



ADMINISTRASJONEN
I. 3/2022

INNKALLING STYREMØTE

Instituttstyrets møte nr. 3/2022 – 27.09.2022, kl.12:00-16:00
Sted: Møterom 1214, Skolelaboratoriet, Kristine Bonnevis hus 1, etg.
Lunsj serveres i starten av møtet.

V-SAK 07/2022 GODKJENNING AV INNKALLING/SPØRSMÅL OM HABILITET I
VEDTAKSSAKER

Forslag til vedtak:
Innkallingen godkjennes

V-SAK 08/2022 EVALBIOVIT Evalueringsprotokoll: Terms of Reference

Sakspapirer:
Fremleggsnotat fra instituttleder
Evalueringsprotokoll: Terms of Reference

Forslag til vedtak:
Evalueringsprotokoll «Terms of Reference» vedtas med de endringer som
fremkommer i styremøtet.

O-SAK 09/2022 Strategidokument for IBV

Oslo, 20. september 2022

Arne Klungland
Instituttleder

Til: Instituttstyret ved Institutt for biovitenskap

Sakstype: Vedtakssak
Saksnummer: V-sak 08/2022
Møtedato: 27.9.2022
Notatdato: 20.9.2022
Saksbehandler: Arne Klungland

Sakstittel: EVALBIOVIT Terms of Reference (ToR)

Tidligere vedtak i saken/Plandokumenter/Henvising til lovverk etc.:

De viktigste problemstillingene:

EVALBIOVIT er en evaluering av biovitenskap i Norge. Bestiller er Norges forskningsråd.

Hovedmålet med fagevalueringen er å vurdere kvaliteten på norsk biovitenskapelig forskning, rammebetingelsene for forskningen og forskningens relevans for sentrale samfunnsområder. Evalueringen skal resultere i anbefalinger til institusjonene, Forskningsrådet og departementene. For at evalueringen skal være nyttig for forskningsinstitusjonenes strategiske utvikling, utvikles det evalueringsmandater/evalueringsprotokoller for hver enkelt institusjon.

Det er frist den 30.9. på å sende inn evalueringsprotokoll, Terms of Reference (ToR). Denne bestillingen er sentral i hva IBV evalueres på, og styret skal revidere og godkjenne punkt 1-5 på side 3 (det øvrige er allerede bestemt av NFR).

Instituttleder går først kort gjennom dokumenter for Administrativ enhet (Instituttet) og forskningsgruppene (i evalueringen er en forskningsgruppe en seksjon) som skal leveres til Forskningsrådet i begynnelsen av desember 2022 (Self-assessment).

Denne linken tar deg til utfyllende informasjon fra NFR vedrørende evalueringen:

https://www.forskningsradet.no/siteassets/tall-og-statistikk-seksjonen/evalueringer/vedlegg-1-evaluation_protocol_rcn_ver1-0_livseval.pdf

Forslag til vedtak:

Evalueringsprotokoll: «Terms of reference» vedtas med de endringer som fremkommer i styremøtet.

Vedlegg: Forslag til evalueringsprotokoll «Terms of reference»

Appendix A: Terms of Reference (ToR)

The board of **Department of Biosciences** mandates the evaluation committee appointed by the Research Council of Norway (RCN) to assess **the Department of Biosciences** based on the following Terms of Reference.

Assessment

You are asked to assess the organisation, quality and diversity of research conducted by **The Department of Biosciences** as well as its relevance to institutional and sectoral purposes, and to society at large. You should do so by judging the unit's performance based on the following five assessment criteria (a. to e.). Be sure to take current international trends and developments in science and society into account in your analysis.

Det i gult er tatt fra:

https://www.forskningsradet.no/siteassets/tall-og-statistikk-seksjonen/evalueringer/vedlegg-1-evaluation_protocol_rcn_ver1-0_livseval.pdf

In this overall assessment, the committee should relate the assessment of the specific tasks to the strategic goals that the administrative unit has set for itself in the Terms of Reference.

a) Strategy, resources and organisation

2.1 Strategy, resources and organisation The evaluation committee assesses the framework conditions for research in terms of funding, personnel, recruitment and research infrastructure in relation to the strategic aims set for the administrative unit. The administrative unit should address at least the following five specific aspects in its self-assessment: 1) funding sources, 2) national and international cooperation, 3) cross-sector and interdisciplinary cooperation, 4) research careers and mobility, and 5) Open Science. These five aspects relate to how the unit organises and actually performs its research, its composition in terms of leadership and personnel, and how the unit is run on a day-to-day basis. To contribute to understanding what the administrative unit can or should change to improve its ability to perform, the evaluation committee is invited to focus on factors that may affect performance. Further, the evaluation committee assesses the extent to which the administrative unit's goals for the future remain scientifically and societally relevant. It is also assessed whether its aims and strategy, as well as the foresight of its leadership and its overall management, are optimal in relation to attaining these goals. Finally, it is assessed whether the plans and resources are adequate to implement this strategy.

b) Research production, quality and integrity

The evaluation committee assesses the profile and quality of the administrative unit's research and the contribution the research makes to the body of scholarly knowledge and the knowledge base for other relevant sectors of society. The committee also assesses the scale of the unit's research results (scholarly publications, research infrastructure developed by the unit, and other contributions to the field) and its contribution to Open Science (early knowledge and sharing of data and other relevant digital objects, as well as science communication and collaboration with societal partners, where appropriate). The evaluation committee considers the administrative unit's policy for research integrity and how violations of such integrity are prevented. It is interested in how the unit deals with research data, data management, confidentiality (GDPR) and integrity, and the extent to which independent and critical pursuit of research is made possible within the unit. Research integrity relates to both the scientific integrity of conducted research and the professional integrity of researchers.

c) Diversity and equality

The evaluation committee considers the diversity of the administrative unit, including gender equality. The presence of differences can be a powerful incentive for creativity and talent development in a diverse administrative unit. Diversity is not an end in itself in that regard, but a tool for bringing together different perspectives and opinions. The evaluation committee considers the strategy and practices of the administrative unit to prevent discrimination on the grounds of gender, age, disability, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation or other personal characteristics.

d) Relevance to institutional and sectoral purposes

The evaluation committee compares the relevance of the administrative unit's activities and results to the specific aspects detailed in the Terms of Reference for each institution and to the relevant sectoral goals (see below). Higher Education Institutions There are 36 Higher Education Institutions in Norway that receive public funding from the Ministry for Education and Research. Twenty-one of the 36 institutions are owned by the ministry, whereas the last 15 are privately owned. The HEIs are regulated under the Act relating to universities and university colleges of 1 August 2005. The purposes of Norwegian HEIs are defined as follows in the Act relating to universities and university colleges² - provide higher education at a high international level; - conduct research and academic and artistic development work at a high international level; - disseminate knowledge of the institution's activities and promote an understanding of the principle of academic freedom and application of scientific and artistic methods and results in the teaching of students, in the institution's own general activity as well as in public administration, in cultural life and in business and industry. In line with these purposes, the Ministry for Research and Education has defined four overall goals for HEIs that receive public funding. These goals have been applied since 2015: 1) High quality in research and education 2) Research and education for welfare, value creation and innovation 3) Access to education (esp. capacity in health and teacher education) 4) Efficiency, diversity and solidity of the higher education sector and research system The committee is invited to assess to what extent the research activities and results of each administrative unit have contributed to

sectoral purposes as defined above. In particular, the committee is invited to take the share of resources spent on education at the administrative units into account and to assess the relevance and contributions of research to education, focusing on the master's and PhD levels. This assessment should be distinguished from an assessment of the quality of education in itself, and it is limited to the role of research in fostering high-quality education

e) Relevance to society

The committee assesses the quality, scale and relevance of contributions targeting specific economic, social or cultural target groups, of advisory reports on policy, of contributions to public debates, and so on. The documentation provided as the basis for the assessment of societal relevance should make it possible to assess relevance to various sectors of society (i.e. business, the public sector, non-governmental organisations and civil society). When relevant, the administrative units will be asked to link their contributions to national and international goals set for research, including the Norwegian Long-term Plan for Research and Higher Education and the UN Sustainable Development Goals. Sector-specific objectives, e.g. those described in the Development Agreements for the HEIs and other national guidelines for the different sectors, will be assessed as part of criterion 2.4. The committee is also invited to assess the societal impact of research based on case studies submitted by the administrative units and/or other relevant data presented to the committee. Academic impact will be assessed as part of criterion 2.2.

For a description of these criteria, see Chapter 2 of the life sciences evaluation protocol. Please provide a written assessment for each of the five criteria. Please also provide recommendations for improvement. We ask you to pay special attention to the following 5 aspects in your assessment:

[To be completed by the board: specific aspects that the evaluation committee should focus on – they may be related to a) strategic issues, or b) an administrative unit's specific tasks.]

1. Research should be at the international research front, and some environments shall be world leading.
2. Perception to obtain national and international research funding.
3. The education and researcher training should be of high quality, emphasize high scientific integrity, and candidates should be suited for careers in academia and other sectors.
4. Synergy and complementary of infrastructure: Do infrastructures hosted by IBV support and enhance the quality of research nationally and in the sections.
5. Successful strategies for academic early career development (post doc and further) scientists.

In addition, we would like your report to provide a qualitative assessment of **the Department of Biosciences** as a whole in relation to its strategic targets. The committee assesses the strategy that the administrative unit intends to pursue in the years ahead and the extent to which it will be capable of meeting its targets for research and society during this period based on available resources and competence. The committee is also invited to make recommendations concerning these two subjects.

Documentation

The necessary documentation will be made available by the life sciences secretariat at Technopolis Group.

The documents will include the following:

- a report on research personnel and publications within life sciences commissioned by RCN
- a self-assessment based on a template provided by the life sciences secretariat
- **[to be completed by the board]**

Interviews with representatives from the evaluated units

Interviews with the **Department of Biosciences** will be organised by the evaluation secretariat. Such interviews can be organised as a site visit, in another specified location in Norway or as a video conference.

Statement on impartiality and confidence

The assessment should be carried out in accordance with the *Regulations on Impartiality and Confidence in the Research Council of Norway*. A statement on the impartiality of the committee members has been recorded by the RCN as a part of the appointment process. The impartiality and confidence of committee and panel members should be confirmed when evaluation data from **the Department of Biosciences** are made available to the committee and the panels, and before any assessments are made based on these data. The RCN should be notified if questions concerning impartiality and confidence are raised by committee members during the evaluation process.

Assessment report

We ask you to report your findings in an assessment report drawn up in accordance with a format specified by the life sciences secretariat. The committee may suggest adjustments to this format at its first meeting. A draft report should be sent to the **Department of Biosciences** and RCN by [date]. The **Department of Biosciences** should be allowed to check the report for factual inaccuracies; if such inaccuracies are found, they should be reported to the life sciences secretariat no later than two weeks after receipt of the draft report. After the committee has made the amendments judged necessary, a corrected version of the assessment report should be sent to the board of **the Department of Biosciences** and the RCN no later than two weeks after all feedback on inaccuracies has been received from **the Department of Biosciences**.