidate at the Faculty of Humanities. The main focus of such interviews, however, is on the overall performance of the PhD candidate and on further research possibilities and projects. Career advice may be given in the form of individual career conversations between supervisors and candidates, depending on what the candidate requests or on the initiative of the supervisor or head of department.

UiBHF hosts a number of strategic knowledge clusters that provide researchers with a focus and shared set of problems, including an existing cluster on Medieval History and an emerging cluster on Medical Humanities. Research in Archaeology (and to a lesser extent, History) is noteworthy for its international quality and has been supported by significant external competitive research funding.

UiBHF’s work on gender equality is framed within the university’s overall Action Plan for Equality, which has produced strong results in the form of a reasonably even gender balance at the faculty level, although the skew is towards administrative rather than academic posts. Vacant positions are advertised internationally and international recruitment, particularly at PhD level (50%), is increasing. PhD students and postdocs are encouraged to spend time at research institutions abroad. UiB is a signatory to ‘The European Charter for Researchers’ and the ‘Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers’.

**Networking**

Research collaboration is mainly initiated by individual researchers and departments. Extensive international collaboration already exists in all departments and centres. At the faculty level, international collaboration is encouraged through administrative support for the use of instruments at the national and EU levels for both teaching and research. The university has made cross-disciplinary and cross-faculty research a priority, and the faculty will follow up by facilitating such research and teaching collaboration.

**Impact on teaching**

The study programmes offered at the faculty are mostly discipline-based. The BA programmes (180 ECTS) include a 90 ECTS specialisation in traditional fields, such as French, History or Philosophy, and the MA programmes (120 additional ECTS) constitute higher-level studies in the same disciplines. Thus, most of the research areas covered by this panel, which are generally of a more thematic nature, are represented by several discipline-based programmes at BA and MA level.

Since much Humanities research is document-based, engaging students in research means engaging them in searching and evaluating textual source material, document analysis, academic writing and
text production. Lecturers are expected to include up-to-date research results and relevant articles in the syllabus. All BA programmes at the faculty include as a minimum requirement a 15 ECTS course consisting of individual, tutored thesis work.

At the MA level, a 60 ECTS thesis must be produced, which, in addition to training the students for research, is in itself regarded as a work of research and sometimes ends up being published. MA students may also be included in their supervisors’ research projects, for instance by using empirical data from projects in their thesis work, by assisting in the preparation of research material, transcribing recordings in linguistic studies, in fieldwork (e.g., in Archaeology), or in research group activities. At the upper BA and MA levels, most programmes offer in-depth courses based on the research interests of the academic staff.

Some programmes find that, in cases where students make use of data about individuals (personal data), there is often not enough time within a BA or MA thesis project to obtain the necessary permissions from the Data Protection Official for Research (NSD). Only a few research groups include MA students.

Research training, drawing on UiB’s archives and collections, is integrated at undergraduate level. Research appears to have a reasonable impact on teaching through the research interests of individual researchers, although UiBHF might be encouraged to develop programmes to support more research-led teaching to promote better integration of teaching with the work of research groups.

Other societal impact
UiBHF submitted five impact case studies to Panel 5. In all of the cases it was not possible to assess impact since none of them clearly articulates the ways in which the underpinning research led to any change in behaviour, policy or practice. Instead, they focused on describing the audiences for the research and attempts that had been made to reach them. While this is praiseworthy, it does not equate to measurable impact.

Overall assessment
As a unit of assessment, UiBHF has strengths in Archaeology and History and to a lesser extent Cultural Studies. The research quality and production in Archaeology are distinguished by excellence. Investment in archives and collections and the acquisition of the Norwegian Language Collections represent a significant investment in institutional research resources.

Feedback
The faculty might be encouraged to develop a higher level of strategic planning with regard to research priorities in order to ensure a more coherent, cross-disciplinary research strategy that makes more effective use of available resources. The current strategic plan (2016–2020) represents an important move in this direction. The organisation and activities of the research groups could be better resourced and coordinated. Resources should be allocated to support the development and strengthening of collaborative projects across departments and faculties and for international networking. Resources should also be allocated to developing and fostering the social impact of research and collecting appropriate evidence to document societal impact of underpinning research. Given the international shifts in funding environments, challenge-driven research should be encouraged and increased (international networking is particularly important here).
3.4 University of Oslo, Faculty of Humanities (UiOHF)

The Faculty of Humanities at the University of Oslo (UiOHF) is organised in seven departments, which makes it the largest faculty of humanities in Norway. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of the Faculty of Humanities decreased from NOK 434.9 million (2013) to NOK 413.5 million (2015). The share of external funding of the total expenditure also decreased from 27% to 24% in the same period. The RCN is the most important source of external funding, followed by other public Norwegian sources. Some modest EU funding is documented in 2013 (NOK 3.3 million) but this category has decreased as well (NOK 1 million in 2015).

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, 111 researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The following data were submitted by the institution: three research groups (Archaeology & Conservation, History and Cultural Studies), four research area publications and seven impact case studies. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy

The Faculty of Humanities at the University of Oslo consists of seven departments, three of which concern Panel 5 (Archaeology, Conservation and History; Culture Studies and Oriental Languages; Classics & History of Art and Ideas). Executive decisions are made by a Faculty Board, chaired by a Dean. Strategy and coordination are discussed at weekly meetings with heads of department. The faculty has a clearly articulated strategy for meeting the university’s objective of strengthening its international position as a research-intensive HEI. The faculty has its own strategic plan until 2020, plus annual plans. Its research strategy is aligned with EU and RCN priorities. Overall, the institution documented a clear and effective research strategy.

Resources

HF has noted an increasing need for technology and more complex and costly infrastructure in many disciplines. Disciplines that are traditionally heavily reliant upon technology continue to be so, with ever increasing costs. New disciplines have also emerged that require investments of new types to pursue their research. The cost of equipment is rarely covered by external project funding. As a result, the pressure on infrastructure budgets is high and the very definition of ‘infrastructure’ is being challenged, as new forms of digital and empirical research activities develop. HF has made its heaviest local investments in the fields of language/text databases, music technology and media research.

The Text Laboratory is part of the ESFRI-financed CLARIN (Common Language Resources and Technology Initiative). It has received generous funding from the faculty over many years. It is now included in Norway’s National Roadmap for Infrastructure 2008–2017 and has recently secured considerable funding from the RCN as well. It plays a central role in several research initiatives, including the activities of the Centre for the Study of Multilingualism Across the Lifespan.

Through its own budget, UiO has provided its music technology section with a state-of-the-art Motion Capture lab, which is of considerable value to both teaching and research. The quality of the equipment has made the section and its researchers attractive partners in national and international cross-disciplinary cooperation. HF has recently made additional investments to upgrade the equipment.
The new COE Centre for Multilingualism in Society Across the Lifespan (MultiLing) was selected as one of UiO’s world-leading research environments in 2015 and was therefore allocated considerable internal financing for new laboratories.

The technology and equipment requirements of media research are a considerable challenge for HF. Along with an ever increasing need for already patented programmes of different kinds, the need to develop new, specially designed programmes is particularly pressing. This is the case in the prioritised field of media innovations, with two externally funded (RCN) projects currently being carried out.

The Norwegian Folklore Archive (NFS) is housed at one of HF’s departments and serves as a national archive of cultural-historical texts and source materials. It currently comprises a corpus of around half a million manuscript pages from throughout Norway. In 2012, the oldest parts of the archives were selected for inclusion in the Norwegian Memory of the World Registry under the auspices of UNESCO.

Moreover, UiO is (contingent on funding) establishing a state-of-the-art ancient DNA (aDNA) laboratory in Kristine Bonnevie Hus, with HF – represented by the prioritised research area Archaeology – as partner and stakeholder. The lab will be designed and equipped to handle DNA extractions from human and other (non-human) aDNA samples for downstream next-generation sequencing or other applications. The aDNA lab and infrastructure will be set up to host scientists from all disciplines at UiO, other universities and research institutes in Norway, as well as international collaborators, and will be unique in Norway. The lab will be operated by the Department of Biosciences on behalf of UiO.

The faculty has a strong track record of raising external (including European) funding. Internal funding follows ‘documented results’, i.e. preferential support is given to the strongest research groups. Maintaining technology infrastructure is mentioned as a challenge. The faculty has recently applied for substantial funding to establish an aDNA lab. The panel would have liked to know more about how this major development fits with the research strategy of the research group ‘Archaeology’, which is not mentioned in the submission. Overall, R&D expenditure has steadily decreased since 2013.

**Research production and quality**

Between 2011 and 2015, the 111 researchers at UiO reached 568 publication points – 50% of them had at least four publication points, while only 31% had no publication points; 24% of publications were at Level 2, 51% in English and 46% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

Forty-five per cent of staff time is allocated to research, and sabbatical arrangements are generous. All four sample publications are articles in the fields of History and/or Cultural Studies; no Archaeology publications have been submitted. The publications appear in high-visibility journals, two in *International History Review*, the third in the *Business History Review*, a Harvard Business School publication. Two of the submitted research groups (Children, and History of Knowledge) are also both very strong in research, with excellent publications. The submitted publications are excellent, substantial pieces of original analysis published in widely cited, internationally regarded periodicals.
Recruitment and training

All academic staff are asked to reflect on the benefits and possibilities of a research stay abroad, and both academic and practical aspects of these stays are discussed with the department’s Head of Research. All departments offer general career guidance, including career opportunities in other sectors.

HF recently launched a five-year career development programme for early-career, full-time scientific staff, with strong emphasis on internationalisation. The participants are granted funding to provide for a PhD fellow, research expenses, administrative support, reduced teaching loads and additional training. They will also be assigned academic mentors and build their international networks through extended stays abroad.

HF recruits a high proportion of its researchers from other institutions internationally. In the period 2011–2015, 43.5% of all researchers, including PhD candidates and postdoctoral fellows, were recruited from abroad. An additional 22.1% were recruited from other institutions in Norway.

The faculty undertakes systematic international recruitment to fellowships and academic posts, and 43% of current staff and PhD students were recruited internationally. A five-year career development programme supports top ERCs; postgraduate mobility is also supported. The faculty has set itself the aim of increasing female recruitment to top posts to 40%. All these are positive steps, and the recruitment of international researchers is an especially strong sign within the context of Norwegian universities.

Networking

HF has many types of international cooperation, with research projects and ongoing collaboration with researchers on all continents. Two Centres of Excellence are organised with broad international participation on their advisory boards and in research activities. International researchers participate in departmental centres such as the Centre for Research on Media Innovations, Centre for the Study of Islam and the Middle East (SIMS) and the Centre for Museum Studies. The faculty administers more than 250 agreements with international partners. The portfolio of language programmes entails formal agreements and collaboration with institutions that excel in language instruction. In the following, a selection of activities is described:

* The departments recruit international experts from top universities for part-time adjunct (‘professor II’) positions to strengthen research as well as instruction. Examples include: opera research (University of Chicago) and media audience research (London School of Economics).

* HF collaborates with other Norwegian Universities to maintain the university centres in Athens, Rome, Paris and St. Petersburg.

* HF is included in three major UiO interdisciplinary and cross-faculty initiatives: HF is the host Faculty for UiO: Nordic, which is working to establish Nordic PhD courses with the Universities of Copenhagen, Helsinki and Stockholm as partners. HF participates in the UiO strategic interdisciplinary initiative UiO: Energy, with research collaboration with the Department of Anthropology at the University of Zhejiang, China (RCN-financed). The collaboration extends to a joint MA degree in ‘Chinese Society and Politics’, with the Universities of Aarhus, Copenhagen and Stockholm as partners. HF is represented on the UiO advisory boards for UiO: Life Science, Arctic Research and North-South initiatives.
* Non-academic partner cooperation includes internships at the BA (mainly with the industry) and MA levels (industry, NGOs and public agencies). The new programme ‘Career: Asia’ offers studies and internships in companies in India, Japan or China.

* HF collaborates with the Confederation of Norwegian Enterprise, Municipal School Authority of Oslo and several German institutions in Oslo in a network to promote German language and education, since Germany is a main trade partner for Norway.

There are Erasmus+ agreements for student exchanges, staff exchanges and professional training with a large number of German institutions.

The faculty has an impressive range of international collaborations (250 agreements with international partners). Cross-disciplinary research and teaching are supported financially.

**Impact on teaching**

Such interplay is important for HF and also part of its strategic plan, which states that the MA level should offer specialised, research-intensive programmes. MA theses are as a rule research projects in themselves. Students have several opportunities to engage in research at all levels:

The Text Laboratory, Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies, has had several large projects (mainly supported by UiO and the RCN), where some have involved students helping with transcription, recordings and manual corrections of computation annotation. The 30–40 student assistants over the last ten years have been integrated into the research at the Text Lab and many have written MA theses and even PhD dissertations sparked by topics, research questions and networks they have encountered there. Students have also received funding from the Norwegian Language Council to write MA theses on current issues related to the national language situation, and thus participated in and contributed to basic research.

Media students engage in research training as first year BA students, conducting small pilot studies as part of their obligatory methodology course (100 students take this course each year). The BA thesis is a group assignment that involves designing and conducting a small-scale research project (30 students will complete it this each year). Some develop their assignment into academic papers in collaboration with a professor. MA theses are research projects in themselves (50–60 master’s candidates will finish each year). Some of the MA candidates develop their thesis into an academic article together with their supervisor after the final exam. Established research projects also invite and encourage MA students to write their theses within the framework of the larger project. This is voluntary for the students, but all larger (and several smaller) research projects have master’s students who write on issues central to the project, participate in research seminars, share data, etc. MA students are heavily involved in many projects and also work as part-time assistants.

The Department of Philosophy, Classics, History of Art and Ideas offers scholarships to 10 MA students per year who write their theses in connection with one of the Department’s established research groups. The groups compete for the scholarships and can then announce them to their students. MA students of Classics can write a thesis related to the Oslo papyrus collection, producing scientific editions of selected papyri, which are published in ordinary scholarly channels.

As an example of impact of research on teaching, opera researchers offer the course ‘Opera through the stage door’, which introduces students to the practices and possibilities of stage analysis in cooperation with the Norwegian National Opera, taking a current opera production as the point of departure.
A minor, primarily administrative, challenge is to develop and adjust the established portfolio of courses provided by the study programmes in order to provide courses that reflect new directions in research within the departments.

There are also challenges with respect to researchers being relieved of teaching duties during projects such as COE and EU projects. When top researchers are released from courses, the students are not offered as much contact with them at an early stage in their studies. There can also be problems related to finding temporary replacements for these researchers with the same formal qualifications, the consequence being that students may be taught by less experienced staff for a period. In this way, the focus on excellence draws resources away from teaching.

The faculty offers MAs in Museology & Heritage, and Archaeology & Conservation. Students are encouraged to undertake research, but little evidence is provided to show how staff research informs/enriches teaching. The submissions of some of the research groups do, however, address teaching and PhD supervision more fully. Successful senior researchers who are bought out with grants are able to devote less time to teaching.

Other societal impact
Of the seven case studies submitted, two demonstrate very considerable impact in terms of reach and significance, e.g. on public opinion about the illicit trade in antiquities. Three had merely ‘contributed new knowledge’ or ‘enhanced public understanding’, but there was little evidence of societal impact beyond dissemination.

Overall assessment
This is a large, complex faculty that nevertheless has a clear vision of its future as an internationally recognised leader in Humanities research and a clear strategy for achieving it, with support focused on research groups and the development of early and mid-career researchers. The research quality of the publications submitted by the selected researchers is excellent. The panel also notes, however, that, according to the NIFU Report, 2016, 31% of staff members have zero publication points.

Feedback
This faculty promotes high-quality research and has a strong track record. There are a few areas where the panel would have been interested to see more information:

How is the internal funding strategy and selection of researchers monitored with respect to their future success in research funding applications? What difference has this strategy made compared to earlier periods? What kinds of research have benefitted from this strategy, and what kinds of research have not? To what degree does the strategy reward promising but established lines of inquiry, and to what degree does it also encourage riskier, blue-sky research questions and projects?

In addition to harvesting existing impact case studies, the faculty may wish to also adopt a more forward-looking proactive approach to the selection, support and monitoring of potential future impact of research.
3.5 University of Stavanger, Faculty of Arts and Education (UiS)

The Faculty of Arts and Education at the University of Stavanger (UiS) is organised in four departments according to educational profile, and two national centres. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of the Faculty of Arts and Education increased from NOK 265.7 million (2013) to NOK 321.9 million (2015). The share of external funding of the total expenditure also increased from 24.8% to 28.2% in the same period. Public Norwegian sources are by far the most important sources of external funding. Some modest EU funding is documented, averaging around NOK 1 million per year.

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, seven researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The institution has submitted one impact case study but no research area publications. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy

The Faculty of Arts and Education, of which History is one part, organises its research in nine Research Area Programmes. None of them has a distinctly historical focus. History is also not listed among the research priorities of the faculty. A research group on Culture and Memory Studies is mentioned in the self-assessment document, but it is not clear whether it is a subgroup of a Research Area Programme or what its status is. It is also unclear who the members are and what role historians play in it. The research area programmes have a distinctly interdisciplinary set-up, with researchers from different disciplines participating in them. The one area where the university has recognised achievements in history has been in history education/uses of history and memory studies. Seven historians from the faculty are mentioned who work on a wide variety of topics: foreign and military history, polar history, environmental history, legal history, urban history, historical demography, migration history and social and micro-history, and there is a small cluster around didactics, historical/cultural literacy, school history and public uses of history. They are all research-active, with an impressive list of publications in recent years. It is unclear, however, which research area programme they belong to and what role they play within these areas. Overall, the impression is of a highly diverse field lacking direction and an overall research strategy.

Resources

The Middle English Scribal Texts Programme (MEST): The Middle English team at Stavanger has carried out two four-year research projects funded by the RCN, both of which have involved the compilation of a text corpus. Both corpora provide access to otherwise unavailable material, transcribed directly from the original manuscripts and made available on an open-access basis. The MEG-C corpus contains samples of texts from a wide range of genres, from the period 1350–1500. The latest version (2011.1) contains 410 texts and around 700,000 words. It is used by English historical linguists worldwide (as well as the project team). The MELD corpus contains transcriptions of some 2,000 administrative/legal texts and letters (approx. 1 million words) from the period 1399–1525. It will make available a large amount of material that has never been published or studied before, and is the result of a very substantial amount of archival and transcription work.

Historical Population Register for Norway: UiS is a partner in the project ‘Historical Population Register for Norway’, which is currently building a national Historical Population Register (HPR) for
Norway based mainly on censuses and church books. The Register aims to include as many as possible of the 9.7 million people who were born in or migrated to Norway between 1735 and 1964. The project includes many national and international partners, and the University of Tromsø is project manager. Harmonising and the possible linking of data from different countries could represent new and exciting research possibilities and tools for comparative analysis.

Digital lab (in the process of establishment): Enables staff and students to test new (state-of-the-art) digital tools for research and teaching.

Visual attention/writing process Lab: A laboratory for measuring eye movements and writing processes is enabling researchers at the UiS to study visual attention, reading and writing as they unfold in real time. In 2015–2016, the Reading Centre has contributed to developing an open source recording and analysis program, OpenEyeWrite, which is compatible with all major eye-trackers. At the national level, the lab has contributed to projects and publications in collaboration with NRK (Norwegian Broadcasting Company), the Norwegian Meteorological Institute, Stavanger University Hospital, and the University of Bergen. Investments over the past ten years include eye-tracking equipment, three systems, upgrades, equipment for tracking writing processes, programming ScriptLog (until 2009), programming OpenEyeWrite (total amount: EUR 100,000). The lab will need some new investments in eye-tracking equipment in order to cover the full range of visual attention tasks, as new software makes new processor demands of existing hardware.

Test lab Sports Sciences: There is a test laboratory for testing VO2max and spirometry.

Natural Science Laboratories: (Chemistry, Physics, Biology). These laboratories are mainly used in the teacher training programmes. They are also used in educational research, as the basis for research, and research questions are developed from teaching and dissemination.

There is seed money available for the Research Area Programmes. There is no sabbatical system in place. Sabbaticals are by application – across the whole faculty, five to six one-year sabbaticals are funded per annum. It is not clear whether historians have benefitted from this system in recent years. Funds are available to increase the research mobility of PhD students and staff. Mobility outside Norway with research networks with other universities is encouraged. However, no successful examples of historians benefitting from such mobility and networking are given. Normally, research-active staff can devote 30% of their time to research. While there is some intention to support research and international mobility that should be welcomed, the evidence provided suggests that such schemes operate within practical and financial constraints.

**Research production and quality**

Between 2011 and 2015, the seven researchers at UiS reached 39 publication points – 71% of them had at least four publication points, while 0% had no publication points; 7% of publications were at Level 2, 35% in English and 42% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

The university has a major RCN project on the compilation of a Historical Population Register for Norway from the eighteenth century (1730s) to the 1960s. Otherwise, individual historians produce a lot of work, but none of it was submitted for assessment, so that we cannot properly judge the quality of the research.

**Recruitment and training**

Academic staff at the Faculty of Arts and Education are mostly recruited nationally, although some are recruited internationally. All academic positions are advertised publicly. UiS organises regular
information meetings about relevant programmes in the EU framework (e.g. Marie Curie), and there is a central support staff that helps with opportunities and applications. Nevertheless, more systematic work should be done in the future to motivate, and better inform PhD candidates and academic staff about opportunities for mobility and career paths.

A team is currently working on revising the institution’s implementation of the European Charter and Code for Researchers.

Over the last four years two PhD students completed their doctorates (both in 2015). There is little indication that the institution gives consideration to the training of PhD students or to the recruitment of postdocs and to the question of career progression.

**Networking**

All PhD candidates are encouraged to carry out a research visit abroad during their PhD education, and funding is available at the faculty. Grants for research visits abroad by academic staff (1-6 months) are also announced at the faculty level. The number of students and staff on exchange or research visits abroad has increased in the last two years. Mobility is an important factor for securing funding for a sabbatical. Researchers have been able to apply for faculty funding to cover expenses relating to mobility, and they are helped in the application phase for external funding. The funding available for sabbaticals is reported to be scarce.

The self-assessment document emphasises the importance of networking and the mechanisms the university has to develop in order to facilitate networking. In the realm of memory studies, there have been contacts with world-leading scholars such as Jay Winter and Astrid Erll.

**Impact on teaching**

Humanities at the Faculty of Arts and Education, UiS, is integrated in several teacher education programmes from early childhood to secondary school (Early Childhood Teacher Education, 1st–7th grade, 5th–10th grade, and 8th–13th grade). The Humanities disciplines represented in these programmes are History (BA level), History Education (MA level), Norwegian/Nordic studies (BA level), Nordic and Literacy Studies (MA level), Religion Studies (BA level), English Language and Literature (BA level), English and Literacy Studies (MA level) and Literacy Studies (PhD level). That means that research in Humanities at the Faculty of Arts and Education, UiS, is both discipline- oriented, especially at the BA level, and multidisciplinary-oriented, especially at the MA and PhD level.

First cycle (BA): Students in the first cycle (BA programmes and one-year programmes) primarily encounter research through the written and taught curriculum and through teachers’ presentation of their own research. Students in teacher education programmes are introduced to research methods during their first term. The BA thesis, written in the third year, is a 15 ECTS independent and individual work. Being mainly a teacher training faculty, many theses have an element of applied research. The Department of Music and Dance includes students in artistic research and communication.

Second cycle (MA): In second-cycle programmes, all students write an MA thesis that varies in size from 30 to 60 ECTS. It is the students’ first real attempt at individual research. The students are given substantial supervision throughout, and they are also given an opportunity to present and discuss their theses with fellow students. All MA students are given a course in Ethics and Philosophy of Science, and this kind of course is further developed in third-cycle programmes. Prior to determining
the topic of the MA thesis, research groups and researchers present their own research and the possibility for students to become involved in ongoing research projects.

Many students have their own ideas about what they want to investigate and would rather pursue an individual path than join an existing research project. The faculty says that it needs to think carefully and strategically about how its research can be strengthened through BA and MA projects as well as PhD projects.

An MA in History Education is in place. Throughout, there is a strong emphasis on research-based teaching – both at BA and MA level. Given that the faculty is heavily involved in teacher training, much of the research has an applied character.

**Other societal impact**
One impact case was submitted for evaluation but was later withdrawn because it could not be finalised.

**Overall assessment**
The overall impression is that historical research suffers from being dispersed across a wide range of themes and interests. Hence, there may well be strong individual research, but little indication of research leadership and organisation. The institution is struggling with regard to resources, recruitment and training. Some of the research carried out has a strong potential for impact, but this is more asserted than demonstrated. There is good attention to research-led teaching, but little information on how successful the MA in History Education is.

**Feedback**
Given that there is a heavy emphasis on teacher training at the institution, it would make sense to give priority to research that relates to history education, school history, didactics, public history, and/or memory history. There is evidence that a small cluster of staff is already active in these areas. This area should be strengthened in future appointments. At the moment, the group of historians is too diverse to become internationally visible as a coherent entity. This could change with more research leadership setting the agenda in the areas listed above.
The humanistic disciplines at the Arctic University of Norway (UiT) are part of a broad and multidisciplinary faculty, the Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education (UiTHSL). The faculty, UiT’s second largest, is spread across three campuses. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of UiTHSL within the Humanities increased from NOK 136 million (2013) to NOK 140 million (2015). The share of external funding of the total expenditure decreased, however, from 18% to 13% in the same period. The share of external funding of the total expenditure decreased, however, from 60% to 48% in the same period. RCN is the most important source of external funds, followed by other public Norwegian sources.

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, 39 researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The following data were submitted by the institution: three research groups (CNN, NordFront and SARG), three research area publications and three impact case studies. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy
UiT is a broad, multidisciplinary institution with some 200 researchers within the Humanities. The Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education (UiTHSL) is divided into six departments and four centres. The structure of its organisation is very clear, with decision-making taking place at faculty and departmental levels; research strategic themes are determined centrally. There is a risk of smaller units losing visibility within this structure or being unable to match the larger objectives. It has clearly stated objectives and an associated programme of action to realise these objectives. In general, there seems to be a close match between objectives and actions. HSL aims to strengthen its Arctic profile, and to develop interdisciplinary approaches to the grand challenges of the future. Its aims and strategies are ambitious, but seem to rests on an appropriate sense of how to invest in and manage such ambitions.

Resources
The faculty has a large research infrastructure within History, Sámi, Russian and English Linguistics. The Registration Centre for Historical Data, located in the Department of History and Religious Studies, leads the national INFRASTRUCTURE project, National Population Register for Norway. The goal is a national Norwegian population register for the time period from 1800, and where possible even earlier. The primary focus is on creating a register for the first two decades of the 19th century.

The main objective of Giellatekno, the centre for Sámi language technology at the Department of Language and Culture, is to create grammar-based language technology for Sámi and other northern languages. Language technology is a prerequisite for any language wanting to survive in a modern society. The academic environment is a partner in the INFRASTRUCTURE project CLARINO, led by the University of Bergen.

English and Russian Linguistics have larger databases and their own laboratories for analysis of experimental data and trolling. A lab manager has recently been employed. Both an increased workforce and more materials will be needed in future. Collaboration has been established with both NTNU and UiO.
The self-assessment refers to a substantial research infrastructure, but provides no detail. International research collaborations bring external funding, but there are big differences between disciplines in this regard. The institution has developed a differentiated support arrangement that responds to the fact that research groups have lifespans and changing needs over their duration. There is a very generous sabbatical system. Besides these examples of support, there is a declared need for further personnel and resources, in particular with regard to Computational Linguistics. It will also be necessary to review the future of the Registration Centre for Historical Data when it reaches the end of its remit. It is not clear how these needs will be met. Nor was it clear on what criteria, and according to what strategy, resources will be distributed between the disciplines included in this panel: History, Archaeology and Cultural Studies.

**Research production and quality**

Between 2011 and 2015, the 39 researchers at UiTHSL listed for this panel reached 194 publication points – 44% of them had at least four publication points, while 26% had no publication points; 23% of publications were at Level 2, 54% in English and 40% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

Attention is paid to the need to organise a research environment. The emphasis is on interdisciplinary, and a distinctly Nordic profile – the latter coming through very clearly in publications and research areas – gives the university unique research competence, for example its contribution to Sámi History. However, it would have enriched this research if comparative perspectives were brought in at times. The submitted publications are of great international interest and of very good (but not outstanding) quality. The research output seems to differ substantially between individuals and disciplines, and various plans are being developed to stimulate research publication.

**Recruitment and training**

All academic positions are advertised in EURAXESS. Employees are encouraged to conduct research abroad. Employees who are awarded R&D terms can receive funding for their stays abroad. There are similar support systems for PhD students and postdoctoral fellows. Around 10 academic employees and around 10 PhD students at the faculty benefit from these support systems annually.

There is an explicit gender policy for recruitment. The appointment of new researchers is in accordance with needs and strategy. The high number of foreign researchers among staff is a sign of strength. A weakness is the low number of PhDs and postdocs. Stays abroad are encouraged, and there are various forms of continuous training, such as writing workshops.

**Networking**

International research collaboration primarily takes place through the projects supported by the RCN and other similar sources, but also through individual efforts by academic employees. Employees are continuously informed about and encouraged to apply for support schemes for international collaboration.

The faculty has a very beneficial academic sabbatical system. Academic employees are expected to spend their sabbatical at an institution outside Norway, and the faculty has established its own support system for spending time abroad. Moreover, the faculty finances five international adjunct professor positions. The purpose of this arrangement is to link the faculty’s academic communities to reputable communities abroad.
Some academic communities work in close collaboration with the research institute sector, but collaboration with private enterprises is less common.

There are some substantial and significant networks at the level of both individual and larger research projects, but it is not clear how these are connected to the strategies for broader global perspectives.

**Impact on teaching**

BA students are not generally involved in research projects. The MA programme in Education, especially the subject of Norwegian, includes smaller research projects starting from the first year. This enables students to carry out limited research projects in connection with BA theses, often at the same time as they are in teacher training practice. Other degree programmes, such as History, have introduced obligatory BA theses, and thereby opened up for students working on smaller research projects. The Department of Philosophy has an optional BA thesis, so MA and PhD students are more often involved in research projects than are BA students. In some disciplines, MA students are hired as research assistants. In addition, the faculty advertises MA funds every year that can be used for fieldwork, archival studies or participation at conferences related to the student’s thesis. The prerequisite for receiving funding is that the MA student is affiliated to a research group. Most PhD students at the faculty are affiliated to a research group or – through external funding – a larger research project.

HSL currently requires the disciplines to emphasise in their teaching how research and teaching are connected, for example by organising a research workshop for BA students at which a researcher demonstrates the research process.

In order to increase the focus on academic writing and language as a tool and an integrated part of the research process, a Writing Centre has been established that will work towards including the research process in teaching.

HSL mentions that the institution could have higher expectations of its research groups as regards contributing to both the existing degree programmes and the development of new programmes.

Good attention is paid to the relationship between teaching and research and various plans for improving it. The connection is most explicit at the level of MA students who are encouraged to participate in small research projects. There is an ongoing project to enhance teaching and broaden the role of research-based education.

**Other societal impact**

The submitted case studies are interesting and relate to current concerns, including some that are unique to the area. The impact is based on high-quality research that has resulted in a high volume of diverse forms of outreach, and also particular impacts, such as contributions to policy and jurisdiction over resources and land.

**Overall assessment**

The faculty has ambitious aims to build on its interdisciplinary strengths in order to develop a stronger focus on the Arctic region/the North and to contribute to global challenges. This strategy encourages researchers to be outward-looking, while at the same time providing them with a focus on a particular and unique region. The comparative (outward-looking) perspective is not, however, a clear characteristic of the research on Sámi History, in particular. The faculty has taken previous evaluations to heart and responded to them constructively. The research outcomes differ in volume.
and also in quality between disciplines, but there are plans in place to improve this. There are some resource challenges ahead, but no plans were provided for how they will be addressed. The work submitted is of high international quality and interest.

Feedback
The potential tensions (rather than synergies) between small units and the larger structure are a potential area of concern. The recruitment of PhD and postdocs is an issue that needs attention. Plans for how to solve the forthcoming resource needs should be developed. It might be valuable to think about strategies for comparing and linking the work on Sámi History to the histories of other ethnic minorities.
3.7 University of Agder, Faculty of Humanities and Education (UiA)

The Faculty of Humanities at the University of Agder (UiA) has four departments under which all study programmes are organised. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of UiA decreased from NOK 38.6 million (2013) to NOK 32.9 million (2015). The share of external funding of the total expenditure increased, however, from 7.4% to 12.2% in the same period. The RCN is the most important source of external funding, followed by private Norwegian sources. Moreover, a small share of the external funding comes from other public Norwegian sources (NOK 3.5 million from 2013–2015).

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, eleven researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The following data were submitted by the institution: one research group (Religion and World-views in Social Context), one research area publication but no impact case studies. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy
The University of Agder is one of the ‘new universities’ in Norway, having been awarded university status only in 2007. It has quite high student numbers (12,000), leading to a poor student-staff ratio, and the last three years have seen a significant decrease in expenditure for research personnel. As an HE institution, it is without a strong track record in internationally leading research. Its Faculty of Humanities, which includes History, incorporates a very wide range of disciplines. The historians responded to one of the main criticisms of the evaluation of the discipline in 2008 – methodological nationalism and localism – by successfully obtaining a research grant from the RCN, in which researchers tried to provide answers to the questions about what implications geographical choice had for historical work and how historical objects were constructed through space. This exercise in historical self-reflection took place with the involvement of international researchers from abroad.

The involvement of staff in other research projects funded by the RCN is mentioned, but no details are given. A range of local history projects that are listed received external funding. The historians’ group consists of 12 permanent members of staff, one postdoc and six PhD students. They seem to function very much as individuals with little evidence of particular research leadership and coordination, except through the two networks/projects mentioned, but the extent to which this is intended to be sustainable is unclear.

Resources
The University Library in Agder is an active organiser of research and education at UiA. This is ensured via a book collection of over 300,000 titles, 20,000 periodicals and a specialist librarian for each department. In some cases, UiA has experienced that financial constraints have meant that this service is poorer than desired. An example of this is that the library has occasionally had to suspend new purchases.

New research methods within the Humanities lead to new demands on the infrastructure. Within media research, equipment is needed that makes it possible to keep up-to-date with the latest media technology.

Major facilities for infrastructure for research also include a linguistic research laboratory, which is currently under development. The first stage of the laboratory is the installation of a soundproof and
electronically screened chamber. The next stage is the installation of eye-tracker equipment. This infrastructure will make it possible to carry out innovative research on the production and perception of language.

In addition, the foreign language study programmes use two language labs to practise spoken language and pronunciation. The research laboratory and the language labs reflect the importance of oral communication in foreign language teaching and research.

There is a financial support scheme in place to which researchers can apply for support for research-related activities. However, no information was given about why certain research areas were prioritised over others. Hence, a limited amount of resources is widely spread. Administrative support is also available for larger-scale research collaborations, although no examples are provided. Library facilities are not great, but interlibrary loans and electronic resources compensate for this to some extent. Average research time is 30% for staff, with some variance (between 10 and 50%, depending on the score on a publications points measure). There is no sabbatical system in place. There are regular seminars, workshops and a bi-annual conference, but few details are given. An emerging research network has focused on the history of science, technology and innovation – using conceptual history approaches.

**Research production and quality**

Between 2011 and 2015, the 11 researchers at UiA reached 89 publication points – 73% of them had at least four publication points, while 0% had no publication points; 5% of publications were at Level 2, 22% in English and 26% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

Research output over the four-year period from 2011 to 2015 is good, with 15 monographs and over forty articles in peer-reviewed journals and edited collections. Thematically, the research that is produced is very broad. It includes local and city history, religious history, Byzantine history, organisational history, social mobilisation, shipping history, and business history. There seems to be a distinct emphasis on local history situated in a national context, and it would be interesting to see what impact the theoretical project on methodological nationalism and its implications had on the research culture of History at UiA. The emerging focus on the conceptual history of science, technology and innovation is also promising. The one chapter that has been submitted from a book on ‘Bugs and Borders’ is an interesting reflection on the impact of epidemics on transnational historical change.

**Recruitment and training**

The heads of department decide the allocation of research time to each scientific staff member, where, among other things, the staff member’s research ambitions and potential for career development are taken into consideration. Staff members also have an opportunity to apply for mobility/research stays abroad. The faculty sets a goal each year for the percentage of staff with scientific competence at associate professor or professorial level. This goal is achieved through the implementation of support measures to increase the competence of existing staff, as well as through the recruitment of qualified external staff. Researchers are to a large extent recruited from other academic institutions in Norway, but international recruitment is increasing. PhD students and postdocs spend little time abroad, and, if they do, usually only a few weeks. PhD students have so far not been offered information about career opportunities outside academia, and finding such information has been left up to the individual PhD student.
The self-assessment says that international recruitment is increasing, but does not give any figures or examples. No information was provided about how the institution supports career progression and offers career advice for PhD students or postdocs.

**Networking**

A wide variety of collaborations is generally encouraged. The faculty has several financial support schemes that researchers can apply for twice a year. The money can be used to organise workshops, seminars and conferences, for travel and to some extent to reduce teaching loads. Administrative support is given when more complex forms of collaboration take place, for instance to set up budgets for large projects, to make practical arrangements for conferences etc. The heads of department occasionally register extra hours on the work plans for academic staff who make special efforts to establish international or national collaboration. This has contributed to many research collaborations at the national and international level, but also in the region, particularly with Kristiansand Hospital and with kindergartens and schools.

In addition to research collaborations, there is also collaboration on education. Many students have a practical training period/internship in schools or businesses. This is particularly true for BA students in Translation and Intercultural Communication, MA students in Communication Studies (‘Samfunnskommunikasjon’) and BA students in Special Needs Education, for whom this is an obligatory part of their studies. The faculty also contributes with external study programmes (further education; ‘etter- og videreutdanning’), often at the request of and in collaboration with external partners.

The institution has a diverse local network, comprising schools and businesses, museums and archives. No information is given about formal collaboration with other national or international universities.

**Impact on teaching**

There is increased awareness of the importance of involving students in research and research-related work; this applies at both BA and MA levels. BA theses have been introduced in the majority of BA study programmes at the faculty, which has made these study programmes more research-oriented. Most MA theses have a scope of as many as 60 credits; this means that research and research-related activity is prominent in MA studies. Students frequently write theses within the research field in which their supervisor works and conducts research. In general, at BA and (in particular) MA level, scientific staff are conscious of relating studies to research. In certain cases, MA students are attached to research groups or to ongoing research projects.

In MA studies in Nordic Language and Literature, work is ongoing to allow students to establish and run a periodical as a way of preparing them for a research-related academic work method.

The greatest challenge is the lack of correlation between study programmes and staff research fields. The content of the study programmes is governed by many considerations: usefulness, relevance to society and the totality and context of the programmes. Some programmes are also governed by framework plans. This means that staff are to a varying degree able to relate their research directly to the study programmes.

There are separate PhD programmes on religion, ethics, history and society, which seems very broad. But only one PhD student has so far completed his thesis during the period since 2013 which, the panel feels, would make an assessment of the working and success of the programme premature. There is also an awareness of the need to introduce research elements into teaching, largely through
BA and MA theses. Overall, the honest self-assessment recognises that most of the teaching at the institution is not research-driven.

**Other societal impact**

No example of societal impact is given, although, with teacher training, internships at local businesses as well as the research listed, UiA clearly has societal impact and a clear potential in this regard.

**Overall assessment**

Overall, there is little evidence of the institution developing coherent and specific research expertise in historical studies, despite the fact that research foci have been emerging that it would make sense to develop. Research output is fair and the quality is good, but there are also deficiencies in recruitment and training and in linking research to teaching.

**Feedback**

We advise leaders of successful and emerging research groups to exercise strong leadership. Many of the research plans are excellent. Past research projects, such as the one on methodological nationalism, are very impressive. There are many opportunities to deepen these obvious research strengths, but the organisation has to support this more systematically and more strongly.

The scientific staff’s research is often highly specialised, i.e. it covers only a narrow field of the total study programme. The degree of specialisation also means that the research, when it relates to study programmes, can appear to be too ‘advanced’ for the students. This challenge could, for example, be met by adjustments to the study programmes, particularly by the academic staff improving their ability to simplify and popularise, and/or by adjusting staff research fields.
3.8 Norwegian University of Science and Technology, University Museum (NTNUmuseum)

The NTNU University Museum is a combination of a museum and a faculty at NTNU. The Museum has four organisational departments, two of which have tasks and an organisation resembling university departments. These are the Department of Natural History and the Department of Archaeology and Cultural History. The Department of Archaeology and Cultural History is the organisational entity listed for HUMEVAL. It is organised in four units: the interiors management unit (collections and stores); the exterior management unit (archaeological investigations, marine and terrestrial); the teaching unit and the conservation unit. All units include researchers. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of NTNU University Museum for research within the humanities decreased from NOK 14.3 million (2013) to NOK 13.9 million (2015). The external funding increased, however, from NOK 13.8 million to NOK 25.9 million in the same period. Public Norwegian sources are the most important source of external funds, followed by private Norwegian sources.

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, 16 researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The institution submitted one impact case study but no research area publications. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy

This is an unusual combination of a museum and a faculty, and the Department of Archaeology and Cultural History (SAK) is the only department (out of four departments) to be assessed by HUMEVAL. This department is structured around four units based on areas of practice. It is involved in the educational programme for Archaeology at BA, MA and PhD level, as well as having various heritage management and museums tasks. A head is responsible for the department, and accountable to the museum director, and the responsibilities of this job are clearly explained. The roles of other senior members are not mentioned. SAK has developed a new research strategy that covers its four priority areas; these are good themes, although still somewhat general, and rooted in the strengths of the resources. The relationship between SAK and the museum is rather unclear as research takes place within both; the group ‘Indre forvaltning’ is concerned with collections and storage, and thereby seems to be a risk of duplication of efforts between the museum and SAK.

Resources

Major research infrastructures are as follows:

* Scientific collections containing archaeological artefacts dating from the Stone Age to the present day from Møre og Romsdal, Nord- and Sør-Trøndelag and Nordland; ethnographical artefacts and other cultural historical items.

* Topographical archives, maps and drawings from terrestrial and marine excavations of the same areas; photographs documenting excavations and objects.

* Laboratories for conservation and analysis of archaeological objects.

* A sub-department for archaeological excavations and surveys (the exterior management unit).

All collections, archives and finds from excavations are, or are in process of being, registered in the national archaeological databases (MUSIT).
The research infrastructure covers and enables all parts of modern archaeological field research, artefact studies and scientific analyses.

Major investments in the last 5–10 years:

**Laboratory:**

* Digital X-ray machine: for documentation and analyses, NTNU equipment grant
* XRF (X-Ray Fluorescence Spectroscopy) for analyses of metals
* FTIR (Micro-Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy) for analyses of organic material

**Archives and scientific collections:**

* Filing cabinets for drawings and archives; storage racks for artefacts

**Excavations and surveys:**

* Geophysical equipment (georadar, gradiometer, magnetic susceptibility meter, electromagnetic inductivity meter, metal detectors)
* ROV (remotely operated vehicle); side scanning sonar
* GIS (geographic information system) measuring systems and software; cameras and software; photo drone

**C14 laboratory:** 1

* Equipment for the preparation of bone samples for C14 dating

In addition to the collection itself, the museum has a good range of equipment, both aimed at the study of the collection and at various kinds of prospecting and archaeological work. The museum receives substantial external funding. Substantial funding comes from the RCN, but even more from other public sources and from private Norwegian sources. The self-assessment states that the museum, for its operation, is dependent on these unpredictable incomes, which can affect medium to long-term planning.

**Research production and quality**

Between 2011 and 2015, the 16 researchers at the NTNU University Museum reached 47 publication points – 69% of them had at least four publication points, while only 19% had no publication points; 20% of publications were at Level 2, 60% in English and 76% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

The museum has collaborated on a number of recent projects. They have an interesting thematic spread, use local expertise and make sense. The case study SPARC is important and connects to similar concerns in other regions; it seems to have been effective both in the collection of new knowledge and in the use of different media to disseminate it, and also as a contribution to the development of new management guidelines.

The museum also points to its duty to produce popular publications and the tendency for this not to count towards/as research.

The research production and expertise seem to be closely linked to, and possibly restricted by, the projects; their SWOT analysis points to a need to better develop research expertise.
Recruitment and training
SAK encourages research trips abroad for researchers. There is a requirement for a stay abroad for PhD students and postdocs. SAK encourages research visits/secondments, domestically or abroad, for MA students.

A goal in recent years has been to strengthen the staff’s research expertise. Several employees are taking or have completed PhDs and postdoc periods as part of this.

SAK has a research forum where all the researchers meet for discussion and planning purposes. The forum also organises lectures, small seminars, courses etc.

Teaching in the new archaeological study programme is career-oriented, and a main goal is to be prepared for everyday work after studies. Not all students will enter directly into relevant jobs after graduation. The programme is therefore structured in a way that enables graduates to take other types of jobs. The university has allocated funds through ‘innovative teaching’ to strengthen this further.

It is not clear how research staff and holders of permanent positions are recruited; PhDs and postdocs are recruited through the faculty and there are some attempts at widening the field despite the final candidates often being local.

Networking
One goal is to achieve interdisciplinary research. Two main priority areas are ancient DNA (aDNA) (e.g. the study of urban medical health in the Middle Ages) and the development and use of technology on land, in air and in water (Marine) (e.g. geophysics, LIDAR and underwater robotics). Several research applications have been developed in connection with these priority areas. These areas also entail collaboration within the museum, with other faculties and with national and international institutions.

There are substantial national collaborations behind recent and ongoing projects, and some international contacts. Staff and students are encouraged to take stays abroad.

Impact on teaching
As the only Archaeology teaching institution in Norway, NTNU’s Archaeology study programme is offered in collaboration between the Department of Historical Studies and the University Museum. This study platform provides special opportunities and characterises the profile of the programme at BA, MA and PhD level. A main point about the teaching organised by the Department of Archaeology and Cultural History at NTNU is that it is coordinated and integrated with the institution’s research and other activities as far as possible. A wide range of expertise is thus available for teaching. This relates particularly to collections (proximity to archaeological objects, collection management) and cultural heritage management (extensive archaeological field surveys). Furthermore, it also applies to heritage issues in general and museology. Research is thereby carried out on a broad basis within Cultural History, as well as specific topics such as snow patch Archaeology, the development of geophysical methods in Archaeology, the emergence and development of sea hunting, contemporary Archaeology and materiality studies.

The Archaeology study programme at NTNU is characterised by extensive fieldwork that encompasses both practical skills and integration of empirical data and research. The results of this activity become part of both student projects and research at the department. Examples of this are historical Archaeology and Stone Age excavations, as well as surveys of tar kilns carried out on field
courses. Students can also be participants in museological investigations. Student projects also serve as smaller investigations in major programmes.

There is a clear philosophy behind researchers’ involvement with teaching (and a proportion of their time is allocated to this). In particular, they emphasise the unique opportunities offered by being able to work with the collection and participate in work in the field.

**Other societal impact**

The self-assessment does not describe or document the societal impact of particular research projects. However, the information provided clarifies their general duties as regards the museum and its collection, as well as their participation in heritage management tasks. Clearly, maintaining the collections and their general work on heritage and conservation involves tangible impacts.

**Overall assessment**

The unusual organisational structure seems to have benefits (collections and heritage management practices being directly accessible to researchers and students). At the same time, it also creates challenges in terms of the distance between decision-making levels. The prior and ongoing research projects, which involve national and international collaboration, are interesting and promise important research outcomes. The contribution to teaching is clear and based on a distinct philosophy about the educational benefits of being close to the evidence.

**Feedback**

It was not clear how various members of the museum are involved in management and decision-making. If that reflects reality, then it may be worth creating greater clarity and involvement, both to ensure synergies and to use diverse talents better.
3.9 University of Bergen, University Museum (UiBmuseum)

The University of Bergen Museum (UiB Museum) covers a wide spectrum of subjects, including subjects in Natural Sciences, Social Sciences and Humanities. It was reorganised in January 2015 due to a series of negative evaluations. In the Humanities, research is dominated by Archaeology and archaeological excavations. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of UiB Museum increased from NOK 24 million (2013) to NOK 35.7 million (2015). The share of external funding of the total expenditure has increased from 71% to 78% in the same period (including staff on external funding only). If staff on external funding contracts are excluded, the share of external funding has decreased from 11% to 8%. Public Norwegian sources (the RCN not included) are the most important source of external funding, followed by private Norwegian sources.

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, 20 researchers were listed for HUMEVAL in one research group (Universitetsmuseet). The following data were submitted by the institution: four research area publications and one impact case study. The evaluation committees interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy

The museum, which covers a wide range of subjects, some of which fall under Panel 5, was reorganised in 2015, and its structure is still being developed. The graph of the museum structure shows a clear division of tasks, although there is little or no description of how decisions are made and coordinated. This is particularly significant since they state that the majority of research is interdisciplinary and that they collaborate with multiple partners. They are currently working on their research strategy, but there is little reflection on how and who is involved in this. Some of its tasks and strategies are predetermined by the duties of the museum in terms of collection care and excavations.

Resources

Approximately one third of the staff at the Department of Cultural History are supported by external funding. These researchers – the five members of this group – have no funding for research other than excavation and post-excitation work.

Staff supporting research, but who are not employed in researcher positions, are not included in this evaluation. UiB Museum has well-equipped laboratories for analyses of pollen, plant macro remains, animal bones (osteology) and conservation work. The preservation laboratories preserve objects, but can also provide various analyses to support research, such as x-ray and methods to identify techniques and materials. Excavation staff members in technical positions also produce important data for research.

Large parts of UiB Museum’s archives and collections of photos and artefacts are digitised and merged with the national databases, which are accessible through national web portals (MUSIT). The digitisation and databases are necessary to enable effective searches of the source material, which today count several million records. UiB Museum alone has approx. 1.5 million objects in addition to associated plans, photos and other parts of the archives. During the period 2008–2015, UM invested NOK 27 million in MUSIT.

UiB Museum cares for a collection of around 500 anthropological films, 80 of which are still 16mm copies that need to be digitised. Films provide insight into the social and cultural context of objects.
and represent sources for both research and public outreach. UiB Museum has gained a worldwide reputation for its film production and received several awards.

The museum collection is in itself a major resource, including its unique collection of ethnographic films. Permanent staff are encouraged to apply for external funding. The funding for staff varies, and some have no funding for research apart from excavation and post-excavation work. The labs are a strong resource, but some of the buildings need restoration; overall, from a resource point of view, the museum seems to be in poor condition. Total expenditure increased during the period 2013–15, but the percentage of external funding of the total has decreased and is now only 8%. However, it seems to be difficult to unravel the costs related to the Humanities from that of other parts of the museum.

**Research production and quality**

Between 2011 and 2015, the 20 researchers at UiB Museum reached 73 publication points – 40% of them had at least four publication points, while 25% had no publication points; 38% of publications were at Level 2, 80% in English and 65% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

**Recruitment and training**

There are no details about recruitment strategy. It is especially unclear whether they mainly recruit from within the organisation or beyond, and, in particular, whether they use different recruitment strategies for PhD, core staff and field projects. The field projects are used as a means of training, including of staff from other museums. Otherwise, there are no details about training, apart from the encouragement of participation in projects and research visits abroad.

**Networking**

The museum prides itself on its interdisciplinarity and strong national and international networks; both claims are borne out by the material. However, they also point to it being a small and vulnerable milieu with gaps in its coverage in relation to its prescribed duties (such as coverage of the later periods). The submitted publications are of a very good to high standard and show a wide spread of research that is of national and at times international relevance, either due to methodological development or thematic contributions. They point to lack of recognition by the research council (RCN) of the public dissemination and the conflict between this and the set duties of a museum.

In general, UiB Museum takes a positive view of national and international exchanges aimed at building networks between researchers. Everyone is encouraged to participate in international and national cooperation and to act as guest researchers abroad. During 2016, researchers from UiB Museum will stay at universities or do fieldwork in Japan, Brazil, Nepal, India, Austria and Palestine. One of the PhD students is on leave from a position at the university museum in Oslo, another is doing fieldwork in Nepal. Researchers and PhD students visit from all over the world. PhD students, with limited time for their thesis, will normally have priority when studying UM’s collections.

The museum is an active partner in various networks, both those specifically related to Western Norway and museums, but also beyond this sector. This is an area where the interdisciplinary strength of the museum is particularly well used.
Impact on teaching
Teaching is not a primary role for the museum. On the other hand, UM has obligations under the Act relating to Cultural Heritage regarding excavations of cultural heritage sites, and responsibility for collections associated with Archaeology, Cultural History and Anthropology. In addition to archaeological and ethnographic artefacts, the collections include old photos, church art, theatre collections, medals and coins, and post-medieval collections. The collections and excavations at UiB Museum are important to teaching.

Research at UiB Museum is important to the implementation of the Act relating to Cultural Heritage, both locally and at the national level. An archaeologist without experience in the method of archaeological fieldwork will not have the necessary background for research. Such experience will also be relevant to paleo-botanists, zoologists and visual anthropologists.

Applications for external research funding (RCN, EU) will normally include at least one to two PhD students. PhD students take part in research projects, and two of the current PhD students are doing their research within the Joint Research project.

The teaching by UiB Museum staff at the different departments of UiB has not been properly compensated for. Discussions between UM and the departments in April 2016 will hopefully solve these challenges.

Teaching is not a primary duty of the museum, and the involvement of museum staff in teaching is based on individual initiatives. More generally, the museum takes on major educational responsibilities through its exhibitions and outreach events.

Other societal impact
Societal impact is a major dimension of most of the museum’s work. The impact case study is strong and demonstrates the close link between the museum’s interdisciplinary research and impact outcomes in terms of enhancing the experience of different parts of the Hardanger region, adding time depth and pedagogic arguments to visitors’ engagement with places.

Overall assessment
The museum is still undergoing structural resettlement following a major reorganisation; the decision-making process remains vague. The museum has several strengths, including its focus on interdisciplinarity, the quality of its collection, and the quality of research outputs, but the milieu appears rather fragile in terms of the need to invest in its infrastructure (buildings), staff expertise, employment conditions for staff, and the recognition/value of the importance of outreach vs pure research. A more explicit recruitment strategy might help to support the stated strategies, such as research.

Feedback
In developing its research strategy, the institution would be wise to scrutinise its unique strengths and to build on them, to explore different ways of connecting outreach with research, and to develop a recruitment and training regime that will support the research strategy.
3.10 University of Oslo, Museum of Cultural History (UiOmuseum/KHM)

The Museum of Cultural History (KHM) is Norway’s largest archaeological and ethnographical museum. Due to its responsibilities within cultural heritage management and as a university research institution, KHM is subject to the legislation and policies of two ministries, the Ministry of Climate and Environment and the Ministry of Education and Research. KHM has five departments that provide a wide range of competences across different areas, such as Nordic and Mediterranean/Oriental Archaeology, conservation ethnography, anthropology, museum studies and university History. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of KHM increased from NOK 161.4 million (2013) to NOK 196.6 million (2015). The share of external funding of the total expenditure decreased, however, from 54 % to 53 % in the same period. Public Norwegian sources (the RCN not included) are the most important sources of external funding, followed by private Norwegian sources. Some modest funding from international private sources is documented during the period (NOK 3.9 million on average per year).

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, 32 researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The following data were submitted by the institution: one research group (Centre for Viking Age Studies (ViS)), three research area publications and four impact case studies. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy (with reference to the institution)

KHM is Norway’s largest archaeological museum, with statutory obligations to conduct archaeological investigations in ten counties (approx. 50–75 excavations p.a.). It includes four academic departments, of which Archaeology is the largest. The overall research strategy is decided by the director and museum board (comprising representatives of academic staff, administrative staff, students and one external member). Each head of department is responsible for the research conducted within his/her department. A ‘Research Council’ is appointed by the director, although its role is not entirely clear. Strategic plans for research, exhibitions and recruitment resulted from a reorganisation of KHM in 2012–2013 and are clearly articulated. Three research themes are identified, each with an associated research group and each supported by internal grants.

Resources

KHM has outstanding facilities, including conservation and other laboratories. Of its total budget, 53% comes from external sources, mostly from development-led excavations. The museum has around 25 permanent academic staff, The majority of staff have 50% research contracts while about one third of staff have 20% of their time allocated to research. In addition, eight fully funded PhD positions are attached to KHM. Research staff are supported by an impressive range of conservators, administrative and ICT posts. KHM’s collections are of international importance and online databases are publicly available.

Research production and quality

Between 2011 and 2015, the 32 researchers at UiO Museum of Cultural History reached 172 publication points – 59% of them had at least four publication points, while only 13% had no publication points; 14% of publications were at Level 2, 52% in English and 48% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).
KHM has had considerable success with major European grant applications (notably HERA) and has two applications pending for Horizon 2020/ERC. In the past 10 years, KHM has hosted 10 externally funded projects. Six of them are concerned with the Viking Age/early Middle Ages. This is the chief (though not only) research focus of KHM and it has been explicitly prioritised since 2006. A strategy implemented in 2010 to increase publication output (by assigning publication points) and to publish what would formerly have remained as ‘grey literature’ has also succeeded, increasing the number of works published annually from 31 to 72.

**Recruitment and training**
Five of nine leading positions are held by women. At the top leader level, the gender composition is more unequal and most positions are held by men. UiO offers gender equality and research leadership programmes. Eight PhD/postdocs are employed, as well as some externally funded research fellows. It is not clear to what extent targeted support and training is available to early career researchers. Recruitment is international, with 65% of the current fellowships being held by non-Norwegian nationals. Sabbatical arrangements are generous and based on publication points; in future, staff will be encouraged to conduct research stays abroad, although care must be taken not to discriminate against staff with young children who may be unable to take up such positions. Seven academic positions will be advertised in the coming two years although it is not stated in which fields. Individual grants are available to support research and KHM participates in the Nordic Graduate School in Archaeology.

**Networking**
KHM played a leading role in establishing the joint research network for the six university museums (with RCN funding). It has active collaborations with labs in Denmark and Sweden. Five of the ten externally funded projects were undertaken in collaboration with institutions outside Norway.

**Impact on teaching**
KHM helps train UiO students in Archaeology, conservation and museology. Most staff have a 10% teaching obligation. Staff supervise PhD students.

**Other societal impact**
Three case studies were submitted. The impact of The Assembly Project (TAP) has primarily been academic and involves ‘increasing awareness’ about assembly sites. A popular TV series was made, however, based on the project and the outcome also featured in a major exhibition. Their overall strategy for the dissemination of research outputs has influenced government policy in relation to university museums. The Viking Ship museum attracts around 450 thousand visitors each year. KHM has used crowd-sourcing in connection with scanning older archival material.

**Overall assessment**
TAP KHM is distinguished by an excellent level of international collaboration, very strong publications and extensive work on public engagement.

**Feedback**
This is an extremely well-produced and detailed submission, with ample evidence of the leading role played by KHM in Norwegian archaeological research.
3.11 University of Stavanger, Museum of Archaeology (UiSmuseum)

The Museum of Archaeology (UiS Museum) is organised as a unit under the University of Stavanger (UiS), at the same level as the university’s three faculties. The museum is organised in four departments: Collections, Conservation, Dissemination, and Protection of Cultural Heritage Sites. No teaching is conducted at the museum, but certain members of the staff teach at the university’s other faculties, as well as at other institutions in Norway. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of UiS Museum increased from NOK 81.9 million (2013) to NOK 92.9 million (2015). The share of external funding of the total expenditure also increased from 30% to 35% in the same period. Private Norwegian sources are the most important sources of external funding, followed by very minor funding from the RCN and other international private sources.

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, UiS Museum listed 31 researchers for HUMEVAL. The institution submitted one research area publication but no impact case studies. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy
The museum has a clear management structure. All heads of department report to the museum’s director, who reports directly to the university rector and director. A key strategic aim is to increase the publication rate. The research strategy is centred on four rather broadly defined themes, e.g. ‘identity’ and museology. The panel would have appreciated greater clarity regarding these themes, how the research strategy is arrived at and how strategic decisions are made.

Resources
UiS Museum has advanced scientific databases for source material within the museum’s research areas: archaeology, environmental archaeological and natural sciences. This applies to paper and digital archives, advanced laboratories within the fields of conservation and natural science, photo collections and other source material. Considerable funds have been spent on a long-term project focusing on quality assurance, digitisation and publication of scientific source material. The museum strives to make its scientific source material available to researchers nationally and internationally.

Around 35% of the museum’s funding comes from external sources, mostly from archaeological excavations in which scientific data are collected, which is the basis for research at the museum. A small proportion of the external funding comes from international collaborations (e.g. DFG for the ‘Harbours’ project) and the RCN. There is very good infrastructure to support archaeological research, including a lab, archives and internally produced periodicals. Generous research leave arrangements are in place. The panel questioned whether the lack of an Archaeology department at the university constrained the museum’s ability to conduct research. For example, do researchers have access to adequate library resources? The museum has recently obtained three government-funded permanent positions. The panel would have appreciated further clarification about the nature and role of these posts within the museum.

Research production and quality
Between 2011 and 2015, the 31 researchers at UiS Museum reached 46 publication points – 19% of them had at least four publication points, while 39% had no publication points; 19% of publications
were at Level 2, 67% in English and 76% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

Three staff members have research as a substantial part of their contracts (two professors, one associate professor). All are highly productive and have produced archaeological research of international significance. The sample publication is excellent. It is methodologically innovative and contains significant results. It appears in Norway’s leading archaeological journal, but could equally have been published in an international journal such as *European Journal of Archaeology*, or *World Archaeology*.

**Recruitment and training**

UiS Museum has facilitated attending courses as a guest student and work at other national and international institutions; the most recent doctorate awarded to a member of the staff was completed at a foreign institution. One of the scientists has been granted the ERASMUS staff mobility scholarship for six weeks in Dublin in autumn 2016.

The doctoral programme at the University of Stavanger has a clear expectation of researcher mobility. This is something the museum will endeavour to achieve by facilitating mobility in cases where this is practicable. So far, none of the museum’s research fellows have had stays abroad in line with these intentions.

With respect to recruitment, about one third of the academic staff have come from abroad in recent years.

UiS Museum aims to follow up the European Commission’s recommendation on the ‘European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers’, including RCN’s main guidelines regarding career counselling and the development of assessment systems to attract the best researchers.

Researchers are encouraged to obtain PhDs and are given funding to help them develop proposals. One staff member was recently awarded a PhD by a foreign institution. Money is earmarked to support female staff seeking promotion. The museum has found it difficult to attract good PhD applicants for research fellowships, but will be able to accept postdoctoral applicants in future.

**Networking**

Measures facilitating international research cooperation:

* Travel grants and working capital: International research cooperation is facilitated by awarding travel grants and working capital to participate in various international meetings/forums.

* Lecturers and visiting scholars: The museum encourages extending invitations to international lecturers and visiting scholars.

* Publication point grants, CRISTIN: Researchers are personally awarded a portion of the publication point grant money, which can be used for travel in connection with research networks and copyediting.

* Programme area for research: Since 2009, the University of Stavanger has organised parts of its research in ‘programme areas for research’, which are established for a three-year period with a possible extension. UiS Museum has two such programmes running. They are used to strengthen the strategic research at the museum, including international cooperation.
UNI-MUSEER: Researchers at UiS Museum have participated in and collaborated on activities in accordance with RCN’s priorities for UNI-MUSEUMS/FIF and FIF-Dissemination. The resources granted to the project have been used for networking and cooperative research efforts between university museums, as well as for publishing.

Beyond these initiatives, UiS Museum researchers have participated in and contributed to projects, networks and organisations both inside and outside the EU, as well as in international research programmes, such as the DFG programme ‘Harbours in the North Atlantic (800–1300 AD)’, the RCN programme Environment 2015 LAND (with the following projects: InSituFarms, The Norwegian Millstone Landscape, and CultMeM – Culture and Memory research).

One member of staff has an ERASMUS scholarship to Dublin; another has links to two UK Universities. The museum is actively seeking to develop international research networks. Travel grants enable researchers to attend international meetings. Only one of the four projects described in 2.2 is clearly collaborative, however, although several are multidisciplinary. The panel would have appreciated more specific examples of collaboration and networks.

Impact on teaching
The museum does not conduct its own teaching, but teaches and supervises at various levels at other faculties and universities, both nationally and internationally.

No teaching is undertaken within the museum and UiS has no Archaeology department. Academic staff do, however, supervise graduate students at other faculties and universities.

Other societal impact
N/A

Overall assessment
The museum produces research of international quality that is original and methodologically innovative, and appears in high-ranking publications.

Feedback
The museum may wish to consider holding a workshop on writing grant applications. The panel would have welcomed more specific examples of networks. The difficulty of balancing the pressures of collection management with the requirement to undertake research could be addressed by a research strategy based explicitly on the museum’s collections and exhibitions.
3.12 The Arctic University of Norway UiT, Tromsø University Museum (UiTmuseum)

The Department of Cultural Sciences (SKU) is an organisational unit within Tromsø University Museum (TMU), which, in turn, is a unit within the Arctic University of Norway (UIT). Established in 1872, TMU is the oldest scientific institution in Northern Norway and became part of UiT in 1976. The main responsibilities of the museum are research and research communication, development and conservation of scientific collections, dissemination, heritage management and education. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of TMU increased from NOK 8.3 million (2013) to NOK 9.8 million (2015). The share of external funding of the total expenditure also increased from 9% to 39% in the same period. The RCN is the most important source of external funding, followed by other public Norwegian sources.

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, five researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The institution has submitted one research area publication and two impact case studies. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy
The Department of Cultural Sciences is one of two organisational units of the University Museum of Tromsø. The museum was founded in 1872 and became part of UiT in 1976. The museum was reorganised in 2007 into two scientific departments, focusing on natural and cultural sciences, respectively. A new museum facility is currently being planned and will be built in Tromsø city centre. The Strategy Plan 2014–2020 aims to strengthen basic research and increase the level of interdisciplinary research, as well as strengthening international collaboration. From the perspective of research strategies, it does not make sense to organise research in eight disciplines in a group with twelve researchers in permanent positions. The recent priority given to Museology and Archaeology at the PhD and postdoc levels also seems to focus on disciplines and not on research themes. Given the small numbers of staff in the Department of Cultural Science and its position within the university, it would be better to identify and more clearly articulate a limited number of strategic research themes.

Resources
TMU has a substantial number of archives, databases and collections. The Museum Library includes one of the largest collections in the world on literature on the High North. Broadly speaking, the collections can be divided into six main collections:

* Archaeological collections: 297,734 catalogue numbers
* Sámi ethnographic collections: 4,450 catalogue numbers
* Recent cultural history collections: 6,772 catalogue numbers
* Polar history collections (Polar Museum): 2,797 catalogue numbers
* Northern Norwegian Folk Music Archive: 13,758 catalogue numbers
* Photo archive: 356,162 catalogue numbers

TMU also holds a large collection of church art (665 catalogue numbers), a numismatic collection (3,650 catalogue numbers) and a traditional seal hunting vessel, MS Polstjerna.

The allocation, from 2012, of two permanent positions responsible for the archives, collections and coordination of databases is a major investment in the research infrastructure. In addition, PhD
students and postdoctoral fellows at the museum work on the collections as part of their mandatory duties. A number of students (at BA and MA level) have been employed to work on the scientific collections.

Another investment in research infrastructure has been the REVITA Project carried out as part of the revitalisation of university museum collections. REVITA aimed to achieve a complete overview of the collections through registration and digitalisation.

The Cultural Historical Laboratory has prioritised the acquisition of an x-ray machine for digital x-rays of artefacts. SKU is setting aside money for this purchase, which is planned in 2017. This will aid documentation, conservation and research, especially of metal artefacts, but also including a range of other museum objects.

The planned new museum building will be a massive investment in research infrastructure for all activities at TMU. This building will facilitate and improve the research infrastructure by co-locating the majority of the activities at the museum.

The museum holds substantial archives, databases and research and teaching collections with a strong regional focus.

Research production and quality
Between 2011 and 2015, the 17 researchers at UiT University Museum reached 72 publication points – 47% of them had at least four publication points, while 29% had no publication points; 32% of publications were at Level 2, 69% in English and 66% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

Researchers at SKU participate in internationally funded research projects, including the ERC project Arctic Domus, situated at the University of Aberdeen, the NordForsk (NRC) projects Rangifer Domus (concluded in 2014), and Yoik in motion between tradition and modernity, managed by SKU but also involving Umeå University and the University of Oulu. The single publication offered provides evidence of strong research quality and an international standard of research production (published in English in international journals). The list of publications shows an appropriately mixed approach to publications, given the cross-disciplinary nature of the research, with publications in both Norwegian and English and a range of different national and international journals and publishers.

Recruitment and training
There is a long tradition of recruiting researchers from other institutions nationally and internationally.

All tenured academic staff are given an opportunity for mobility as part of their sabbatical/research leave. All PhD students and postdoctoral fellows are encouraged to spend time at research institutions abroad with financing provided by the RCN or the Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education at UiT. The financing also covers family members.

UiT endorsed the European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers in 2010, and has been working actively to follow up this endorsement and prepare for implementation. In conformity with the HR Strategy for Researchers, a plan of action for the Charter and Code has been decided for a period of two years. Following this period, the plan will undergo internal evaluation and revision. An external evaluation will take place every four years. In
connection with the internal and external review and revision, UiT will map whether the plan of action’s goals for measures/activities have been achieved.

The department has 12 full-time academic staff at a range of different levels and it has recently positively addressed gender balance issues through a Gender Equality Plan. Staff are recruited nationally and internationally. A professor II position in Museology (up to 20%) was created at TMU from 1 September 2013 to 31 December 2016. The professor recruited holds a chair at the Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages, at the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Oslo. There is a strong focus on staff having international and national mobility for research leave. It is a weakness that ‘the vast majority of the recruitment at SKU over the past decade has been from TMU or UiT’ (p. 14 in the self-assessment). This does not appear to have changed in the past two years as new permanent staff, PhDs and postdocs have been recruited.

**Networking**

Researchers at SKU participate in international projects, such as the ERC project Arctic Domus, situated at the University of Aberdeen, and the NordForsk projects Rangifer Domus (concluded 2014) and Yoik i motion between tradition and modernity, managed by SKU but also involving Umeå University and the University of Oulu.

When it comes to the scientific collections, TMU will expand research cooperation with the other university museums in Norway (Bergen, Oslo, Stavanger and Trondheim). The university museums have established cooperation on both research and collections: MUSIT (Management of Collections Databases at the University Museums in Norway) with the web portal UNIMUS. UNIMUS includes the following databases: the Photo Database, Database for Archaeological Artefacts, Database for Ethnographic Objects and the Database for Numismatics.

The cultural heritage management institutions within TMU’s administrative area (Northern Norway north of Rana Municipality) cooperate actively with each other: the Sámi Parliament, Nordland County Council, Troms County Council, Finnmark County Council and the World Heritage Rock Art Centre, Alta Museum.

The Strategy Plan aims to strengthen national and international collaboration on research, research funding, collections management and heritage management. The museum clearly acts as a facilitator of cross-disciplinary research activities across UiT. There is a good mobility programme for PhDs and postdocs, generous terms for sabbaticals and important resources for collaborations within the university and with other regional institutions. Things are weaker when it comes to international networking in the context of specific research themes and projects, as well as with other university museums.

**Impact on teaching**

The institution offers no study programmes.

The TMU archives and collections are actively utilised by national and international students at both the BA and MA level. PhD students utilise the museum archives and collections in their research.

As part of mandated archaeological heritage management activities, students take part in the archaeological excavations, write reports, catalogue findings and input documentation data into the databases. The number of students taking part in archaeological heritage management projects was previously higher, but has declined significantly in recent years, with the majority of field archaeologists having completed an MA.
Researchers and PhD students at TMU teach a variety of courses at UiT and other institutions as part of the interplay between teaching and research at the institution at the BA and MA level.

The research undertaken at TMU is relevant to other departments at UiT and institutions outside the university. However, the current financial structure at UiT, whereby individual departments and institutes must pay for the use of lecturers from other institutional units within the university, represents a major obstacle to the internal exchange of lecturers at the institution.

Moreover, TMU has not been given the right to conduct student examinations, although it has petitioned for this right. Most of the researchers at SKU do take part in the examination of students at other institutions, both national and internationally. Academic staff have the right to serve as primary supervisors for PhD students at the institution and several researchers co-supervise PhD students at other institutions. Researchers also supervise MA students at UiT and other institutions, both nationally and internationally.

The museum is integrated with teaching at the university and appears to have an impact at all levels, from undergraduate to PhD. However, there are no specific study programmes at this institution. The museum is an obvious and very important resource for all levels of teaching at the university, but the self-assessment does not say much about the role of the research produced in the department in teaching activities at the university.

**Other societal impact**

The two case studies represent significant social impact through heritage management activities and research projects that engage with important social issues, which are communicated to the public by way of museum exhibitions.

**Overall assessment**

The Department of Cultural Sciences represents a strongly interdisciplinary area, one of two major divisions within Tromsø University Museum. It clearly adds significant strength to the museum and to the research environment at UiT as a whole. In addition to research, it is strongly focused on communication and provides a conduit through which university research can be communicated to the public.

**Feedback**

The Museum of Tromsø is the oldest scientific research institution in the region. External research funding needs to be increased to achieve its ambitions. Staff might be encouraged to pursue a more international strategy in research publication to lift the international profile of the department. More thinking needs to be done on the development of strategic research themes, both as a way of strengthening the scientific profile of the institution within the university, and to facilitate international collaboration and external funding. In a university museum with very good resources for research and communication it should be a goal in itself to organise work differently from traditional university departments and to develop new ways of integrating research and communication. The potential for such integrated work should also be considered when recruiting researchers to such environments.
3.13 BI Norwegian Business School (BI)

The Business History Unit at the Norwegian Business School (BI) is organised as one of three groups in the Department of Innovation and Economic Organisation. According to the institutional self-assessment, BI’s total expenditure within the research area of the panel increased from NOK 7.5 million (2013) to NOK 7.8 million (2015). External funding decreased, however, from NOK 8.1 million to NOK 5.2 million in the same period. Private Norwegian sources are the most important source of external funds, followed by the RCN and other public Norwegian sources. Notably, BI has not documented any core funding from the Norwegian government.

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, twelve researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The institution has not submitted any research area publications and no impact case studies. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy

The Business History Unit (BHU) at BI Norwegian Business School is part of the Department of Innovation and Economic Organisation. Although academic authority lies with the Business History Unit, the Head of Department and the subordinate Provost also influence BHU’s work. The self-assessment indicates that the leadership structure is changeable and not satisfactory. While four to five professors and associate professors who concentrate on teaching are financed by BI Norwegian Business School, five to six full-time researchers depend on commissioned projects. As BHU is currently in a transition, it lacks a clear strategy.

Resources

There is a specialist library for Norwegian (and Scandinavian) Economic History. BI Norwegian Business School provides the resources for the teaching programme, mainly by raising fees from students. However, research depends to a large degree on external funds, i.e. mainly from companies. This could be reduced if BI Norwegian Business School provided at least basic funding. In contrast, BHU intends to expand teaching in order to secure more institutional support from BI Norwegian Business School.

Research production and quality

Between 2011 and 2015, the 12 researchers in BHU reached 59 publication points – 67% of them had at least four publication points, while only 8% had no publication points; 8% of publications were at Level 2, 36% in English and 32% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

Contrary to the trend in Business History in the last two decades, BHU has concentrated on qualitative research on the micro-level. It has produced a number of publications, but few of them in peer-reviewed journals (which are particularly important in Economic History). The institution is strong in Business History and intends to take advantage of this in the future.

Recruitment and training

The current group of staff (three teaching positions, six research positions, one doctoral student) contains three female scholars (two researchers and one doctoral student).
There is no clear recruitment strategy, as researchers have to raise funds for their salaries by securing commissioned projects. Again, at least basic institutional support would allow for more strategic recruitment. There is no doctoral teaching programme.

**Networking**
The Business History Unit builds its external non-academic collaboration on its extensive commissioned research. The group regards itself as very strong in this respect and the aim of producing top-class research out of commissioned work has been successful and has strengthened its academic standing. All group members have been able to gain academic competence through commissioned work. There is no formal international collaboration, but the group does produce individual publications of international significance and it participated in the formation of the European Business History Association. The group has organised a series of international workshops from 2010 to 2013 and, in 2014, submitted a bid to host the World Economic History Congress in 2018. One of the historians is currently (2012–2018) a member of the executive committee of the International Economic History Association.

BHU does not have a formal collaboration with other institutions, although it plays a role in international professional associations such as the European Business History Association, and through commissioned work. Moreover, it has organised a number of conferences and workshops.

**Impact on teaching**
The Business History Unit has a fairly diverse teaching programme, but all courses have to be relevant to BI’s business education. Most of the courses tend to be more macro-oriented than the research, reflecting the role of historians in a business school. Of particular importance is an introductory course called ‘Bedriften’ (The Company) which is taught to all first-year BA students at BI (about 4,700 divided between a number of classes, also at BI in Bergen, Stavanger and Trondheim).

**Other societal impact**
Research by BHU has influenced companies and organisations, but information on wider public impact is sparse. The documentation provided makes it difficult to know or assess whether it has had an impact.

**Overall assessment**
BHU is strong in commissioned business research, and it has developed a good teaching programme, but teaching and research are not strongly interlinked.

**Feedback**
The panel encourages BHU to request more support for research from BI Norwegian Business School, to develop a doctoral programme and to create a stronger synergy between research and teaching. It should attempt to publish more articles in peer-reviewed journals. Not least, BHU needs to expand its international cooperation.
3.14 Norwegian School of Economics (NHH)

Established in 1936, the Norwegian School of Economics (NHH) is a public, specialised university organised in six departments. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total funding of NHH has increased from NOK 173.5 million (2013) to NOK 195.2 million (2015). The share of external funding of the total expenditure has been relatively constant throughout this period, at a level of 17% per year. The RCN is the most important source of external funding, followed by Norwegian private sources. From 2013 to 2015, there was a relatively big increase in EU funding, from NOK 0.6 million in 2013 to almost NOK 2 million in 2015.

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, five researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The following data were submitted by the institution: one impact case study and one research area publication. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

**Organisation, leadership and strategy**

The Economic History group at NHH has been part of the Department of Economics since 1998. It consists of 4+1 senior researchers (full professors) who specialise in research areas such as Monetary History, Maritime History and Business History. There are no scientific priorities or strategic initiatives regarding this research area at the institutional level. Nor are any strategic initiatives reported at the research group level. Some of the researchers in Economic History have collaborated on individual projects, but this does not fit the definition of research groups used in this evaluation. The institution has no particular development, expansion or recruitment plans for the research area. A clear profile and organisational structure are not discernible.

**Resources**

The established principle in Norway is that students do not pay fees for education, which limits NHH’s ability to raise additional income. The school does, however, have the right to charge fees for Executive Education programmes, which has been an important source of additional income for the school.

In general, staff divide their time evenly between teaching and research, but there is much individual variation over time. The institution wants to increase its external funding, which is currently below 20%. Nothing is reported about external funding within the area of Economic History. Infrastructural resources include an archive of Norwegian wage and price history.

**Research production and quality**

Between 2011 and 2015, the five researchers at NHH reached 37 publication points – 100% of them had at least four publication points, while 0% had not publication points; 31% of publications were at Level 2, 88% in English and 71% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016). All researchers within the research area of Economic History contribute to national and international journals within their respective speciality. The overall productivity is good and the sample publication of high quality.

**Recruitment and training**

The percentage of international academic staff members at NHH increased from 18% to 27% in the period 2007–2014. With just a few exceptions, new academic staff members are required to have a PhD or equivalent, so that the proportion of staff with a doctoral degree is now 96%. The school has
no plans to greatly increase the overall size of its academic staff, but continues to actively recruit both female and international candidates to vacancies that arise. Resources have been set aside for international recruitment and more academic departments participate in international recruitment fairs. The greatest impact on diversity has been in relation to postdoctoral positions.

Recruiting internationally remains an important part of the school’s internationalisation strategy. In order to support the academic departments in this, a project was set up in 2015 to provide a framework for the induction of international staff and their families. The project team identified the needs of new international staff and their families, developed measures to help meet these needs and put them in place.

As for mobility and career paths, NHH staff can have their qualifications evaluated with a view to career advancement, in which case the institution appoints an evaluation committee. In this system, assistant professors can advance to associate professors, and associate professors to full professors. All evaluation committees have external members. PhD students and postdoctoral scholars are encouraged to spend time at research institutions abroad, and funding is provided. As for the mobility of senior staff, NHH has a wide network of international cooperating institutions, at which staff members sojourn for shorter or longer periods, especially during sabbaticals.

For many years, there has been very few PhDs and postdocs affiliated to the area of Economic History. No plans are presented to change this. There is thus a lack of balance in relation to different career stages. There is also a complete lack of gender balance (all five professors are men). The institution states that it adopted a plan for improved gender balance in 2007, but the reported figures for the whole institution indicate that progress has been slow.

**Networking**

In addition to NHH’s strategic research initiative, NHH was one of eight Norwegian institutions, together with the RCN and the University of California, Berkeley, which established the Peder Sæther Centre for Advanced Study at Berkeley. The primary mission of the centre is to strengthen ongoing research collaborations and foster the development of new research collaborations between academic staff at the University of California, Berkeley, and the consortium of Norwegian academic institutions.

A separate initiative currently being planned with UC Berkeley is a new Innovation School. This has developed out of the successful Norwegian Entrepreneurship programme, (Gründerskolen), that NHH has offered for many years. This programme gives students an opportunity to gain first-hand experience of entrepreneurship by working as interns in high-tech start-up companies overseas.

Individual researchers collaborate with scholars at other relevant institutions, both nationally and internationally. However, there are no strategic partnerships or particular plans for further developing research networks within the area of Economic History. There has been an increase in international recruitment to the institution as a whole.

**Impact on teaching**

At BA and MA level, students carry out research using interview methodology and produce reports analysing the results. At MA level, students write theses within language management and intercultural issues, and 75% of PhD students’ four-year period is devoted to research.

The research topics of the area are relevant to study programmes and courses in Economic History at the undergraduate and MA level. Students can write their MA thesis on topics related to the research of the Economic History group. There have been very few PhD students in the area. Individual
researchers have contributed textbooks on Norwegian Economic History, but there is little or no
information on the role of teaching as a context of research for this group or its individual members.

Other societal impact
The impact case concerns how historical research on certain economic indicators has contributed to
a standardised way of reporting and comparing the economic development of Norway. This work has
involved collaboration with statistical and financial authorities. It has also initiated public debate on
national self-perceptions of the historical development and relative status of the Norwegian
economy. This work makes a valuable contribution, and it will be interesting in future to monitor the
ongoing results of this collaboration.

Overall assessment
The area of Economic History comprises research of a good but not excellent quality. It also makes
important contributions to various study programmes in Economic History. There is a general lack of
strategic research initiatives, however, both at the group and the institutional level. The lack of PhDs
and postdoc fellows creates an imbalance in the overall research environment. Network activities
and international collaborations are limited to individual research projects.

Feedback
The institutional self-assessment reflects a passive attitude towards the research area of Economic
History and its future development. The research area’s role in the new strategic research initiatives
of the institution needs to be clarified. In particular, the reviewers urge the institution to
development a clear strategy for recruitment and for the dissemination of research findings in
teaching and beyond.
3.15 Telemark University College (HiT)

In 2016, Telemark University College (HiT) merged with Buskerud and Vestfold University College (HBV) to become the University of Southeast Norway (USN). For HUMEVAL, however, HiT is the relevant institution for the evaluation. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences (AF) was organised in four departments where the majority of the researchers in the Humanities belonged to the Department of Cultural Studies and Humanities (IKH). According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of HiT within the research area of the panel increased from NOK 6.9 million (2013) to NOK 11.9 million (2015). The share of external funding of the total expenditure also increased from 4.6% to 8.8% in the same period. The external funding only comes from Norwegian sources. The RCN is not listed as a funding source, however.

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, 16 researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The institution has not submitted three research groups (Kulturarv i bruk, Politisk kultur and EMAL) but no research area publications or impact case studies. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy
HiT is an institution in transition following the merger, and it is now in the process of applying for full university status. Funds are available to encourage researchers to apply for national and international grants, although the precise details are not specified, and it is unclear what intellectual and institutional (in addition to financial) support is provided. HiT supports several research groups (embodied knowledge; heritage; politics of sport; sustainable tourism; body and meaning). These are large and relevant fields and serve as useful umbrellas for a number of disciplines and methods. In terms of strategy and leadership, it is unclear how HiT intends to make a distinctive contribution in all these fields, including how it plans to use its resources and limited number of researchers to maximise impact. For example, the uses of heritage is a subject that is also studied in many other places. Altogether, the institution lacks a clear profile. It might be worth prioritising particular research topics and questions where Telemark might make a difference. HiT has three PhD programmes that are central to its application for university status. The one programme that relates to this assessment is Cultural Studies, which is cross-disciplinary. No information is provided about the structure of this programme or its relationship to the research groups or intellectual strategy. The introduction of postdoctoral fellowships has been raised, but awaits a decision until the transition to university status is confirmed. HiT should be encouraged to devise strategies for the dissemination of knowledge.

Resources
HiT has many laboratories, also at AF, connected with the Department of Environmental and Health Studies and the Department of Sports and Outdoor Studies. For the Humanities, the main resource is the library. The library at USN has a collection of around 214,000 print books, 163,000 electronic books, 1,700 print journals and 27,000 electronic journals. The library subscribes to many of the most important database services in the Humanities, such as Idunn, Atekst, Sage and JSTOR, as well as to multidisciplinary databases such as Science direct, Springer, Wiley and Taylor & Francis.

There are libraries at all campuses at HiT, and they are well equipped to support the ongoing research. The physical collection at the library at the Faculty of Arts and Sciences in Bø has around 110,000 print books and a particularly strong collection of books on Norwegian literature and
linguistics. Other areas within the Humanities, such as History, Philosophy and Cultural Studies, are also well represented.

Due to the multi-campus model, there is well-established e-communication with sufficient IT support at hand.

Telemark provides some financial support for researchers preparing grant applications, but the precise nature of this or other support is unclear.

**Research production and quality**

Between 2011 and 2015, the 16 researchers at HiT reached 54 publication points – 50% of them had at least four publication points, while only 19% had no publication points; 8% of publications were at Level 2, 22% in English and 56% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

On average, researchers only have 20% of their time earmarked for research, and they devote 60% to teaching and 20% to other activities. The self-assessment explains that heads of department have some flexibility to adapt time commitments for individual lecturers. The institution should have a principled and strategic debate about the respective priorities of teaching, administration and research. At present, the little time that is earmarked for research cannot be said to be sufficient to maintain dynamic research groups, manage a PhD programme or lead to a significant research output.

**Recruitment and training**

HiT carried out a project to qualify lecturers at AF, where each researcher’s ambition to become a professor was addressed in dialogue with the head of department. Career ambitions were also mapped at AF around 2012. When R&D funds, i.e. sabbatical leaves, are allocated, the researcher’s ambition and ability to achieve professor status is one of the main considerations.

HiT encourages PhD students to study abroad. There are funds available and the Internationalisation Committee puts great effort into finding relevant networks and partners for PhD students and other staff. Awareness of the need for international experiences has increased in recent years.

In 2014, HiT was granted permission to sign the European Charter and Code for Researchers by the European Commission. The new institution’s ambition is to continue this work.

The information on staffing states that researchers are expected to have a PhD, but it contains little other information on staffing strategy, recruitment or career development.

**Networking**

HiT had an international committee with representatives from all four faculties. It advised the rector on international matters and distributed funds to researchers or research groups committed to international projects and cooperation. Whether this will continue has yet to be decided.

AF is by nature a multi-disciplinary faculty. The PhD programme in Culture is a good example of an interdisciplinary approach, since it involves two faculties (AF and the Faculty of Art, Folk Culture and Teacher Education) and four departments. Administrative responsibility lies with AF. HiT also had several cross-disciplinary research groups.

AF has formal cooperation with Telemark Research Institute, located in Bø, at SKI (Centre for Culture and Sports Science). It is also cooperates with this institute on the financing and supervising of PhD
students. Finally, AF has a close relationship with the local authority and Bø Municipality. There has been a local development project in Bø between the local authority, local businesses and HiT.

The self-assessment mentions that students are often recruited through international partners and networks.

**Impact on teaching**

The MA programme in Cultural Studies has a broad perspective on 'culture', and the researchers occasionally supervise MA students, depending on the subject. There is also room in the MA programme in Educational Science for researchers to organise courses based on their own research, as well as supervising students studying relevant topics.

HiT sees student involvement in research projects as beneficial. This is especially evident in the Natural Science Departments where students are involved in projects from the BA to PhD level. HiT reports that this is not the case in the Humanities. At best, as in the MA in Cultural Studies, externally funded projects are occasionally available for the students.

HiT believes that the most plausible explanations for the lack of student involvement in research projects would be ‘traditional thinking in the Humanities’ and ‘lack of suitable projects’.

HiT has recently established research groups to be able to take on bigger projects. A related ambition at HiT is to see the possibilities that student projects represent and include them in applications.

Telemark offers lecturers an opportunity at advanced BA level and also at MA level to create specialised courses in which they can draw on their research. No information is provided about the number of courses or particular approaches to research-led teaching. In contrast to the sciences, students do not at present get involved in research in the Humanities, although HiT aims to change this through the establishment of research groups. Institutional support for such initiatives could be specified.

**Other societal impact**

Research on the role of design in education fed into the national debate about the reform of the school curriculum. Some of that research at Telemark was used directly in the political debate. This is a good example of a response mode of impact, where existing research was used to respond to public and policy debates. HiT might also wish to consider taking more proactive steps and addressing how research groups might turn their findings into social impact in future.

**Overall assessment**

HiT is a teaching college that is now aiming for full accreditation as a university. It has started a PhD programme in Cultural Studies and is awaiting the first cohort of graduates. Time commitments, however, remain overwhelmingly biased towards teaching and administration.

**Feedback**

The panel applauds Telemark for its pursuit of a doctoral programme and research groups, but it also urges it to develop a realistic overall research strategy, within the limits of its staff and resources. In particular, it might be helpful to narrow the focus of the aims and projects of the research groups to allow them to produce a smaller number of higher quality outputs and impacts. All in all, HiT needs to more selective and focus on particular research fields where it can make a sizeable impact.
3.16 Volda University College (HVO)

Volda University College (HVO) is organised in four faculties of which the Faculty of Humanities and Education is the largest. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of HVO for research relevant to the humanities has increased from NOK 58.7 million (2013) to NOK 66.2 million (2015). The share of external funding of the total expenditure decreased, however, from 15% to 12% in the same period. The RCN is the most important source of external funds, followed by other public Norwegian sources. Some modest EU funding is documented of around NOK 1 million per year.

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, six researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The following data were submitted by the institution: one research group (Cultural Encounters) and one impact case study. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy
Volda University College (HVO) is a higher education institution that has developed from an older teacher training college. It is a relatively small institution with four faculties, and most of the scholars assessed under Panel 5 come under the ‘cultural encounters’ research group at HVO. It focuses on cultural encounters in different spatial contexts and is multi-disciplinary in its make-up, consisting of historians, archaeologists, philosophers, theologians and religious studies scholars. It has only existed as a distinct research group for a few years, but it has strong research leadership from senior professors from diverse disciplines. It has a particular strength in local and regional histories, where it has an excellent track record in obtaining substantial sums (near NOK 10 million) for local and regional research projects, usually leading to multi-volume book publications. It currently has two clearly defined research foci, one on migration, especially contemporary labour migration to Norway and historical migration from Norway to North America, and one on the interaction between peasant farmers and the Norwegian civil service. The latter is important in challenging a long-held dualism describing an alleged conflict between farmers/folk culture and civil servants/elite culture.

Resources
The HVO library employs a staff of 10 and supports all subject areas taught at the university college. It provides a large number of resources, including about 100,000 printed volumes, more than 100,000 eBooks, a huge number of international databases, dictionaries and encyclopaedias, 350 current print journals and more than 17,000 full text e-journals. A reading room, video room, computer lab and other study areas are accessible during opening hours.

Data rooms, wireless network and language lab: HVO has several open computer rooms with approximately 300 PCs. In addition it has a digital language lab and a number of group rooms with PCs. HVO has a wireless network in large parts of the campus.

Special rooms: HVO is well equipped with special rooms for practical and aesthetical subjects like music, arts and crafts, sports and drama. The Music Department has a sound studio and special ICT study rooms. The Media Department has its own well-equipped editing facilities, and radio and television studios, and is among the foremost in the field when it comes to digitalisation of television and radio.
HVO provides help with the technical preparation of research applications and also has a publishing fund to facilitate open-access publication. There seem to be adequate library and IT facilities at hand, but, in comparison with bigger institutions, there is certainly a lack of R&D resources.

Research production and quality
Between 2011 and 2015, the six researchers at HVO reached 35 publication points – 50% of them had at least four publication points, while 33% had no publication points; 9% of publications were at Level 2, 16% in English and 35% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

Recruitment and training
PhD candidates are recruited through externally funded research projects and advertised positions at HVO. The PhD candidates participate in a PhD forum (‘Avhandlingsforum’). HVO offers two (internal) programmes to support PhD candidates: welfare research (study of professions) and didactics. These programmes are not included in HUMEVAL. The PhD candidates are encouraged to participate in international conferences and networks, and they are also encouraged to apply for funding from HVO to enable them to spend time at research institutions abroad.

HVO participates in several research schools at the national level.

In the last three years, only one PhD student graduated from the institution. The institution does not have any PhD programmes in the Humanities. It is unclear what specific training programmes are in place for PhD students. Regarding recruitment, it is clear that the college has defined particular research foci and is trying to recruit in those areas. No indication is given, however, of whether special attention is devoted to postdoctoral recruitment and career progression within the institution.

Networking
The nature of the research at HVO varies from individual programmes to applied development projects, conducted in close cooperation with end users. HVO is working to make courses more accessible, flexible and convenient for international applicants, and for the increasing number of students enrolled in lifelong learning courses. Sunnmøre Business Park for Culture and Arts, located in Volda, provides counselling for students who wish to establish their own businesses.

International work is emphasised in all study programmes through exchanges of teaching staff, internationally oriented research and by offering teaching and syllabuses in English. The programmes of study and the overall learning environment are organised to accommodate students who, in a Norwegian context, represent a minority in terms of cultural and language background. The academic environments and the courses are required to focus on intercultural challenges.

The regional research institute Møreforsking/Møre Research is an important partner. It offers research and knowledge-based development services in a broad range of areas, and one of its departments is located on the HVO campus.

HVO participates in the formal network UH-nett Vest. This is a collaboration between the University of Bergen and the university colleges in Bergen, Sogn og Fjordane, Stord/Haugesund and Volda. The objective of the network is to play an important and distinctive role in the fields of higher education and research. Its main focus is on teacher education and research. HVO is also a member of the network Forskningsforum Møre/Association of Universities, Universities Colleges and Research Institutes in Møre & Romsdal County. Forskningsforum Møre is working on plans to establish a
formal (regional) network in 2016 (spring semester) focusing on the European framework programme for Research and Innovation, Horizon 2020.

There is evidence of good international networking, with scholars from HVO taking up visiting positions at prestigious universities in the USA. At the same time, the institution actively seeks to attract international visiting fellows to Norway, although no specific examples are provided here.

**Impact on teaching**

HVO encourages BA and MA students to participate in R&D projects. Below-average class sizes enable students to frequently interact with academic and administrative staff. Lifelong studies are one of the main objectives, and HVO is endeavouring to make courses more accessible, flexible and convenient. The strategy is not to become a very large academic institution, but to remain a quality university college in the Northern hemisphere.

There is an MA programme entitled ‘Cultural Encounters’ that has been running successfully for more than ten years. It is strongly interdisciplinary in orientation. There is also good evidence in the case study that MA students are well-integrated in research projects, with several MA students contributing their MA theses to the research carried out within the project.

**Other societal impact**

The cultural encounters theme is highly relevant to society, as is detailed in connection with the first-ever project on the Coastal and Maritime History of Norway undertaken by the research group Cultural Encounters. It has provided significant insight into encounters between fishermen and their communities and inland communities, local, regional and national bureaucracies and communities from abroad. This historical knowledge could form the basis for formulating policies on intercultural understanding and communication, although no evidence of such impact is provided. The impact case study provided concerns the encounters between peasant farmers and civil servants mentioned above. The self-assessment shows a long list of publications coming out of the research project and it also demonstrates how the existing views on the historical relationship between a folk and an elite culture is changing because of this research, but nowhere does it address how this impacts on society.

**Overall assessment**

Overall, our impression is that, for a small institution, HVO has developed a reasonable research strategy with which it has been quite successful. It focuses on local and regional research within the framework of ‘cultural encounters’, which allows it to build on its multidisciplinary strength. It has been particularly successful in linking its research strategy with its teaching, especially at the MA level.

**Feedback**

The institution should be encouraged to build on its success at the MA level and build a PhD programme on cultural encounters. This would significantly strengthen its research portfolio. In addition, it should be encouraged to think about ways of promoting more postdoctoral research. It should link more with policymakers to translate its significant research results into the public sphere. It should actively develop plans to attract increased research funding to provide better research resources and build a stronger research base.
3.17 Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies (IFS)

The Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies (IFS) is an independent research Institute and part of the Norwegian Defence University College (NDUC). The research centres at IFS are organised around four main, interdisciplinary themes: Asian Security Studies, Civil-Military Relations, Norwegian and European Security, and Transatlantic Studies. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of IFS increased from NOK 35.5 million (2013) to NOK 37.8 million (2015). The share of external funding of the total expenditure also increased from 31.7% to 65.7% in the same period. Public Norwegian sources other than the RCN are the most important source of external funding, followed by funding from the RCN. Some modest funding from international private sources is documented in 2013.

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, 15 researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The institution has submitted one impact case study but no research area publications. Researchers from IFS take part in a research group submitted by UiTHSL (From North Front to Ice Front). The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy

The Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies (IFS) is part of the Norwegian Defence University College (NDUC) and comprises four research centres. IFS offers an MA degree programme in military studies at NDUC and civilian education institutions. The organisational structure and leadership positions (Director, Head of Research and Heads of Centres) are clear. IFS is currently in transition and is devising a research strategy that will concentrate on three major fields: Norway’s security challenges (1), armed forces and society, (2) and global power shifts (3). These are promising issues. The latter two fields are huge, however, and should be specified. Moreover, the connections between the three fields are not clear.

Resources

IFS does not offer courses at PhD level. PhD students employed at IFS are graduates of other institutions. A total of five PhD students employed at IFS graduated from other institutions in the period 2013–2015.

IFS does not maintain any major research infrastructure, but a high-quality library is at its disposal at NDUC.

The resources provided by the Norwegian government (mainly the Norwegian Ministry of Defence) are apparently adequate. Professors and associate professors can devote 60% of their time to research. All tenured academic staff can apply for research leave and sabbaticals. However, about half of the staff depend on external funds. This is problematic, as it aggravates or even impedes long-term research planning.

Research production and quality

Between 2011 and 2015, the 15 researchers at IFS reached 70 publication points – 60% of them had at least four publication points, while only 13% had no publication points; 24% of publications were at Level 2, 46% in English and 13% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

No publications have been submitted by the institution for the assessment of areas. However, four researchers from IFS belong to the research group ‘From North Front to Ice Front’ submitted by
UiTHSL – the panel’s evaluation of this research group and its publications is discussed below. As the lists demonstrate, however, IFS has a fair record as regards publications. In particular, the group that worked on ‘Geopolitics in the High North’ from 2008 to 2013 was productive and conducted innovative research. However, the number of publications based on peer reviews needs to be increased.

**Recruitment and training**
IFS has established an overseas research grant for which the employees may apply in connection with longer stays at research institutions abroad. Both permanent employees on sabbatical leave and employees in temporary positions who wish to go abroad to strengthen their research project may apply.

IFS does not offer MA level courses or PhD programmes for civilians from outside the Norwegian Armed Forces. All researchers at IFS are recruited from other institutions in Norway and internationally. IFS offers research grants to MA students and early-career researchers carrying out research on subjects of interest to the institute. The objective of the grants is to strengthen the research environment at IFS and to build a foundation for future recruitment. Several PhD students working on externally funded projects are employed at IFS. They are formally enrolled as students at other institutions offering PhD courses, both nationally and abroad. The policy of IFS is that the PhD students should receive the most suitable education for their project. On several occasions, the institute has paid tuition fees for students taking their degree abroad. This is to ensure the best possible education for the PhD students and to broaden IFS’s network, internationally and nationally.

NDCU has not signed or implemented the European Charter and Code for Researchers. To a considerable extent, IFS already complies with the requirements and the principles stated in the declaration. However, there are areas, such as specific career development strategies, that are underdeveloped. These areas will be included in the implementation of IFS’s strategy.

There is no clear recruitment strategy. IFS does not offer a doctoral programme and the MA programme is restricted to military and civilian members of the Norwegian Army. Although researchers who work at IFS are recruited internationally, a clear strategy is not discernible.

**Networking**
IFS cooperates to a large extent with national and international research institutions on developing research applications, carrying out research projects and organising seminars and conferences. In addition, IFS cooperates with other military education institutions within the Norwegian Armed Forces, on both research and teaching.

Even though IFS cooperates with national and international research institutions, in particular on organising conferences and conducting research projects, the collaboration seems to be concentrated on military education institutions. IFS should open up more strongly to civilian institutions and expand its international network, although it has collaborated with renowned institutions such as the Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik in Berlin and the Moscow State Institute for International Relations.

**Impact on teaching**
NDUC offers an MA programme in Military Studies, which is also the highest military education in Norway. The main purpose of the programme is to prepare students for central positions in the defence sector, both nationally and abroad. The students at NDUC are mainly mid-career officers with a BA degree.
Research staff at IFS are important contributors to the MA programme. They hold lectures on subjects such as the development of Military History and Theory within a broad societal context, including military influence on civilian society and vice versa, Norwegian foreign and security policy during the Cold War, European Political History, the History of Norwegian central government, and the philosophy of science and methodology. Researchers at IFS also supervise students.

The students at NDU are employed by the Norwegian Armed Forces and receive a salary during their studies. The students carry out some research as part of writing their MA thesis, but students are not otherwise engaged in research.

IFS also offers master’s student research grants to MA students enrolled in MA programmes at other institutions who are interested in writing their thesis about a topic relevant to IFS. Students who receive the MA grant are offered an academic mentor and an office at the institute, to enable them to become part of the research environment at IFS.

Teaching by IFS staff at NDU is always research-based.

Since IFS is part of NDU, teaching soldiers and civilian members of the Norwegian Army is an integral component of its work. The fields of research are therefore related to the MA programme, but no details are given in the self-assessment.

**Other societal impact**

At least some research groups, for example the team that has worked on the ‘Geopolitics of the North’, have achieved a societal impact. All in all, the influence on policymakers and on the defence community seems to have been especially strong.

**Overall assessment**

IFS is a one of the major institutes for defence studies in Europe. It is in the process of developing a more coherent research strategy. However, the new fields of research should be more strongly and convincingly interlinked. Its international network needs to be expanded and its publication strategies reinforced.

**Feedback**

IFS should be encouraged to develop a more coherent and long-term recruitment strategy. Stronger collaboration with civilian institutions is also advisable.
3.18 Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research (NIKU)

The Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research (NIKU) is organised in six departments. The institute does not provide any teaching except upon invitation by institutions teaching relevant subjects. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of NIKU increased from NOK 84.5 million (2013) to NOK 96.8 million (2015). NIKU depends mostly on external funding. The share of basic funding has decreased from 16 percent (17.3 MNOK) to 14 percent (17.6 MNOK) in the same period. Public Norwegian sources other than the RCN are the most important sources of external funding, followed by private Norwegian sources. Funding from the RCN is rather modest, although it more than doubled during the period 2013–2015.

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, 58 researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The following data were submitted by the institution: four research groups (Building-Context-Transformation, City-SIS, Cultural Heritage Politics and Krigsminner), two impact case studies but no research area publications. The evaluation committee did not interview representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy

NIKU (Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research) is an independent institution for archaeological investigations and commissioned research in the cultural heritage sector. It engages in research on landscape, cities, memory and cultural politics, and climate and environmental issues, as well as developing tools and methods for the preservation and conservation of cultural heritage sites. There is a research director with overall responsibility for research activities and a recent strategic programme that identifies four prioritised research themes. These themes have been chosen based on their expected relevance to calls from the RCN and EU/Horizon 2020. The sole motivation for this adaptive ‘market strategy’ is to increase the amount of external funding. It is a weakness that not much is said in the self-assessment about how this strategy relates to the institution’s particular scientific strengths and competences, how it will increase quality in research, or what measures the institute will take in future to develop an attractive environment for research collaborations with external partners.

Resources

Investments are made in some advanced scientific tools, including GIS-equipment and an adapted ArcGIS Online-solution.

NIKU applies annually for funding for infrastructural and technical resources from the Ministry of Climate and Environment. The role of infrastructure as a context for research in the institute is not addressed in the self-assessment.

Research production and quality

Between 2011 and 2015, the 58 researchers at NIKU reached 95 publication points – 28% of them had at least four publication points, while only 31% had no publication points; 10% of publications were at Level 2, 59% in English and 72% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

The assessments of research groups point to great variation in research production within the institute. The two impact cases refer to a large extent to internal and commissioned reports and
conference presentations. This is an expected publication pattern given the focus on applied research and the development of tools and methods.

**Recruitment and training**

All PhD students at NIKU work on their PhD part-time as they need and wish, in order to stay connected to various projects where they work as consultants. This makes it difficult for PhD students to do part of their PhD studies abroad. A few PhDs have done their research and publishing independently, without formal supervision or affiliation to a university. Some delivered their work for evaluation for what was called the Doctor Philos degree.

NIKU aims to increase the number of employees with PhD degrees and is working constantly to create the necessary structural framework in order to facilitate the completion of already started dissertations.

The strategies for career development, training and recruitment are currently weak. Too much is expected of the dynamics of externally funded projects in this respect.

**Networking**

NIKU works nationally and internationally with public authorities, other research institutions, international organisations, private enterprises and NGOs within a variety of fields, such as archaeological investigations; history, conservation and adaptation of historic buildings; conservation; cultural heritage and climate change; cultural heritage and urban development; historic landscapes and environments; polar regions and indigenous people; technology intensive methods and tools for the support of research and management; and heritage management as a means of pursuing wider societal goals.

NIKU’s goal is to increase participation in EU projects. There are a number of relevant H2020 programmes in 2016 and 2017, and a number of NIKU’s researchers have been invited to contribute to applications.

Network activities and international collaborations are expected to grow out of individual projects. The institute needs to develop its own initiatives and a long-term strategy for creating a productive research environment.

**Impact on teaching**

NIKU does not offer any teaching programmes. A few of the researchers are sometimes invited to give lectures at relevant courses at various institutions.

NIKU cooperates with the Department for Culture Studies and Oriental Language, which has the MA programme ‘Museologi og kulturarvstudier’, where the students can write a project-based thesis based on experience at various institutions, including NIKU. This may provide some possibilities for increased involvement of students in NIKU’s activities and projects.

NIKU occasionally hosts students from various European universities and academies, such as the University of Gothenburg, Freie Universität Berlin, Ecole du Louvre, Paris and the University of York.

NIKU is not a teaching institution. Researchers occasionally contribute presentations to university courses. Collaboration with the MA programme in Museology at UiO gives students the possibility to write a thesis related to NIKU projects. Nothing is reported on how attractive this opportunity is to the students and it is unclear to what extent NIKU is involved in commissioned courses within the cultural heritage sector.
**Other societal impact**
The two impact cases resemble project descriptions. They describe the aims, methods and expected outcomes of planned research activities rather than documenting actual impact.

**Overall assessment**
This institution faces constraints not faced by the others considered by Panel 5, as a result of its heavy dependence on external consultancies. It seems to regard itself as too reliant on external contracts (and too small) to develop an independent research strategy, and is instead dependent to a degree on larger, more research-oriented institutions. It is therefore difficult to evaluate it on exactly the same terms as other institutions. Within these constraints, the research quality was satisfactory.

**Feedback**
It is vital that the institute combine its efforts to become an attractive partner in externally funded projects with a sustainable strategy for creating institutional stability and infrastructure for long-term innovation in research. Issues of career development, the establishment of international collaborations and networks cannot be left to individual projects alone, or to what the self-assessment refers to as the ‘research market’.
3.19 UNI Research (UNI)

Established in 2002, Uni Research Rokkan Centre is a sub-division of Uni Researchers Ltd, which is a multidisciplinary research institute that carries out research and development in the fields of biotechnology, health, environment, climate, energy and social sciences. According to the institutional self-assessment, the total expenditure of the research centre increased from NOK 45.4 million (2013) to NOK 49 million (2015). The share basic funding was 6% (NOK 9.5 million) in 2015. The RCN is the most important source of external funding, followed by other public Norwegian sources.

Within the research area of Archaeology, History and Cultural Studies, five researchers were listed for HUMEVAL. The institution has submitted one research area publication and one impact case study. The evaluation committee interviewed representatives of the institution during the project.

Organisation, leadership and strategy

The centre is a sub-division of Uni Research Ltd., a research company with around 400 staff from around 40 countries specialising in research in health, climate, environment, natural sciences and social science. Historians are employed in the Social Science division. Uni Rokkan Centre came into existence in 2002 as the result of a merger of two older centres. It is a contract-based research institute with less than 10% base funding from the RCN. The University of Bergen is the majority owner. The centre is organised in four research teams in which History has an input in the following fields: a) democracy, civil society and public administration, b) health, welfare and migration, and c) culture, power and meaning. They work in strongly interdisciplinary environments with social scientists. The centre has a clear focus on social and cultural practices in these fields, and a strategy of developing the centre into a research partner that is attractive for international world-leading research. Governance and healthcare/welfare have been assigned top priority as research areas for the institute.

Resources

Uni Research Rokkan Centre is a partner of the Norwegian Citizen Panel (Medborgerpanelet), which is currently expanding its advanced core research facility for digital social science and multi-disciplinary research. This means that the centre has access to a fully-equipped on-site social science digital research lab called the Digital Social Science Core Facility (DIGSSCORE). This leads to possibilities for experimental social science research and the expansion of collaboration on a transformative scale.

In cooperation with the University of Bergen’s Department of Economics, the centre has established new infrastructure that meets high standards of data safety.

Members at the centre are full-time researchers with no obligation to teach. They have an on-site, fully equipped social science digital research lab. Data storage and data safety meet the highest quality standards. Overall, resources can be described as excellent. They are further enhanced by close cooperation with the University of Bergen.

Research production and quality

Between 2011 and 2015, the researchers at Uni reached 28 publication points – 80% of them had at least four publication points, while 0% had no publication points; 7% of publications were at Level 2,
23% in English and 33% were journal articles (for the Humanities as a whole, the respective figures were 23% at Level 2, 57% in English and 53% in journals; NIFU Report, 2016).

Research with a historical dimension includes labour history, gender history, history of health and medicine (e.g. history of a specific hospital), history of public administration (histories of the Norwegian civil service or the institution of the county governor) and local/ regional history (histories of specific municipalities/regions of Norway). Furthermore, the centre produced a ‘History of Equality’ and, for a period, the editor of the Norwegian Journal of Gender Studies was one of its staff. The one publication that was submitted is on the introduction of laboratory medicine at Bergen General Hospital, published in the Social History of Medicine and detailing everyday relations between the clinic and its laboratory. It seeks to revise the prevailing view in the literature that such relationships were dominated by conflict. Hence, it engages with the literature in the field in the best possible way, is strongly argumentative and also strong in presenting new empirical evidence.

**Recruitment and training**

There are three levels of employee: researcher, senior researcher and research professor (equivalent to professor at a higher education institution, and the status must be approved by an external source). As most of the researchers are trained researchers holding a PhD, most of the employees hold senior researcher positions. Most researchers are recruited from the University of Bergen, but also from other universities in Norway and abroad. In addition, the centre employs affiliated researchers whose main positions are at universities abroad.

PhD students are often employed at the centre after graduation. It is not uncommon for PhDs and postdocs to spend time abroad.

The institution recruits at the level of researcher, senior researcher and research professor — largely from Norway and even from the University of Bergen. Researchers are encouraged to spend time abroad and the institution is aware of the importance of career progression. Some of the researchers convert their research into PhDs.

**Networking**

The centre’s policy involves establishing international networks and international collaboration on research. There are currently international partners in 25% of all ongoing projects.

**Impact on teaching**

The centre is a research institution, and although the employees may have experience of lecturing and teaching, it is not done through the centre.

The institution is not involved in teaching and hence can have no impact on it.

**Other societal impact**

The impact case study submitted is on local self-government and constitutional reform. The centre’s research on Norwegian municipalities had a significant impact on parliamentary action, resulting in the rejection of a proposal to regulate the tasks of Norwegian municipalities in the constitution, and in an alternative proposal being put forward that is currently under consideration. The motion that was rejected was initially expected to pass by a two-thirds majority, but due to the research carried out by the centre and communicated to Parliament, 70% of MPs voted against it.
**Overall assessment**

This is an impressive research centre in which historians play an important role in a strongly interdisciplinary setting. It has established itself as a top institution within Norway and is taking concerted strides to also become an internationally leading research institution. There is good evidence of strong research leadership and a sensible focus on a few areas of research. The research is demonstrably impact-oriented and is of the highest quality.

**Feedback**

The institution should be encouraged to go further in its internationalisation strategy and build strategic alliances with similar institutions and relevant HE units abroad.
4 Assessment of research groups

4.1 UiN-History

Overall score: 3

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
The focus of the research group is identical to the subject area of History and is therefore too general. It is only loosely organised around a research seminar in History. Research topics focus on regional history, but topics such as memory politics and legal history are also included. The group lacks a joint research programme and a more elaborate research strategy, but comprises good individual projects.

Research production and quality
Publications are submitted in three different languages, and some of them are of a more general nature. Productivity has remained fairly low at the group level, also in relation to the amount of time and resources available for research. The overall quality of publications is good.

Recruitment and training
There is no qualified plan for recruiting doctoral students and postdoctoral scholars. Only external PhD students participate in the seminar. This makes the group heavily unbalanced from a career and recruitment perspective.

Networking
International networks have been rather weak and need to be extended. Collaboration has concentrated on regional institutions.

Impact on teaching
There is no doctoral programme. All members of the group teach students on undergraduate and master courses on topics relating to their research.

Overall assessment
The group reflects the status of the general area of History at a comparatively small university. The research programme and recruitment strategies will be developed in more detail in order to focus research more clearly.

Feedback and comments
Research activities and research impact would benefit from a developed strategy for thematic and interdisciplinary approaches. The focus on Northern Norway should be maintained and specified. The idea of developing the group’s specialisation in the history of the coastal north in collaboration with research on similar areas in other countries is promising and worth pursuing.

2 The scores for research groups in panel 5 is given only for the overall assessment
4.2 NTNUHF-FATNAT (The fate of nations)

Overall score: 5

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
This group has an original, innovative and ambitious research agenda. It has a clear understanding of its past, present and future goals and accomplishments. Its findings and goals are impressive. It has an excellent strategy for collaboration between teams – mainly through conferences or joint volumes/publications. It is less clear about the nature of its overall leadership and how its strategy is decided, monitored or changed. The nature of collaboration within each team is not specified, other than joint writing. What about collaborative research and analysis? The high quality of outputs is nevertheless evidence that collaboration is working and effective.

Research production and quality
Research production and quality are excellent. Articles appear in high-profile international journals, including *The Economic History Review* and the *International History Review*. For books, the focus is on English-language publishers, with a mix of second tier publishers such as Berghahn and Palgrave and a few first-tier publishers like Cambridge University Press. One selected publication (on Nazi armament investment) is less about the core theme of the research group, but very good on its own terms.

Recruitment and training
The group mainly recruits domestically, but also via international networks. It attracts foreign postdocs. Its main links are with the European University Institute (Florence) for PhDs, but it also has postdoc links to Harvard Business School and others.

Networking
The group has very strong international networks, but the self-assessment says little about the rationale behind intentional links, i.e. why Berkeley and Bonn, and not other institutions that have relevant strengths, e.g. material flow studies? The main links are to German and US scholars. Given the thematic concerns of the group, the links to former European colonial empires seem to be underdeveloped.

Impact on teaching
The research group mentions a planned dedicated MA, but otherwise it does not refer to specific steps to bring its research into teaching more generally.

Overall assessment
This is an excellent research group, with a clear focus, agenda and development plan, and publications in leading international journals and monographs. However, from the information available, its links to teaching appear to be underdeveloped.

Feedback and comments
The panel would have appreciated a little more information on the nature of collaboration within each research team and how the group seeks to cultivate that collaboration and the skills required
over time. The rationale for collaboration with specific institutions should be thought about. Given its concern with resources and development, the group might also benefit from additional links to European and African researchers, and organisations working on these questions. Finally, the documents rightly emphasise that the group sees itself as working not only on raw materials and the fate of producers, but their impact more generally. The question for the panel concerned what impact the research group had on what specifically, and how (and to whom) it might plan to communicate its findings.

4.3 UiBHF-Health

Overall score: 3

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
This is a grouping of 21 scholars, spread widely across the age spectrum. Those submitted for evaluation consist of five professors, one associate professor and one postdoc, who are, like the group as a whole, interested in questions of health, welfare and the history of science. They range very widely over very different research areas, as exemplified by the sample of research submitted. They have links to a number of other researchers in Norway, but seem to be short on international links – at least they do not list any, despite the fact that the annual conference they organise on the history of science and medicine explicitly targets foreign scholars, and despite the fact that their two emerita professors are undoubtedly world-leading scholars in their fields. They have existed as a group for more than a decade. Their external funding, which is exclusively from Norway, is around NOK 1.5 million per annum. The group is only loosely integrated. They share a research seminar, but otherwise the group functions in sub-units or via feedback to individual research projects. The self-assessment emphasises interdisciplinarity, and, indeed, medicine, cultural studies, political science and sociology all play an important role in this history-grounded research group. However, they are barely interrelated and do not constitute a strong and coherent research agenda.

Research production and quality
The research of this group focuses on the history of science, the history of medicine and health, and the history of welfare. The submitted publications are all of a high standard. One article focuses on families and citizenship. It discusses women’s movements, lesbian and gay movements and their contribution to remaking ideas of citizenship. It connects social movement research with research on citizenship – linking into international debates and making an important contribution to them. One article is on the health services and the Sámi people. It is a highly interesting discussion on Sámi identity and the provision of health services in Northern Norway. One article is on Norwegian folklore archives. It examines the production of folklore archival records in an extremely interesting and innovative way. One article on laboratory medicine is another excellent piece challenging an argument about conflicts between clinics and research laboratories. In relation to Bergen, it shows how laboratories and clinics worked hand in hand in a variety of different fields. A PhD thesis chapter outlines the circulation of knowledge on leprosy through meetings, medical journals and correspondence. The standard of research here is high. One article is on the irresponsible criminal in the Norwegian medical-legal discourse. This reaches very high standards of research, employing Foucauldian theory to explore changing understandings of criminality and criminal ‘types’. Overall, the publications demonstrate a wide range of topics and concerns across the research group, but
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they also show that there is a common research interest in the question of how knowledge has been created and transferred across spatial and disciplinary boundaries. However, this overarching issue and theme is rather general. This assessment is based on the English-language articles submitted.

**Recruitment and training**

There is little information here beyond the ordinary. They have no international PhD students and they do not mention postdocs. Overall, one gets the impression that this is not given adequate thought by the group.

**Networking**

Most of their major research networking at the national and European level seems to date from before 2011 (nothing thereafter is listed). There are links with a range of other, mainly Norwegian researchers. Nothing specific and contemporary is mentioned.

**Impact on teaching**

The information provided about teaching does not go beyond the fact that members of the research group are active in ordinary teaching. Presumably, they also teach their research specialisms, but not much thought is given to a deeper integration of research and teaching.

**Overall assessment**

The group is producing excellent individual research and its chosen field is making an important contribution to knowledge. It is also coherent as a group, focusing on the production and transfer of knowledge in an interdisciplinary way. However, its international networking seems to be weak, especially over the last five years. Too little thought is given to organisation and leadership and to where the group would like to go next. The description of the relationship of the research to teaching is particularly poor, and there is a deplorable absence of any strategy for the internationalisation of PhD students and postdocs.

**Feedback and comments**

The group should prioritise particular areas in the history of knowledge and build on the excellent individual research to obtain major international grants that would give the group higher international visibility. It should also integrate research more with teaching and it should develop a strategy for attracting international PhD students and postdocs. Not least, it should also think about how to integrate the latter two categories more firmly within the group and ensure their career progression.

---

4.4 **UiBHF-Homo sapiens**

**Overall score: 5**

**Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources**

This is a dynamic research group that draws on longstanding research by the group’s leader. It has recently expanded to develop and apply innovative interdisciplinary approaches to a series of well-articulated fundamental research questions relating to the behavioural evolution of early Homo sapiens. The group is both interdisciplinary and international, with strong contacts across various departments and schools within UiB, as well as internationally (e.g. Witwatersrand, Tubingen, CNRS
Bordeaux, Max Planck Institute, Royal Holloway and Berkeley. Research has primarily been funded by ERC FP7 and a South African National Research Foundation Chair held by the group leader, with in-kind laboratory support from Royal Holloway, Bordeaux and Tubingen. The group has ambitious plans for future research funding. The research group appears to be well resourced and organised at UiBHF.

**Research production and quality**

Publications appear in top international peer-reviewed journals (Current Anthropology, Journal of Archaeological Science, Polson, and the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America (PNAS) and are supported by significant peer-assessed research funding. The publications include significant core contributions within the specific field. The group has a broad and ambitious publication strategy and has also disseminated its results more broadly in the public realm.

**Recruitment and training**

The group appears to have been successful in recruiting postgraduate students and postdocs at all levels. Early-career researchers are encouraged to participate in the activities of the group and to move to other partners in the network. There is no mention of participation in the Nordic Graduate School.

**Networking**

The group is both international and interdisciplinary, and it has a strong network in South Africa, the USA and Europe. Mobility across the network for training purposes and the use of specialist laboratory facilities is encouraged and facilitated by research funding.

**Impact on teaching**

The group is involved with teaching at all levels, although the clearest impact is at postgraduate level. Little detail is given about the commitment to teaching at the university. In contrast, the group’s educational outreach programme (the Origins Museum and Nature Reserve) aimed at disadvantaged local students aged 6-16 years in South Africa is particularly praiseworthy.

**Overall assessment**

This is a dynamic and successful research group that has ambitious plans to become one of the leading groups within its field. It has a very clear research focus and a tight sense of identity.

**Feedback and comments**

It would be useful to ensure that young researchers also engage with the wider archaeological field, such as through participation in the Nordic Graduate School, to avoid them becoming isolated from wider theoretical and methodological developments.
4.5 UiBHF-Medieval

Overall score: 3

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
The group was formed very recently to reflect UiB’s established strength in Medieval Studies. Members belong to several departments. It is not clear how research activities are coordinated and led. The group’s purpose is to facilitate interdisciplinary cooperation, organise joint seminars and joint publications. It also intends to apply for external funding for ‘joint projects’, but no specific projects or themes are mentioned. The self-assessment document primarily consists of synopses of the research of each submitted member.

Research production and quality
The 19 submitted publications include one dissertation, edited volumes with Oxbow, Ashgate, Aarhus and Brepols, and articles in some high-ranking international periodicals such as Speculum and Scriptorium. They span a wide range of topics and methodologies and do not reflect particular foci or themes across the group as a whole. Most are of very good quality.

Recruitment and training
Recruitment is handled by individual departments and the group has no formal role in the process. No specific training is offered.

Networking
No formal collaborative links have yet been established, but this is being addressed. Individual members are involved in international collaborations.

Impact on teaching
It is stated that research informs and is ‘highly relevant’ to the group’s teaching, although no examples of this are given.

Overall assessment
This is a good, newly formed and young group with considerable potential: 10 of the 25 members have PhDs, and there are two postdocs. The group is still in an embryonic stage, but thought is being given to its future direction and strategic aims. Its publications range from student work to articles by senior professors who are established leaders in their fields.

Feedback and comments
The group might be encouraged to take a more strategic approach to developing and pursuing specific research themes as the basis for national and international research networking and to developing more visibility in its particular areas of expertise.
4.6 UiBHF-Middle Eastern and African Studies

Overall score: 3

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
This research group, by its own admission, is loosely focused around several clusters of research projects and the work of a small number of individual staff members, but this is consistent with the disciplines involved (especially History). It has formal connections with CMI in Bergen, with whom it shares seed funding for joint projects and conferences. Funding for research is sought on a project by project basis. Despite the small size of the group, significant external research funds have been secured for postdoctoral projects, staff exchanges, publication and conferences over the past four years. One of the main activities of the group is to present and discuss work-in-progress and draft publications. This is valuable, although the group did not seem to have a strategy or mechanism for setting longer-term intellectual priorities for the group that might ensure that its sum is larger than its parts.

Research production and quality
The focus of research is on the modern History (from 1800) of the Middle East and Islamic Africa, with the emphasis on Sudan, Palestine/the Levant and intellectual pathways in the Muslim world (including Islamic law). Members of the research group publish in both English and Norwegian, both monographs and articles in international book series and Norwegian journals, although international journals appear to be absent.

Recruitment and training
The MEA research group is organised around tenured staff (4), postdocs (1) and PhD students (3). Staff (tenured, postdocs and PhDs) from other departments may be part of the research group through involvement in specific research projects.

Networking
The research group has a formal relationship with CMI in Bergen; beside this, networking tends to take place on a project by project and individual basis. This reflects conventional practice within the discipline. The group has an international exchange with Paris 1. The self-assessment also refers to other international networks and conferences, but they are not specified.

Impact on teaching
The MEA research group is central to the courses offered at AHKR that result in a BA in History with specialisation in the Middle East. The group contributes a weekly MA seminar.

Overall assessment
The research group is modest in size, with a core group of four individual members who mostly undertake individual or project-related research networking, supported by a small group of postdocs and PhD researchers. This is not unusual given the core discipline of History, and the group appears to make a significant collective contribution to teaching. The quality of the research is generally quite high, but the size of the group makes it difficult to see this as having a significant impact over and above each individual’s output.
Feedback and comments
The group might be encouraged to identify possible resources to develop a more coherent and cohesive identity and research strategy and to identify intellectual priorities for future research and collaboration. UiBHF’s resourcing of development studies as a priority area may provide a means by which this focus might be realised.

4.7 UiBHF-Transnational History

Overall score: 4

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
This is a large, but loose grouping of scholars interested in broadly defined questions of global exchange, ranging from business and migration to missionaries. Perhaps it is better characterised as a federation than a research group. The emphasis is on bringing together people with shared or overlapping interests in questions of transnational exchange and how to study them (method). For the group as a whole, the main activities appear to be conversations, conferences and mutual support. There is no clear strategic goal, nor identifiable leadership. It is organic, and its most productive and successful features are smaller groupings of more thematically focused research – e.g. the project on missionaries. Another strength is that it brings into dialogue topics that have tended to be viewed in isolation – e.g. bringing a migration perspective to bear on missionary studies. However, it is unclear by what mechanism or criteria resources and ideas are devoted to certain themes, and not others. Nor is there any information on research activities that bring different groups together to discuss methodological and theoretical frameworks of transnational research.

Research production and quality
The self-assessment refers to ‘several major publications...being prepared’, but no information is provided on their nature, progress or publication plans. One submitted article is interesting (on cartels), but it is an analytical overview of the literature, rather than a piece of empirical research. The article on Jewish immigration is similarly a critical historiographical overview. Both are well informed but comparative in approach and their relationship to the ‘transnational’ and exchange-oriented nature of the group is unclear. The chapter on Norwegian merchants and missionaries in China is more directly concerned with networks and transnational history. It provides an early overview of the research project, and some initial findings, situating them within trends in global economic history. One paper offers some general reflections on the effect of exile on diaspora artists, although research here is limited to a few pages on one female Kurdish artist. The four publications illustrate the range of topics and concerns across the research group, but they perhaps also raise the question of how these different pieces interact or enrich each other in ways that produce something that is larger than its parts.

Recruitment and training
The group emphasises international exchanges for researchers at all career stages. It refers to PhDs and postdocs being recruited from abroad as well as from Norway, but does not provide detailed information, which makes this difficult to assess.
Networking
The group is clearly active in a number of international networks, including with Harvard, Berlin and Chinese universities. Some of this is via conferences, but it has also established more regular links with international scholars over time. The focus of networking seems to be project-specific rather than on encouraging exchanges across and between projects.

Impact on teaching
There is a clear sense of research-led teaching here, with the group introducing a BA course on migration as well as a PhD course on Global History. It attracts many MA students, though no numbers are given. The panel was impressed with this transfer from research to teaching.

Overall assessment
The group is active in a number of research initiatives on topics ranging from business in China to missionaries and Jewish migration. It is active at national and international conferences, and its publications show familiarity with and contributions to major historiographical subjects and developments. The methodological exchanges and interdisciplinary activities within the group are clearly fruitful. Other than the migration/missionary project, however, the strategic aims and values and the nature of actual research collaboration within the group remain underspecified.

Feedback and comments
It might be useful for the group to think about overall strategic priorities, about future research collaboration and the nature of intellectual exchange between different members and disciplines, and also about publication priorities – and how resources might be best devoted to them. Furthermore, the group should be encouraged to think about how it can translate its work into world-leading and step-changing publications and applications for large-scale funding.

4.8 UiO HF-Archeology (ARK)

Overall score: 4

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
The submission presents four research themes as one research group, with the result that coherence is only provided in terms of overall approach (i.e. anthropological and interdisciplinary), and details and specificity of focus are missing. Similarly, it is unclear how the group is led, whether it meets regularly, and how strategic decisions are reached and implemented. The group appears to be well supported and resourced, both from within the Humanities Faculty and through the RCN. It has clearly been very successful in attracting external funding.

Research production and quality
Publications reflect the core themes of the group (heritage, archeometry/environmental arch; prehistoric technology; historic archaeology). Some of the articles and where they are published (BAR, Oxbow) reflect the relatively high proportion of junior members. Eight of 14 members are either PhD students or postdocs, while only two are full professors. The quality is good to very good, with some papers making original contributions to international research. Most members of the group are highly productive.
Recruitment and training
The group recruits PhD students internationally, supports student attendance at international conferences and has arranged visiting placements for students at Oxford, Cambridge and Kiel. The group has played a core role in the Nordic Archaeology School, and emphasises mentoring and linking senior members with younger ones as a means of training.

Networking
Individual members have held visiting positions abroad or collaborated on projects with foreign universities. Guest lecturers provide another form of networking. ARK collaborates with Oslo’s Museum of Cultural History, but formal international links are not mentioned.

Impact on teaching
Research feeds into teaching via joint staff/student seminars and a dedicated PhD seminar. The high research profile of some members of the group has helped it to obtain major grants for the graduate school, e.g. from the RCN. Teaching and research are highly integrated.

Overall assessment
This is a very productive group with many early-career researchers and lots of potential for future development. It is difficult to judge what its agenda is, however, apart from a shared anthropological approach, and what its strategy is apart from research grant applications.

Feedback and comments
The early-career members of the group could be encouraged to reach a wider readership by targeting international peer-reviewed journals and avoiding vehicles such as BAR and Oxbow-edited volumes. The panel would have welcomed more information about the group’s research direction and how it is decided.

4.9 UiOHF-Children and Conceptions of Childhood in History

Overall score: 5

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
This excellent research group has existed since 2000. The group is well-consolidated. It has a clear organisational structure, a well-defined profile, an active international network and a wide range of high-profile research and publication activities, funded by, among other sources, two RCN grants (a postdoc 2003–2006 and collective project 2013–16). This group seems to have developed from a more loosely organised research network into a full-scale research programme as a result of RCN funding from 2013.

Research production and quality
The research group has excellent production, published mainly in international channels. Monographs and book chapters have been published with leading publishers in the field, as well as articles in mainly Scandinavian journals. Many publications are in the pipeline. Only five of the eight submitted publications concern childhood, but they all attest to first-class scholarship.
Recruitment and training
There has been international recruitment of a postdoc and two PhD students, and there is a good blend of junior and senior scholars. No information has been provided about future plans for recruitment.

Networking
The group has an excellent and comprehensive international network, involving leading scholars in the field as well as individual international contacts. The research group proper involves members from the USA, Scandinavia, Germany, Belgium and the UK.

Impact on teaching
The research group has a good impact on teaching. A course on the History of Childhood has been taught, and MA students take part in the seminars. The research is deemed relevant to BA, MA and PhD students, but the details of this impact are not described.

Overall assessment
This is an excellent research group. The external funding has clearly been exploited to the full, yielding excellent research and a strong international research network. Even without overarching conclusions across the projects involved, and despite the wide chronological span, the shared focus on children is clearly fruitful and there is a potential to expand lines of inquiry across periods and projects – not least with regard to the role of discipline.

Feedback and comments
This research group is clearly highly capable and prolific. It includes scholars from the fields of history of ideas, theology, history, social history, literature and media. It might be worthwhile to explore disciplinary differences in the approach to childhood in greater depth. The publications are of an international standard but there are no articles in internationally leading journals. Publications in high-profile journals may be a way of augmenting the scholarly reach and influence of the group.

4.10 UiOHF-History of Knowledge

Overall score: 5

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
The group builds on a well thought through and productive strategy for developing collaborative and interdisciplinary research projects. It is successful in attracting external research funds, has a strong impact and makes a strong contribution to the overall environment for Humanities research and education at UiO.

Research production and quality
The group has an innovative and productive thematic umbrella and impressive methodological and theoretical coherence between work on a diverse set of topics, high visibility in international research communities, sample publications of very good quality in internationally leading journals, and high productivity among its core members.
Recruitment and training
There is a very good balance between senior and junior scholars and a strong commitment among group leaders to recruiting PhD students and postdocs internationally and from different academic backgrounds. It has a sound and successful strategy for seeking external funding for younger scholars.

Networking
Core members of the group are affiliated to leading research institutions around the world, and there is an ambitious strategy for linking young scholars to relevant local and international networks. In general, the group is very good at translating local collaborations into international and interdisciplinary networking activities.

Impact on teaching
The group has a particularly strong impact on advanced levels and has made innovative contributions to the development of the MA programmes. In general, the group’s research activities are an important resource for PhD programmes at UiO.

Overall assessment
This is an ambitious and very strong research group, producing research of excellent quality and with a strong presence in relevant international research networks.

Feedback and comments
It might be worth considering activities that can help to further develop the coherence of the overall research theme of ‘History of knowledge’, for example a large-scale research programme or a research school.

4.11 UiOHF-SKiN – Systems of Knowledge in the Nordic Middle Ages

Overall score: 4

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
This relatively new group, which consists of six scholars from three departments, was established in 2014. It has a clear aim, namely to establish an interdisciplinary centre of excellence. Its chief strategy is to collaborate on grant applications; to this end, it has received two major RCN grants (one collective research project, one postdoc). The University of Oslo has contributed two PhD scholarships. It is not clear how the group is led or how progress is monitored.

Research production and quality
All members are research-active and some are highly productive. The submitted publications are of high quality, mostly comprising book chapters (Brepols and Brill), as well as articles in World Archaeology and the European Journal of Archaeology, both leading journals, and monographs published by Four Courts Press. Active collaboration has yet to manifest itself in publications.
Recruitment and training
The group’s grants enable them to recruit PhD students and postdocs, which are advertised internationally. Members of the group use their international connections to attract students.

Networking
Members of the group have been visiting scholars and external examiners at a wide range of foreign universities, but no formal networks or links are mentioned. The group plans to hold an international conference.

Impact on teaching
All members of the group will participate in teaching a Viking & Medieval Studies programme. Members have supervised some 30 PhDs over the past 10 years. A joint seminar exists for staff and students.

Overall assessment
This is a new and very good research group with great potential. Individual members already have an international profile and excellent publication records, but it is unclear what impact collaboration has had. There are clear plans for collaboration on postgraduate teaching.

Feedback and comments
The panel would have appreciated more information on, and evidence of, collaboration. For example, five projects undertaken by members of the group are described, but there is nothing to indicate that these projects are collaborative. The group would benefit from wider links, at least with other departments in Northern European universities. The international conference and publication of its proceedings will provide an obvious platform for building collaboration and networks.

4.12 UiTHSL-CNN (Creating the New North)

Overall score: 4

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
This research group is excellently organised, well-consolidated (work began in 2004) and highly active. It has a clear organisational structure, with seminars every other week and a well-defined research profile. It includes the collective project ‘The Projected Reformation in Northern Norway’ (RCN-funded) as well as individual research. The research is funded by, among other sources, an RCN grant (2013–16), and the home faculty contributes resources, for example for translation into English and conference attendance. The group is broadly interdisciplinary, involving archaeology, history, religious studies, human geography, architectural history and literary studies.

Research production and quality
The research group is highly productive, and its publications straddle a diverse array of topics centring on Northern Norway, ranging from Northern horticulture via book history to missionary networks. Most of the research has been published in Norwegian contexts (most volumes are published by Orkana Akademisk), but the publications do include book chapters published by Brill and Wehrhahn and articles published in Scandinavian journals, including several in Acta Borealia and
Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia (both Level 1). The quality of the research seems to warrant an even more ambitious publication strategy and, given the quality of the research undertaken, the research group should be encouraged to pursue a broader and more internationally focused publication strategy.

**Recruitment and training**

Twelve doctoral students have been recruited to the group. Recruitment and training of doctoral students is a key aim for the group, which functions as a research school. Posts are advertised in English.

**Networking**

The group favours multi-disciplinary, transnational and comparative approaches and has created a good international network capable of sustaining such approaches, involving scholars from Scandinavia, Russia, Poland and Germany.

**Impact on teaching**

The research group has a good impact on teaching, mainly in the form of research topics being introduced to the teaching and research group members serving as supervisors at the MA and PhD level.

**Overall assessment**

This is a very good research group. The external funding has been used to good effect, yielding substantial research and a good international network. The group has a clear vision to be a research school for young scholars and it is highly active in its endeavours to secure additional funding.

**Feedback and comments**

The disciplinary diversity and specialised insight demonstrated by this group is a strength. Much of the research has been published in Scandinavian contexts, but, given the quality of the scholarship and the ambition to be a research school, the group should be encouraged to pursue a broader and more international scholarly audience and to strengthen its international network.

**4.13 UiTHSL-NordFront**

**Overall score: 4**

**Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources**

This is a relatively young research group that has only existed for three years, but is based on earlier large projects. It consists of 18 members, most of them very established scholars. Ten of them, including three assistant professors and two PhD students, have been submitted for evaluation. It is a highly integrated group based on the recognition that the ‘High North’ played an important role during the Second World War and the Cold War. The group seeks explicitly to explore that role in its varying facets. The group’s origins lie in major research networks on the North and Russia and on the North and Norwegian polar politics. This has resulted in much research on the North and its entanglements with international politics and a variety of different neighbours, especially Russia/the Soviet Union. While grounded in these major research projects, the group itself is still in the process of development. It was allocated two PhD positions and some seed funding to prepare a research
and dissemination project on the Second World War in the North, and it has submitted a major application for funding to the RCN. The group is led by senior scholars with considerable experience in organising and conducting research, although its actual management is not detailed. They have a clear strategy, which they are putting into practice, and their future will depend on how successful this strategy is. In terms of outside research funding, it is too early to say (although the panel is impressed that NOK 3.7 million has already been generated in external research income from exclusively Norwegian sources), but we were impressed by the coherence and intellectual rigour of the research questions holding the group together.

**Research production and quality**
The research production of this team focuses on the militarisation of the Arctic since the Second World War and how this contributed, at one and the same time, to tensions and endeavours to overcome these tensions, especially in the context of the Cold War. They have a clear strategy for publication.

The research group follows an integrated approach, bringing together cultural, social, economic and political history, as well as history from above and history from below. The individual publications submitted make it clear, however, that the research is much more disparate than the group’s scope as described in the self-assessment. Some of it falls outside the timeline (1940s onwards), and one publication is political science rather than history. There also seems to be a clear divide between research on the Second World War/Cold War and on the Arctic. There are several outstanding articles of international importance within the specific field.

An outstanding article deals with the Norwegian-Soviet border as a political and cultural construction, utilising much border studies literature and theory to good effect. Another article considers the forgotten history of 7,000 female forced labourers from the Soviet Union who worked in Norway during the German occupation. A highly intriguing piece of memory history is provided by an article on how Norwegian Waffen SS volunteers have been remembered in Norway. One article, utilising cultural studies theory and in particular the work of Homi Bhaba, looks at the ways in which knowledge was assembled on North-East Lapland in Sweden in the 18th century. One article, essentially traditional military history, focuses on the Norwegian armed forces and the coming of the Second World War. It looks in particular at the rearmament period from 1937 to 1940, asking whether it prepared Norway for the coming of war. Another article explores Soviet women under Finnish occupation, detailing a clash of imaginations and representations regarding women’s role in society between Soviet and nationalist Finnish viewpoints. Another submission is part of a book that looks at the research networks between Norway and the Soviet Union relating to Arctic research. Overall, the research is of very good quality and at its best engages with international research in similar fields.

**Recruitment and training**
The information provided in the self-assessment statement mainly refers to the funding of postdoc and PhD positions and how they in turn have contributed to conferences. Hardly any attention is given to recruitment strategy, career progression and the tutoring of PhD students and postdoctoral fellows. Overall, one gets the impression that this is not given adequate thought by the group.

**Networking**
Most of the group’s research networking is derived from the previous projects, and their links, in particular with Russian scholars and institutions, are impressive. But there are also established links
with Swedish, Finnish and US scholars. All this bodes well for the planned internationalisation of the research.

**Impact on teaching**
The group has devised a specific MA programme based on its research expertise. This ensures a high level of integration between the research findings and the teaching/dissemination. However, the master’s course has not yet started, so there is no information at present about recruitment and delivery.

**Overall assessment**
Thematically, this is a very coherent research group with a clear potential for high impact and important research and outputs. The group is mainly composed of very experienced researchers and benefits from their prior networks and contacts. It has a clear strategy in place for future development that includes an internationalisation strategy. The publications are largely very interesting and make important contributions to a distinct field. The research is tightly focused around a set of intriguing research questions, and is methodologically and theoretically aware. One clear weakness is the lack of thought given to the integration and promotion of PhD students and postdocs.

**Feedback and comments**
The group should be congratulated on its integrated and well thought out research focus. It should, however, bring its research output more closely in line with this focus. The only area in need of some attention is that of early-career researchers at PhD and postdoc levels, including the group’s strategy for mentoring and ensuring career progression. A more transparent description of the management of the group would also be beneficial.

### 4.14 UiTHSL- Sub-Arctic Stone Age Research Group (SARG)

**Overall score: 5**

**Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources**
The self-assessment provides an exceptionally clear statement, with a clear research focus on the archaeology of hunter-gatherer-fisher groups in the North. The group has clearly articulated aims, including generating more peer-reviewed, high-level publications. A strategy to attract external funding is also outlined. The group’s research cuts across international borders which makes it an interesting format for a research group. Initial seed funding has been provided by the faculty.

**Research production and quality**
Research production and quality are very good. The publications reflect the research focus of the group and include some excellent, intellectually ambitious papers, some in peer-reviewed journals, others as chapters in edited volumes. The scope ranges from syntheses and interpretations of data to more conceptual pieces. The former are the more substantial, and several pieces make significant contributions. One of the publications (on fetishism) does not fit the core theme of this cluster, but is interesting in itself.
**Recruitment and training**
The research group is in the process of recruiting a Marie Curie postdoc. It has been allocated two PhD posts by the faculty (PhD students are recruited through the university). PhDs are encouraged and supported to spend a term or longer abroad and attend international conferences. A joint PhD programme is being planned with Kiel and Bergen, and students participate in the Nordic Graduate School.

**Networking**
The group has an extensive regional network, in line with the geographical focus of its work, but several members of the group also have considerable international networks, such as the network around the study of rock art. There are also formal collaborations with Bergen, Kiel and Groningen (the group includes one member from Groningen), including joint fieldwork.

**Impact on teaching**
Three of the members have some involvement with teaching, and two of them have substantial roles ranging from the BA to the PhD levels. The research will directly affect teaching, especially for PhD students, who benefit from participating in the networks. More details would have been helpful.

**Overall assessment**
This is a very strong research group in terms of focus and members. It has a clear set of aims and management, and aims to ensure involvement at different levels by everyone from local partners to PhD students to international colleagues. The research publications are rather varied, but include excellent, internationally important pieces.

**Feedback and comments**
The group could benefit from all members producing stronger outputs (as is also the plan), and from detailing the benefits to teaching.

**4.15 UiA-Religion and World-views in Social Context**

**Overall score: 3**

**Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources**
This group has only existed for two years, but seems to have established a fruitful ethos of scholarly exchange. Joint activities include seminars, discussions, collaborative research applications and the project God and Mammon (since 2013), which has yielded both a seminar and scholarly publications. Its leadership and organisational aims and principles are not described, however. The precise nature of research collaboration and exchange is underspecified. Instead, the concern with autonomy within the group is underlined. Resources are available in connection with research applications.

**Research production and quality**
The group has produced a wide array of good scholarly publications, the bulk of which grows out of the God and Mammon project. Only five of the fifteen members of the research group are under evaluation. The publications listed include monographs and articles, some in leading journals such as *Historisk Tidsskrift* and *Nordic Journal of Religion and Society*. The publications relate the interaction
between religion and economy to an older methodological debate, especially Weber’s writings on charisma and on the spirit of capitalism. The publications submitted are a mix of empirical case studies and historiographical debate. Some of the writing in English is awkward and problematic, however. The influence of the publications might have been further strengthened by making further connections with research on related themes outside Norwegian History.

**Recruitment and training**
The recruitment policy was described. The group consists of senior staff. History PhD students have only been included since autumn 2015.

**Networking**
The section dedicated to research collaboration is blank.

**Impact on teaching**
The research group has a good impact on teaching, and the activities within the group are deemed relevant to BA, MA and PhD students. Apart from the participation of MA students in seminars, however, the transfer of research to teaching is unclear and not described.

**Overall assessment**
This is a good research group, which – especially within the theme of ‘God and Mammon’ – demonstrates a substantial degree of internal scholarly interaction and mutual exchange, despite its recent establishment. The activities and publications attest to a good deal of critical reflection and methodological deliberation.

**Feedback and comments**
The research group should be encouraged to take a long-term view of its main aims and research in order to discuss overall structures for research collaboration and publications, and the activities and recruitment needed to advance them. The panel would have appreciated information about recruitment and networks, and more information about future plans and how the group aims to cultivate the skills required over time.

Now that the research group seems to have established itself, the next step should be to cultivate international as well as national connections more actively.

## 4.16 UiB Museum-Universitetsmuseet

**Overall score: 4**

**Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources**
This research group is the result of a recent reorganisation (1/1/2015) that combined the Departments of Cultural History and Natural History. Each of them is still managed by its own head, but further details about the management are not provided. The scope and focus of research suggest two different directions, one regional and the other worldwide. Research is initiated by individuals, but it is stated that it is also coordinated by the management. A substantial part of its activities are based on its legal obligations and the needs of the collection. There is a strong commitment to wide dissemination. In addition to funding from the university, there is substantial external funding from
the Directorate for Cultural Heritage (Riksantikvar), but also from the RCN and projects. Future strategies include closer connections between excavation and research.

**Research production and quality**
The quality and type of publication vary, ranging from important core scientific papers, to overviews and a general text aimed at the general public. Eighteen texts were submitted, four of which were in Norwegian. Five were in peer-reviewed journals, four were book chapters, five in conference proceedings and four were other types. There is a high level of production and also a commitment to different audiences, as well as different channels, including films.

**Recruitment and training**
The description of recruitment only refers to PhD students and does not mention recruitment to the research group. PhD students are recruited by the university through open competition both nationally and internationally. Students participate in the Nordic Graduate School and are encouraged to attend conferences.

**Networking**
The research group has some international contacts, but its obligatory work is tied to the region, where its network is strongest. The museum does, however, also participate in the various museum networks that exist.

**Impact on teaching**
This is not a teaching institution, but members of the group contribute a substantial amount of teaching hours at all levels, and they currently have eight PhD students attached to the group. Details were not provided about the kind of teaching and how it is connected to research.

**Overall assessment**
This seems to be a very large research cluster; it is divided into two parts with separate heads. It is not clear how research is managed within this structure and how collaboration and synergies are developed. Much of the work is based on legal obligations rather than totally free research. There seems to be two distinct research foci – one regional and one worldwide, but it is not clear how they interact and how they can provide coherence. The research appears to be primarily self-directed, and the quality varies from very strong contributions to international debates to descriptive comments. The concern with dissemination and the awareness of alternative communication forms are distinct strengths.

It has a good age and gender profile.

**Feedback and comments**
The research group would benefit from achieving greater clarity about its character, and from greater focus by concentrating on some distinct themes and developing more explicit strategies to allow research collaboration and synergies to evolve. These might allow a more targeted and strategic approach to securing external research funding. Further advanced research training for members of the research group might be explored.
4.17 UiO Museum/KHM - Centre for Viking-Age Studies (ViS)

Overall score: 5

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
The group (formed in 2010) has clear goals and articulates a clear strategy for reaching them. Its origins lie in an attempt (still ongoing) to achieve Centre of Excellence funding. Its current aim is to reapply in 2020. The group consists of eight members of staff including three postdocs, and its leader is a senior, internationally recognised scholar. The group’s strategy involves targeting major research grants and developing international networks, and its projects are collaboratively developed. The group has succeeded in raising both public and (some) private funding.

Research production and quality
The group has seven to eight loosely defined research themes that are broadly reflected in its publications; it seeks to increase the percentage of journal articles. The submitted work includes publications in high-profile international periodicals (Antiquity; Proceedings of the Viking Congress), an Oxbow monograph, NAR, and edited volumes. A series of internationally significant edited volumes on the Kaupang Excavation Project, headed by the group’s leader, have not been submitted to the panel.

Recruitment and training
The group has recently recruited four relatively junior members who are involved in preparing major grant proposals. Several ViS projects include PhD students (who are internationally recruited), and the group plans to include PhD students as members in the near future. Three members are postdocs. PhD students and postdocs are involved in conference organisation and editorial work.

Networking
The group has been exemplary in developing its international networks. Three major conferences (with associated workshops) have been held as part of the group’s strategy to develop its international network and all the ViS projects have a wide range of international partners.

Impact on teaching
The group is based at the Museum of Cultural History, which only has PhD students; the nature of their contracts means that they have only minor (5%-7%) teaching obligations.

Overall assessment
This is an excellent research group with clear aims, a strategy for achieving its goals, and an excellent publication record.

Feedback and comments
The group should be encouraged to reapply for Centre of Excellence funding and continue with its strategy to target major research grants and develop international networks. Although research production and quality are high, the group might be encouraged to develop a more explicit strategy for research publication to increase its academic impact internationally. This will in turn contribute to visibility, thereby enhancing recruitment.
4.18 HVO-Cultural Encounters

Overall score: 3

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
This group comprises a broad range of scholarly expertise within an overall thematic framework pertaining to cultural encounters. The presentation provides little information about organisation and leadership. There are promising and well-organised plans for future projects and research proposals. The areas of expertise are highly diverse. This is a potential strength, but also a potential challenge in terms of scholarly cohesion. There is little information about endeavours to create a shared basis across the involved disciplines, theoretical or otherwise, and nor does the report offer much data about the collaboration within the two main research areas. The research group seems to have the academic capacity required to develop scholarly cohesion within the group and to address cross-disciplinary challenges in a way that might be valuable beyond this particular group, but this potential does not seem to have been fully exploited.

Research production and quality
The group has produced a wide array of good scholarly publications, straddling Norwegian fishing and Ricœur/Agamben, and ranging from a few monographs with high-profile international publishers (Brill, Brepols) and some monographs and collections with Level 1 international (e.g. Springer, Armand Colin) and Norwegian publishers (Akademika, Tapir), via book chapters and articles in, mainly, Norwegian journals to governmental reports. Much has been published in Norwegian, not least research concerning local history. It might be worthwhile considering whether some of this research should be made available in an international context. Good examples of broader dissemination include articles in English on Norwegian mission and corruption in Denmark and Norway in the 19th century.

Recruitment and training
The group recruits via its institution and via externally funded projects. There is little information about a conscious strategy, especially regarding the training of PhD students and early-career researchers.

Networking
The research group collaborates closely with local and regional institutions on local history. No formal international affiliation is mentioned, but there are references to individual scholars’ connections to the USA and Scandinavia and to a Scandinavian network on Christian immigration. Plans for future projects have an international component. There is nonetheless a potential for more purposeful development of international links.

Impact on teaching
The research group has a good impact on teaching through the MA programme ‘Cultural Encounters’ and through courses at BA level. MA students have been involved in research. The details of this impact are not described, however.

Overall assessment
This is a good, albeit thematically rather heterogeneous, research group. There is no doubt about the individual members’ scholarly capacity, but the research group has a potential for development in
terms of collaborative organisation, explicitly addressing cross-disciplinary challenges and international orientation.

Feedback and comments
The panel would have appreciated a little more information on the nature of collaboration and how the group seeks to cultivate that collaboration and the skills required over time. Given its concern with cultural encounters, a fertile international scholarly area, the group might benefit from more formal collaboration with international scholars working on related topics. The report might have been more detailed in terms of the exact nature of the collaboration with local and regional institutions, since there is little doubt that the research group has a clear strength when it comes to local history. The group comprises scholars from History, Religious Studies, Theology, Philosophy and Archaeology. The cross-disciplinary experience gleaned from collaboration across these disciplines might have been addressed more explicitly.

4.19 NIKU-Building-Context-Transformation

Overall score: 2

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
The cluster originated in an organisation (NIKU) dedicated to public heritage management, research and advice. It is planned to last from 2016 to 2020. Within the larger organisation, the structuring and aims of the research cluster are clearly set out, and the reasons for and tasks of the research group are clearly articulated. However, there is little specific information about how leadership and management of the diverse tasks will be organised within the group. Members of the group have different professional backgrounds. Of the 14 members listed for evaluation, six are researchers, three of whom have a PhD and some have specialist training (conservators). Resources are delegated from NIKU to individual members of staff based on a pro rata principle, while a minor part of funding comes from consultancies and some additional research funding from the RCN. There are clear plans for advancing research, but lot of them are still aspirations.

Research production and quality
The selected publications are mainly applied research and relate to methodology. As the research group has just been formed, the publications indicate the research potential of its members rather than research conducted. They reflect the interests and competences of the research cluster well, but the research quality is low to modest since most of the pieces are descriptive accounts of procedures rather than more in-depth investigations of the basis for such procedures. Moreover, they do not generally address broader research questions beyond their immediate applied context. Most of the selected publications are in Norwegian, some are in journals, but at least one is a policy-advice paper.

Recruitment and training
Recruitment seems to be based on searching for matching skills within the organisation. There are good opportunities for further training on-the-job, including acquiring specialist skills, although the research group states that this criterion does not apply to them.
Networking
This research group has some international contacts, but its national network seems stronger, partly due to the consultancy work mainly being done in Norway.

Impact on teaching
N/A. This is not a teaching institution, and there are therefore no PhD students or postdocs.

Overall assessment
This cluster is coherent in terms of its focus on buildings, but much of its pre-existing publications and other forms of work are applied and mainly take the form of short descriptive accounts of procedures. They lack analytical ambitions and do not address broader research contexts. Not all members of the research cluster are research-active. There is a good network, especially in Norway, and a good age and gender profile.

Feedback and comments
The research group benefits from being part of a larger organisation (NIKU), but the synergies within the group (shared projects, tasks, cross-benefits from research) could be improved. The research ambitions behind most of the publications are modest, i.e. there is no sense of an ambition to become leaders in a particular field, or to develop core methods. The group should be encouraged to develop a more coherent and cohesive research and publication strategy, to develop its international networks and target national and international research funding sources to contribute to the cohesiveness and development of the group.

4.20 NIKU-City-SIS

Overall score: 4

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
This is a research cluster within an organisation (NIKU) dedicated to public heritage management, research and advice. Despite being newly established in 2016 – as the result of an RCN application – this group has a clearly articulated strategic focus. The group has a collaborative approach to publications, with regular workshops to discuss work in progress. It is not clear, however, how decisions are taken, how the group is led etc. Members of the group have different professional backgrounds. Of the 12 members submitted, five have an MA or PhD degree.

Research production and quality
Publications effectively reflect the core themes of the group; some members of the group are highly productive, while others are less so (of the 12 members, five have been submitted for evaluation). The submitted publications represent a significant contribution to the field, with most of the publications being of international interest. Group members publish in key journals. There are good reasons to expect that the core researchers in this group will continue to publish in high-ranked publications. Within the wider research group, the level of publication varies, with some having a very low publication rate.
Recruitment and training
Recruitment takes place both from within the organisation (based on appropriate skills) and through open competition. There are relatively few opportunities for formal training, but considerable possibilities for on-the-job development (having to meet externally generated targets, being included in teams etc.). Workshops encourage a collaborative approach to research.

Networking
This research group has some international contacts, and its members have participated in various projects. Its national network appears strong, partly due to a range of consultancies. There are plans to establish a reference group.

Impact on teaching
N/A

Overall assessment
The research group benefits organisationally from being ‘hosted’ by NIKU, which provides the managerial infrastructure. The actual management of the group is less clear. The members of the group who are research-active undertake highly original research with a high degree of visibility in the field, and with a coherent thematic focus. The research output from the rest of the research group is limited.

Feedback and comments
Opportunities for further research training could be pursued to lift the whole group; the management of the group could be made more transparent and aimed at wider synergies between members

4.21 NIKU-Cultural Heritage Politics

Overall score: 4

Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources
The group has a clear raison d’être and well-defined objectives, with a clearly articulated five-year plan. There are managerial structures in place within NIKU to ensure that goals are met. The research group is partly a continuation of established interests within the organisation, and it has recently been streamlined as a specialised group. It has made a good strategic investment in future challenges, managerial as well as theoretical. Members of the group have different professional backgrounds. They all have higher degrees (MA or PhD), and there are plans for workshops and grant applications, and also for establishing a reference group.

Research production and quality
The research group submitted four journal articles and two monographs. The quality varied, with publications being from good to very good. Several publications appeared in reasonably high-visibility journals/publishers. Its research aims are to produce six to eight scientific peer-reviewed publications by 2018. With one exception, the selected publications constitute a coherent and interesting cluster exploring different dimensions of heritage politics, including some where they have access to a
unique data set. Within the wider group, the level of publication varies, with some having a very low publication rate, while others are impressive.

**Recruitment and training**
Recruitment takes place both from within the organisation (based on appropriate skills) and through open competition. There are relatively few opportunities for formal training, but considerable possibilities for on-the-job development of skills. The group also holds seminars and writing workshops, and emphasises co-authorship as a means of providing training.

**Networking**
The group has a stated aim of developing closer relations with the university sector and strengthening its research network via conferences and seminars. Several members already have strong national and international networks.

**Impact on teaching**
N/A

**Overall assessment**
The research group benefits organisationally from being hosted by NIKU, which provides the managerial infrastructure. Some attention has been given to the actual management of the group, but more detailed plans would be useful. The submitted publications are a bit too diverse to reflect a strong and coherent research group, while the research quality of the publications varies, with some being very good. The research group has only just been established.

**Feedback and comments**
Opportunities for further research training might be pursued to lift the whole group; the management of the group could be made more transparent and aimed at achieving synergies between members.

---

**4.22 NIKU-Memories of War (Krigsminner)**

**Overall score:** 2

**Organisation, leadership, strategy and resources**
This newly established research group intends to pursue research on the archaeological remnants of the Second World War in Northern Norway. A start-up meeting is planned in collaboration with relevant organisations in the region. However, the self-assessment is incomplete and does not provide details about organisational matters and resources.

**Research production and quality**
Publication records are highly divergent within the group, with some members documenting very few academic publications. All members of the group lack a strong research record on the issues that are to be studied in the project.

**Recruitment and training**
Strategies not clearly spelt out. There are no specific plans for young scholars.
Networking
The focus is mainly on regional collaborations. Given the nature of the research theme, it is essential to develop research networks with experts in memory and heritage studies beyond Norway.

Impact on teaching
No information is provided.

Overall assessment
The group has only recently been established. It is not possible to assess the potential of the group and its research plans based on the limited information provided in the self-assessment.

Feedback and comments
The group clearly needs a more elaborate and specific research strategy. It also needs to develop broader research networks and expand the group with researchers in other subject areas, and especially History, with a specialisation in memory politics and the post-war era.
5 Reference list


NOKUT. (2016). 2015 Student Satisfaction Average Scores per Institution (note to the evaluation panels). Oslo: NOKUT.


### 6 List of abbreviations used in the reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aDNA</td>
<td>Ancient DNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHO</td>
<td>Oslo School of Architecture and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATH</td>
<td>Ansgar University College and Theological Seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAR</td>
<td>British Archaeological Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHU</td>
<td>Business History Unit (BI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI</td>
<td>BI Norwegian Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVH</td>
<td>Buskerud and Vestfold University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARIN</td>
<td>Common Language Resources and Technology Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN</td>
<td>Creating the New North (UiT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIStin</td>
<td>Current Research Information System in Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CultMeM</td>
<td>Culture and Memory research (UiS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFG</td>
<td>Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
<td>Diakonhjemmet University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIGSSCORE</td>
<td>Digital Social Science Core Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATNAT</td>
<td>The Fate of Nations (NTNU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIF</td>
<td>Forskning i Fellesskap / Research together (RCN-funded collaborativ project for the university museums)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIH</td>
<td>Fjellhaug International University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>EU Framework Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIPRO</td>
<td>RCN's ‘bottom-up’ funding instrument for investigator-initiated research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSV</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences (UiN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTIR</td>
<td>Micro-Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic information system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Higher Education Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERD</td>
<td>Higher Education Expenditure on R&amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HiHm</td>
<td>Hedmark University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HiL</td>
<td>Lillehammer University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HiØ</td>
<td>Østfold University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIOA</td>
<td>Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HiT/TUC</td>
<td>Telemark University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPR</td>
<td>Historical Population Register (Norway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTL</td>
<td>Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education (UiT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMEVAL</td>
<td>This evaluation of the Humanities in Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVO</td>
<td>Volda University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFS</td>
<td>Norwegian Institute for Defence Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG-C</td>
<td>The Middle English Grammar Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELD</td>
<td>A Corpus of Middle English Local Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEST</td>
<td>Middle English Scribal Texts Programme (UiS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF</td>
<td>Norwegian School of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHS</td>
<td>School of Mission and Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MultiLing</td>
<td>Multilingualism in Society across the Lifespan (UIO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIT</td>
<td>The national archaeological databases (Norway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAFHA</td>
<td>North Atlantic Fisheries History Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAV</td>
<td>The Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDUCC</td>
<td>Norwegian Defence University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFS</td>
<td>Norwegian Folklore Archive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHH</td>
<td>Norwegian School of Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIFU</td>
<td>Nordic Institute for Studies in Innovation, Research and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIKU</td>
<td>Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLA</td>
<td>NLA University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMH</td>
<td>Norwegian Academy of Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOKUT</td>
<td>The Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRK</td>
<td>Norwegian Broadcasting Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSD</td>
<td>Norwegian Centre for Research Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTNU</td>
<td>Norwegian University of Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTNUUHF</td>
<td>Norwegian University of Science and Technology Faculty of humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTNUMuseum</td>
<td>Norwegian University of Science and Technology University Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIO</td>
<td>Peace Research Institute, Oslo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCN</td>
<td>Research Council of Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF</td>
<td>UK Research Excellence Framework (a system for performance-based research funding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROV</td>
<td>Remotely operated vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAK</td>
<td>Department of Archaeology and Cultural History (NTNU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH/SAMAS</td>
<td>Sámi University of Applied Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMS</td>
<td>Centre for the Study of Islam and the Middle East (UiO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKI</td>
<td>Centre for Culture and Sports Science (Telemark Research Institute)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKU</td>
<td>Department of Cultural Sciences (UiT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>The Assembly Project (KHM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHR</td>
<td>Norwegian Association of Higher Education Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiA</td>
<td>University of Agder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiB</td>
<td>University of Bergen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiBHF</td>
<td>University of Bergen Faculty of Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiBMuseum</td>
<td>University of Bergen University Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiBSV</td>
<td>University of Bergen Faculty of Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiN</td>
<td>Nordland University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiO</td>
<td>University of Oslo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiOHF</td>
<td>University of Oslo Faculty of Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiOMuseum/KHM</td>
<td>University of Oslo Museum of Cultural History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiOTF</td>
<td>University of Oslo Faculty of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIS</td>
<td>University of Stavanger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiSMuseum</td>
<td>University of Stavanger Museum of Archaeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiT</td>
<td>The Arctic University of Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiTHSL</td>
<td>The Arctic University of Norway, Faculty of Humanities, Social Sciences and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiTmuseum</td>
<td>The Arctic University of Norway University Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNI</td>
<td>UNI Research (In the case of this evaluation specifically the UNI Research Rokkan Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ViS</td>
<td>Centre for Viking Age Studies (KHM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WoS</td>
<td>Thomson-Reuters Web of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRF</td>
<td>X-Ray Fluorescence Spectroscopy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 7 List of panel members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Trentmann</th>
<th>Frank</th>
<th>Birkbeck College, University of London</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Johansson de Chateau</td>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>Technopolis/Faugert &amp;Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bauerkämper</td>
<td>Arnd</td>
<td>Free University of Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berger</td>
<td>Stefan</td>
<td>Ruhr-University, Bochum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birkedal Bruun</td>
<td>Mette</td>
<td>University of Copenhagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ekström</td>
<td>Anders</td>
<td>University of Uppsala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamerow</td>
<td>Helena</td>
<td>University of Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>University College London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stig Sørensen</td>
<td>Marie L.</td>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>