

Evaluation report

Evaluated point	Grade	Comments
Scientific impact of research	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of the R&D outcomes are of a good international standard. • There is evidence that research publications are of international interest in the field of literary studies, as coordinated through the funded Entanglements project. • Research has been disseminated by internationally recognized publishers and in journals of an appropriate international quality. • There is evidence of disparity both in the volume and quality of high-level publications per researcher and across research areas. <p>The emphasis of the Centre upon cooperation and coordination, both domestically and regionally, was in clear evidence. The broader international outlook is good, but international collaboration could develop further beyond the level of the individual researcher and research groups. The level of scientific impact in general and the Centre's development of distinctive methodologies has contributed to its grant success.</p>
Sustainability and potential of research	Very good	<p>The Centre is very good in defining its research niche and in implementing this in its research and dissemination activities, but better baseline and external funding would help to develop its research structure further. The Centre has an active research policy and transnational orientation of the study of the culture of the Baltic region. Being an autonomous unit of the Estonian Academy of Sciences, the unit adds significantly to the diversity of humanities studies in Estonia.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Centre has a unique infrastructure that is well accommodated to the specific field of research: for example, its partnership in the graduate school of cultural studies and arts. • There is a good balance between research and developmental activities related to the Centre's museum, as evidenced in the digitalization of the museum's collection. • The Centre offers excellent research environment to PhD students from Estonian universities, but it might further develop its research development for visiting researchers and PhD students. • The sustainability of the Centre's research is supported by hiring junior scholars and organizing international research cooperation, but this could be further strengthened.

Evaluated point	Grade	Comments
Societal importance of research	Good	<p>The R&D directions confidently take account of, and integrate, the Centre's scientific research endeavour through the use of their archival and physical resources and in response to contemporary cultural and developmental trends and needs.</p> <p>Public events and school visits alongside specialist seminars held at the Vaikese Illimari House serve to link the content of the collections through active participation for example, in the planting schemes for the garden. The unit shares expertise through public talks and literary walking tours. It collaborates with the Estonian National Museum to support exhibitions, contribute artworks and scholarly expertise to exhibitions, to theatrical productions and to episodes of public broadcasting, as well as providing training for educators and public librarians.</p> <p>The evolution and development of the Centre's research focus, and particularly the understanding of cultural transfer and cultural entanglement is of significant cultural importance, not only in advancing self-understanding and cultural memory within Estonia, the Baltic region and the Estonian diaspora, but also in extending public understanding and knowledge exchange beyond Baltic borders through broader cultural outreach and tourism.</p>
<p>Scientific basis in the field is sufficient to conduct doctoral studies. (This question should be answered only if:</p> <p>a) institution being evaluated is conducting doctoral studies and; b) The field being evaluated is proposed to grant positive evaluation. If these conditions are met then: a) If the level of scientific basis is sufficient for conducting doctoral studies in every structural unit being evaluated, then the</p>		N/A

Evaluated point	Grade	Comments
answer should be „yes“; b) If the scientific basis is not sufficient in some structural units, then those units should be listed.)		

Summary assessment

Evaluated point	Grade	Comments
<p>Areas of special note as appropriate (Where necessary indicate sub-fields, assessment criteria, and/or structural units which, in the committee's opinion, were of a notably high level.)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a vital Centre for the tangible integration of the arts with humanities and the exploration of changing environmental and everyday histories and cultures. • There is an excellent range of collaborators who are producing significant scientific impact on the field of literary studies. • The intellectual coherence and the scholarly development of the Centre are particular strengths. • There is evidence of significant creative engagement with literary, theatrical and visual material alongside in-depth research and scholarship and the theoretical underpinning through multilingual Baltic history and literary culture, discourses of modernity and the Soviet and post-Soviet entanglements.
<p>Areas in need of improvement as appropriate (Where necessary indicate sub-fields of the field being evaluated, assessment criteria, and/or structural units which, in the committee's opinion, revealed significant shortcomings.)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A more systematic institutional approach to internationalization would further the research capacity of the Centre • As noted in the self-evaluation form, re-establishing the institutional relationship with the University of Tartu would help realise the potential of the Centre's research activities
<p>Assessment proposal to the Minister of Education and Research</p>	<p>To grant positive evaluation</p>	<p>No special comments</p>

Feedback

Evaluated point	Comments
<p>Feedback for institution (This question should be answered only if the institution asked for feedback from the evaluation committee in the self-report (about up to three specific areas of R&D which it finds to be currently important, e.g., related to its development plan).)</p>	<p>Not requested</p>
<p>Suggestions for unit, institution, state etc. (As appropriate, committee can give additional feedback for the structural unit, the institution, or the State (please specify whom feedback is directed to) according to the directive assessment criteria for regular evaluation (article 7).</p>	<p>Self-Evaluation: The self-evaluation report should be redesigned in order to prioritise analysis over description. The employment of descriptors such as ‘add facts’ is counterproductive and tends to lead to an emphasis on product over process throughout. The inclusion of a final section on strategic forward planning would be a more coherent summation of the self-evaluation exercise, while also providing continuity from one evaluation exercise to another.</p> <p>Evaluation of Scientific Impact: The panel has encountered wide-spread problems concerning the evaluation of publications in the humanities. The academic community of arts and humanities clearly lacks confidence in the criteria for scientific impact as presently formulated. What is needed for a more equitable and effective evaluation is: (i) Appropriate credit should be given for research undertaken in the production of monographs, the editing of and contributions to multi-authored work. (ii) The evaluation system should take account of the scientific quality of a publication irrespective of the language in which it is written. A multi-lingual system of evaluation is a matter of balancing three variables: (1) the scope (2) the subject and (3) audience. (iii) The current system fails to capture the range of research and the various modes in which it is produced. This is particularly evident in the absence of criteria for non-text based research [‘artistic’, ‘practice-based’]. A bench-marking exercise against other European models would be useful.</p> <p>Societal Impact: The academic community requires a more lucid definition of what is understood by societal impact; this should be substantiated by exemplars drawn from a much broader range of domains than the impact of research on the economy. It is clear that enterprise and entrepreneurial approaches do not appear to be at the forefront of most institutions visited. There is also a need to outline the relationship between scientific and societal impact for research in these fields such that the criteria may provide an appropriate and effective framework for quality assessment of the research.</p>

Evaluated point	Comments
	<p>Doctoral Programmes: While the research base for doctoral programmes is generally satisfactory, there are widespread issues around completion rates that are linked to extremely low funding levels. The current provision in Estonian is out of line with other European countries. Many students are by necessity in full-time employment, and carrying out their doctoral research part-time.</p> <p>Academic leadership: There is a lack of strategic leadership in (almost) all institutions. In many cases, the dean of the faculty or the director of a non-university research institute have a clear vision about the future of their unit, but are not successful in conveying it to the heads of department and the (senior) researchers. Therefore appropriate professional training and development in strategic management for researchers at various stages of their career is necessary.</p>