

# Some general points

---

- Good report
- Evaluations of research activities in Norway are important
- It is important that the evaluator panels/committees are international
  - International calibration of national research is necessary
- Improvements in report from EVALMIT compared to EVALNAT
  - E.g. depictions showing the national landscape and relative standings of different unit's research production and quality.

# Recognizable findings

---

- Findings in report are generally recognizable.
  - To coarse?
- There are some cases, however, where it seems to be a discrepancy between reported results, and experienced and communicated reality at institution (through RG reports)
  - A challenge for institutional usefulness of report
- Underlines that, for the *process leading to the report*:
  - Communication through reports is crucial
  - Interview and fact check improves this; but only arranged at AU level

# Missing aspects

---

Fundamental research is considerable in Mathematics

- (and in several other fields, Physics, Chemistry, biology, ...)
- Has **special challenges** (e.g. funding, link to *short term* societal needs, long term, ...)
- Differs significantly from e.g. research in technology
- These aspects deserves maybe a deeper discussion and analysis

Fundamental research in Mathematics (++)

- Plays a **vital** role in research and development of technology. This is mentioned, but
- could be given an even deeper explanation and more emphasis.

# Relevant recommendations?

---

- Yes, of course, some are useful
- Some others: “get more phd positions/funding”, “improve gender balance by adequate hiring strategy ...”
  - Correct, well known
  - Aspects that are strongly resource dependent
- Cases of lack of compliance between reported results at different levels (RG-AU-National report)
  - May undermine trust in the recommendations at institution level.
  - Could be avoided by a routine for quality assurance (in units/RG level)?

# Challenges and suggestions

---

- Challenge: some AU are included in more than one EVAL
  - EVALNAT (Physics) and EVALMIT (Mathematics), **but same AU**
  - EVALNAT (Bio., chem.) and EVALMIT (environm. techn.), but same AU
  - One of the fields will not appear in the relevant national report
- Suggestions
  - Perhaps it would be better to evaluate “**field wise**”; as it was done ~10 years ago
  - **Interviews** (as at AU level) are important; also at RG level in some way? Digital ok, but physically best.