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The evaluation of research and doctoral training is being carried out in the years 2010–2012 and will end in 2012. The steering group appointed by the Rector in January 2010 set the conditions for participating in the evaluation and prepared the Terms of Reference to present the evaluation procedure and criteria. The publications and other scientific activities included in the evaluation covered the years 2005–2010.

The participating unit in the evaluation was defined as a Researcher Community (RC). To obtain a critical mass with university-level impact, the number of members was set to range from 20 to 120. The RCs were required to contain researchers in all stages of their research career, from doctoral students to principal investigators (PIs). All in all, 136 Researcher Communities participated in this voluntary evaluation, 5857 persons in total, of whom 1131 were principal investigators. PIs were allowed to participate in two communities in certain cases, and 72 of them used this opportunity and participated in two RCs.

This evaluation enabled researchers to define RCs from the “bottom up” and across disciplines. The aim of the evaluation was not to assess individual performance but a community with shared aims and researcher-training activities. The RCs were able to choose among five different categories that characterised the status and main aims of their research. The steering group considered the process of applying to participate in the evaluation to be important, which lead to the establishment of these categories. In addition, providing a service for the RCs to enable them to benchmark their research at the global level was a main goal of the evaluation.

The data for the evaluation consisted of the RCs’ answers to evaluation questions on supplied e-forms and a compilation extracted from the TUHAT – Research Information System (RIS) on 12 April 2011. The compilation covered scientific and other publications as well as certain areas of scientific activities. During the process, the RCs were asked to check the list of publications and other scientific activities and make corrections if needed. These TUHAT compilations are public and available on the evaluation project sites of each RC in the TUHAT-RIS.

In addition to the e-form and TUHAT compilation, University of Leiden (CWTS) carried out bibliometric analyses from the articles included in the Web of Science (WoS). This was done on University and RC levels. In cases where the publication forums of the RC were clearly not represented by the WoS data, the Library of the University of Helsinki conducted a separate analysis of the publications. This was done for 66 RCs representing the humanities and social sciences.

The evaluation office also carried out an enquiry targeted to the supervisors and PhD candidates about the organisation of doctoral studies at the University of Helsinki. This and other documents describing the University and the Finnish higher education system were provided to the panellists.

The panel feedback for each RC is unique and presented as an entity. The first collective evaluation reports available for the whole panel were prepared in July–August 2011. The reports were accessible to all panel members via the electronic evaluation platform in August. Scoring from 1 to 5 was used to complement written feedback in association with evaluation questions 1–4 (scientific focus and quality, doctoral training, societal impact, cooperation) and in addition to the category evaluating the fitness for participation in the evaluation. Panellists used the international level as a point of comparison in the evaluation. Scoring was not expected to go along with a preset deviation.

Each of the draft reports were discussed and dealt with by the panel in meetings in Helsinki (from 11 September to 13 September or from 18 September to 20 September 2011). In these meetings the panels also examined the deviations among the scores and finalised the draft reports together.

The current RC-specific report deals shortly with the background of the evaluation and the terms of participation. The main evaluation feedback is provided in the evaluation report, organised according to the evaluation questions. The original material provided by the RCs for the panellists has been attached to these documents.
On behalf of the evaluation steering group and office, I sincerely wish to thank you warmly for your participation in this evaluation. The effort you made in submitting the data to TUHAT-RIS is gratefully acknowledged by the University. We wish that you find this panel feedback useful in many ways. The bibliometric profiles may open a new view on your publication forums and provide a perspective for discussion on your choice of forums. We especially hope that this evaluation report will help you in setting the future goals of your research.

Johanna Björkroth
Vice-Rector
Chair of the Steering Group of the Evaluation
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1 Introduction to the Evaluation

1.1 RC-specific evaluation reports

The participants in the evaluation of research and doctoral training were Researcher Communities (hereafter referred to as the RC). The RC refers to the group of researchers who registered together in the evaluation of their research and doctoral training. Preconditions in forming RCs were stated in the Guidelines for the Participating Researcher Communities. The RCs defined themselves whether their compositions should be considered well-established or new.

It is essential to emphasise that the evaluation combines both meta-evaluation\(^1\) and traditional research assessment exercise and its focus is both on the research outcomes and procedures associated with research and doctoral training. The approach to the evaluation is enhancement-led where self-evaluation constituted the main information. The answers to the evaluation questions formed together with the information of publications and other scientific activities an entity that was to be reviewed as a whole.

The present evaluation recognizes and justifies the diversity of research practices and publication traditions. Traditional Research Assessment Exercises do not necessarily value high quality research with low volumes or research distinct from mainstream research. It is challenging to expose the diversity of research to fair comparison. To understand the essence of different research practices and to do justice to their diversity was one of the main challenges of the present evaluation method. Understanding the divergent starting points of the RCs demanded sensitivity from the evaluators.

1.2 Aims and objectives in the evaluation

The aims of the evaluation are as follows:

- to improve the level of research and doctoral training at the University of Helsinki and to raise their international profile in accordance with the University’s strategic policies. The improvement of doctoral training should be compared to the University’s policy.\(^2\)
- to enhance the research conducted at the University by taking into account the diversity, originality, multidisciplinary nature, success and field-specificity,
- to recognize the conditions and prerequisites under which excellent, original and high-impact research is carried out,
- to offer the academic community the opportunity to receive topical and versatile international peer feedback,
- to better recognize the University’s research potential.
- to exploit the University’s TUHAT research information system to enable transparency of publishing activities and in the production of reliable, comparable data.

1.3 Evaluation method

The evaluation can be considered as an enhancement-led evaluation. Instead of ranking, the main aim is to provide useful information for the enhancement of research and doctoral training of the participating RCs. The comparison should take into account each field of science and acknowledge their special character.

---

\(^1\) The panellists did not read research reports or abstracts but instead, they evaluated answers to the evaluation questions, tables and compilations of publications, other scientific activities, bibliometrics or comparable analyses.

\(^2\) Policies on doctoral degrees and other postgraduate degrees at the University of Helsinki.
The comparison produced information about the present status and factors that have lead to success. Also challenges in the operations and outcomes were recognized.

The evaluation approach has been designed to recognize better the significance and specific nature of researcher communities and research areas in the multidisciplinary top-level university. Furthermore, one of the aims of the evaluation is to bring to light those evaluation aspects that differ from the prevalent ones. Thus the views of various fields of research can be described and research arising from various starting points understood better. The doctoral training is integrated into the evaluation as a natural component related to research. Operational processes of doctoral training are being examined in the evaluation.

**Five stages of the evaluation method were:**
1. Registration – Stage 1
2. Self-evaluation – Stage 2
3. TUHAT⁵ compilations on publications and other scientific activities⁴
4. External evaluation
5. Public reporting

### 1.4 Implementation of the external evaluation

**Five Evaluation Panels**

Five evaluation panels consisted of independent, renowned and highly respected experts. The main domains of the panels are:

1. biological, agricultural and veterinary sciences
2. medicine, biomedicine and health sciences
3. natural sciences
4. humanities
5. social sciences

The University invited 10 renowned scientists to act as chairs or vice-chairs of the five panels based on the suggestions of faculties and independent institutes. Besides leading the work of the panel, an additional role of the chairs was to discuss with other panel chairs in order to adopt a broadly similar approach. The panel chairs and vice-chairs had a pre-meeting on 27 May 2011 in Amsterdam.

The panel compositions were nominated by the Rector of the University 27 April 2011. The participating RCs suggested the panel members. The total number of panel members was 50. The reason for a smaller number of panellists as compared to the previous evaluations was the character of the evaluation as a meta-evaluation. The panellists did not read research reports or abstracts but instead, they evaluated answers to the evaluation questions, tables and compilations of publications, other scientific activities, bibliometrics and comparable analyses.

The panel meetings were held in Helsinki:

- On 11–13 September 2011: (1) biological, agricultural and veterinary sciences, (2) medicine, biomedicine and health sciences and (3) natural sciences.
- On 18–20 September 2011: (4) humanities and (5) social sciences.

---

⁵ TUHAT (acronym) of Research Information System (RIS) of the University of Helsinki

⁴ Supervision of thesis, prizes and awards, editorial work and peer reviews, participation in committees, boards and networks and public appearances.
1.5 Evaluation material

The main material in the evaluation was the RCs’ self-evaluations that were qualitative in character and allowed the RCs to choose what was important to mention or emphasise and what was left unmentioned.

The present evaluation is exceptional at least in the Finnish context because it is based on both the evaluation documentation (self-evaluation questions, publications and other scientific activities) and the bibliometric reports. All documents were delivered to the panellists for examination.

Traditional bibliometrics can be reasonably done mainly in medicine, biosciences and natural sciences when using the Web of Science database, for example. Bibliometrics, provided by CWTS/The Centre for Science and Technology Studies, University of Leiden, cover only the publications that include WoS identification in the TUHAT-RIS.

Traditional bibliometrics are seldom relevant in humanities and social sciences because the international comparable databases do not store every type of high quality research publications, such as books and monographs and scientific journals in other languages than English. The Helsinki University Library has done analysis to the RCs, if their publications were not well represented in the Web of Science databases (RCs should have at least 50 publications and internal coverage of publications more than 40%) – it meant 58 RCs. The bibliometric material for the evaluation panels was available in June 2011. The RC-specific bibliometric reports are attached at the end of each report.

The panels were provided with the evaluation material and all other necessary background information, such as the basic information about the University of Helsinki and the Finnish higher education system.

Evaluation material

1. Registration documents of the RCs for the background information
2. Self evaluation material – answers to the evaluation questions
3. Publications and other scientific activities based on the TUHAT RIS:
   3.1. statistics of publications
   3.2. list of publications
   3.3. statistics of other scientific activities
   3.4. list of other scientific activities
4. Bibliometrics and comparable analyses:
   4.1. Analyses of publications based on the verification of TUHAT-RIS publications with the Web of Science publications (CWTS/University of Leiden)
   4.2. Publication statistics analysed by the Helsinki University Library - mainly for humanities and social sciences
5. University level survey on doctoral training (August 2011)
6. University level analysis on publications 2005–2010 (August 2011) provided by CWTS/University of Leiden

Background material

University of Helsinki
- Basic information about the University of the Helsinki
- The structure of doctoral training at the University of Helsinki
- Previous evaluations of research at the University of Helsinki – links to the reports: 1998 and 2005

The Finnish Universities/Research Institutes
- Finnish University system
- Evaluation of the Finnish National Innovation System
- The State and Quality of Scientific Research in Finland. Publication of the Academy of Finland 9/09.

The evaluation panels were provided also with other relevant material on request before the meetings in Helsinki.
1.6 Evaluation questions and material

The participating RCs answered the following evaluation questions which are presented according to the evaluation form. In addition, TUHAT RIS was used to provide the additional material as explained. For giving the feedback to the RCs, the panellists received the evaluation feedback form constructed in line with the evaluation questions:

1. Focus and quality of the RC’s research
   • Description of
     - the RC’s research focus.
     - the quality of the RC’s research (incl. key research questions and results)
     - the scientific significance of the RC’s research in the research field(s)
   • Identification of the ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research

The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s publications, analysis of the RC’s publications data (provided by University of Leiden and the Helsinki University Library)
A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness
   • Strengths
   • Areas of development
   • Other remarks
   • Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

2. Practises and quality of doctoral training
   • Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC’s principles for:
     - recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates
     - supervision of doctoral candidates
     - collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes
     - good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training
   • Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.

The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities/supervision of doctoral dissertations
A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practices related to leadership and management
   • Strengths
   • Areas of development
   • Other remarks
   • Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

3. The societal impact of research and doctoral training
   • Description on how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).
   • Identification of the ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.

The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities.
A written feedback from the aspects of: societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness
   • Strengths
   • Areas of development
   • Other remarks
   • Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)
4. International and national (incl. intersectoral) research collaboration and researcher mobility

- Description of
  - the RC’s research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities
  - how the RC has promoted researcher mobility
- Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, national and international collaboration

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

5. Operational conditions

- Description of the operational conditions in the RC’s research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).
- Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.

A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practices related to leadership and management

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

6. Leadership and management in the researcher community

- Description of
  - the execution and processes of leadership in the RC
  - how the management-related responsibilities and roles are distributed in the RC
  - how the leadership- and management-related processes support
    - high quality research
    - collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC
    - the RC’s research focus
  - strengthening of the RC’s know-how
- Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes

7. External competitive funding of the RC

- The RCs were asked to provide information of such external competitive funding, where:
  - the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and
  - the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki
- On the e-form the RCs were asked to provide:
  1) The relevant funding source(s) from a given list (Academy of Finland/Research Council, TEKES/The Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation, EU, ERC, foundations, other national funding organisations, other international funding organisations), and
  2) The total sum of funding which the organisation in question had decided to allocate to the RCs members during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010.

Competitive funding reported in the text is also to be considered when evaluating this point.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness, future significance

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

8. The RC’s strategic action plan for 2011–2013

- RC’s description of their future perspectives in relation to research and doctoral training.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, processes and good practices related to leadership and management, national and international collaboration, innovativeness, future significance

- Strengths
- Areas of development
9. Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

The RC's fitness to the chosen participation category
A written feedback evaluating the RC's fitness to the chosen participation category
- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

10. Short description of how the RC members contributed the compilation of the stage 2 material
Comments on the compilation of evaluation material

11. How the UH's focus areas are presented in the RC's research?
Comments if applicable

12. RC-specific main recommendations based on the previous questions 1-11

13. RC-specific conclusions

1.7 Evaluation criteria

The panellists were expected to give evaluative and analytical feedback to each evaluation question according to their aspects in order to describe and justify the quality of the submitted material. In addition, the evaluation feedback was asked to be pointed out the level of the performance according to the following classifications:
- outstanding (5)
- excellent (4)
- very good (3)
- good (2)
- sufficient (1)

Evaluation according to the criteria was to be made with thorough consideration of the entire evaluation material of the RC in question. Finally, in questions 1-4 and 9, the panellists were expected to classify their written feedback into one of the provided levels (the levels included respective descriptions, ‘criteria’). Some panels used decimals in marks. The descriptive level was interpreted according to the integers and not rounding up the decimals by the editors.

Description of criteria levels

Question 1 – FOCUS AND QUALITY OF THE RC’S RESEARCH

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

Outstanding quality of procedures and results (5)
Outstandingly strong research, also from international perspective. Attracts great international interest with a wide impact, including publications in leading journals and/or monographs published by leading international publishing houses. The research has world leading qualities. The research focus, key research questions scientific significance, societal impact and innovativeness are of outstanding quality.

In cases where the research is of a national character and, in the judgement of the evaluators, should remain so, the concepts of "international attention" or "international impact" etc. in the grading criteria above may be replaced by "international comparability".
Operations and procedures are of outstanding quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of outstanding quality.

**Excellent quality of procedures and results (4)**

Research of excellent quality. Typically published with great impact, also internationally. Without doubt, the research has a leading position in its field in Finland.

Operations and procedures are of excellent quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of excellent quality.

**Very good quality of procedures and results (3)**

The research is of such very good quality that it attracts wide national and international attention.

Operations and procedures are of very good quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of very good quality.

**Good quality of procedures and results (2)**

Good research attracting mainly national attention but possessing international potential, extraordinarily high relevance may motivate good research.

Operations and procedures are of good quality, shared occasionally in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of good quality.

**Sufficient quality of procedures and results (1)**

In some cases the research is insufficient and reports do not gain wide circulation or do not have national or international attention. Research activities should be revised.

Operations and procedures are of sufficient quality, shared occasionally in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to some extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of sufficient quality.

**Question 2 – DOCTORAL TRAINING**
**Question 3 – SOCIETAL IMPACT**
**Question 4 – COLLABORATION**

**Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)**

**Outstanding quality of procedures and results (5)**

Procedures are of outstanding quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of outstanding quality. The procedures and results are regularly evaluated and the feedback has an effect on the planning.

**Excellent quality of procedures and results (4)**

Procedures are of excellent quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of excellent quality. The procedures and outcomes are evaluated and the feedback has an effect on the planning.

**Very good quality of procedures and results (3)**

Procedures are of very good quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and
management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of very good quality.

**Good quality of procedures and results (2)**

Procedures are of good quality, shared occasionally in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of good quality.

**Sufficient quality of procedures and results (1)**

Procedures are of sufficient quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to some extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of sufficient quality.

**Question 9 – CATEGORY**

Participation category – fitness for the category chosen

The choice and justification for the chosen category below should be reflected in the RC's responses to the evaluation questions 1–8.

1. *The research of the participating community represents the international cutting edge in its field.*
2. *The research of the participating community is of high quality, but the community in its present composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition or a clear break-through.*
3. *The research of the participating community is distinct from mainstream research, and the special features of the research tradition in the field must be considered in the evaluation.* The research is of high quality and has great significance and impact in its field. However, the generally used research evaluation methods do not necessarily shed sufficient light on the merits of the research.
4. *The research of the participating community represents an innovative opening.* A new opening can be an innovative combination of research fields, or it can be proven to have a special social, national or international demand or other significance. Even if the researcher community in its present composition has yet to obtain proof of international success, its members can produce convincing evidence of the high level of their previous research.
5. *The research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact.* The participating researcher community is able to justify the high social significance of its research. The research may relate to national legislation, media visibility or participation in social debate, or other activities promoting social development and human welfare. In addition to having societal impact, the research must be of a high standard.

**An example of outstanding fitness for category choice (5)**

The RC’s representation and argumentation for the chosen category were convincing. The RC recognized its real capacity and apparent outcomes in a wider context to the research communities. The specific character of the RC was well-recognized and well stated in the responses. The RC fitted optimally for the category.

- Outstanding (5)
- Excellent (4)
- Very good (3)
- Good (2)
- Sufficient (1)

The above-mentioned definition of outstanding was only an example in order to assist the panellists in the positioning of the classification. There was no exact definition for the category fitness.

---

5 The panels discussed the category fitness and made the final conclusions of the interpretation of it.
1.8 Timetable of the evaluation

The main timetable of the evaluation:

1. Registration  
   November 2010
2. Submission of self-evaluation materials  
   January–February 2011
3. External peer review  
   May–September 2011
4. Published reports  
   - University level public report  
     March–April 2012  
   - RC specific reports

The entire evaluation was implemented during the university’s strategy period 2010–2012. The preliminary results were available for the planning of the following strategy period in late autumn 2011. The evaluation reports will be published in March/April 2012. More detailed time schedule is published in the University report.

1.9 Evaluation feedback – consensus of the entire panel

The panellists evaluated all the RC-specific material before the meetings in Helsinki and mailed the draft reports to the evaluation office. The latest interim versions were on-line available to all the panellists on the Wiki-sites. In September 2011, in Helsinki the panels discussed the material, revised the first draft reports and decided the final numeric evaluation. After the meetings in Helsinki, the panels continued working and finalised the reports before the end of November 2011. The final RC-specific reports are the consensus of the entire panel.

The evaluation reports were written by the panels independently. During the editing process, the evaluation office requested some clarifications from the panels when necessary. The tone and style in the reports were not harmonized in the editing process. All the reports follow the original texts written by the panels as far as it was possible.

The original evaluation material of the RCs, provided for the panellists is attached at the end of the report. It is essential to notice that the exported lists of publications and other scientific activities depend how the data was stored in the TUHAT-RIS by the RCs.
2 Evaluation feedback

2.1 Focus and quality of the RC’s research

- Description of
  - the RC’s research focus
  - the quality of the RC’s research (incl. key research questions and results)
  - the scientific significance of the RC’s research in the research field(s)
- Identification of the ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research

ASPECTS: Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness

The analysis of publications indicates that 206 PPH works were published during the evaluation period. The majority of publications or 57% are A1 refereed journal articles (22%) and A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed) (35%).

On average, the 8 doctoral members of the RC published 2.5 A1, A3, C1 publications annually for 2005-10, which is at the higher end of Helsinki social science.

Also, during the evaluation period, 52% of the publications are circulated in English. Publishing in English allows for a potential larger audience.

Strengths
The quality of the PPH research is upright considering that this RC has only 4 professors working with 3 researchers, 1 university lecturer and 12 doctoral candidates. It is noted that of the 206 publications 85% are single authored.

Challenges
The majority of publications seem to be authored by a minority of scholars. A challenge would be to encourage the other scholars to publish more or for the senior scholars to publish more with juniors.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

2.2 Practises and quality of doctoral training

- Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC’s principles for:
  - recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates
  - supervision of doctoral candidates
  - collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes
  - good practices and quality assurance in doctoral training
  - assuring of good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates
- Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.
- Additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC’s other scientific activities/supervision of doctoral dissertations

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

Strengths
Since the career opportunities for PhDs in philosophy in Finland are tight, it is a strength of the PPH that they encourage their doctoral students to publish internationally in foreign languages while working on their PhDs. This benefits their job search outside of Finland.
The fact that the students study abroad is an important strength. The strength should be emphasized, encourage and funded.

**Challenges**
Due to the lack of career prospects in Finland for new PhDs in philosophy the PPH could investigate being more restrictive in the selection of students for the philosophy doctoral program. In addition, a more restrictive selection approach may positively influence the number of PhD students dropping out of the program. The drop out rate could be considered a problem. This problem may be traced to the student selection process.

Since the career opportunities for philosophy in Finland are constrained, it may be helpful to recruit foreign doctoral students that would return home to pursue a career in their home country. This challenge would require a focused and intense marketing initiative.

**Numeric evaluation: 3 (Very good)**

### 2.3 The societal impact of research and doctoral training

- **Description on how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).**
- **Identification of the ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC's research and doctoral training.**
- **Additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC's other scientific activities.**

**ASPECTS:** Societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness

**Strengths**
PPH members are considerate of the greater society. They write and speak in the popular media such as TV. This is commendable.

**Challenges**
The process of keeping attuned to popular culture often challenges academics. The PPH, especially with their emphasis on practicality, should be encouraged and rewarded for keeping up with all kinds of moral issues emerging in society and in its public debates.

**Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)**

### 2.4 International and national (incl. intersectoral) research collaboration and researcher mobility

- **Description of**
  - the RC's research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities
  - how the RC has promoted researcher mobility
- **Identification of the RC's strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.**

**ASPECTS:** Scientific quality, national and international collaboration

**Strengths**
It is noted that the PPH works closely with theology and the humanities. In addition, from their publication record it is clear that this RC works closely with the medical and legal communities. The fact that philosophy doctoral students study abroad clearly reflects the strength of mobility. This is good for the students and the PPH.
Challenges
Collaboration necessitates contact with colleagues. Usually, this is done over a long period of time that is used to build a network of international colleagues and professional associations. This long process develops via attending international conferences and sabbaticals. The professors in the PPH have done a good job in developing such a network. For example, the PPH has strong connections in the Americas and Japan. The challenge in this area is generally funding. There can be strong and weak budget cycles for various reasons but the administration should strive to maintain a positive secular trend in funding.

Numeric evaluation: 5 (Outstanding)

2.5 Operational conditions

- Description of the operational conditions in the RC’s research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).
- Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

Strengths
None obvious.

Challenges
With four professors, it is clear that the operational aspects of the PPH would be enhanced by more positions that are permanent.

Great universities are department driven. (For example Stanford has about 70 departments). These eminent departments are rather narrow in scope. The PPH is located in the Department of Political and Economic Studies that includes economics, development studies, social philosophy, moral philosophy, social science history (political history, economic and social history) and political science. This is a very large department. Did the reforms of 2009 fit the PPH well?

Large departmental arrangements can be counter-productive. Focus can be lost and efforts diminished in such operational conglomerates. Generally, departments made of conglomerations (in this case: politics, economics, two areas of philosophy) are perceived as low cost adaptations to budget constraints and imposed by administration. A challenge is to ensure this particular grouping is academically justified.

2.6 Leadership and management in the researcher community

- Description of
  - the execution and processes of leadership in the RC
  - how the management-related responsibilities and roles are distributed in the RC
  - how the leadership- and management-related processes support
    - high quality research
    - collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC
    - the RC’s research focus
    - strengthening of the RC’s know-how
- Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

Because the PPH is made up of a few professors and is dependent on a larger departmental structure, leadership may tend not to be an important issue with so few scholars.

However, the students may require more leadership. They may be able to benefit from closer supervision with their time frames for graduation.
For example:
1. could the RC enter into written formal agreements between the doctoral students and their supervisors so that everyone understands all expectations
2. could members of the supervisory group include external university professors
3. could doctoral students be abetted in generating publishable articles and
4. could the doctoral students have their progress monitored and thereby ensure their graduation in a timely manner.

2.7 External competitive funding of the RC

• The RCs were asked to provide information of such external competitive funding, where:
  • the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010, and
  • the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki
• On the e-form the RCs were asked to provide:
  1) The relevant funding source(s) from a given list (Academy of Finland/Research Council, TEKES/The Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation, EU, ERC, foundations, other national funding organisations, other international funding organizations), and
  2) The total sum of funding which the organisation in question had decided to allocate to the RCs members during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010.

Competitive funding reported in the text is also to be considered when evaluating this point.
ASPECTS: Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness and future significance

Strengths
The external funding over the six-year period of evaluation is about two million euros (1.982.034). The one-third of a million euros per year of external funding for the PPH is a strength for a RC of this size. The success of PPH in getting significant funding is a strong indicator of the good efforts of the PPH.

Challenges
A challenge could be to encourage the adjuncts (docents) to seek external funding to cover their full-time salaries. However, this may not be realistic.

2.8 The RC’s strategic action plan for 2011–2013

• RC’s description of their future perspectives in relation to research and doctoral training.
ASPECTS: Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal Impact, processes and good practices related to leadership and management, national and international collaboration, innovativeness, future significance

Strengths
The PHH strategic action plan seems to reflect the University’s plan.

Challenges
It should be a challenge for the PPH to develop a sophisticated strategic action plan of scholarly development.

2.9 Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

The RC’s fitness to the chosen participation category
Category 2. The research of the participating community is of high quality, but the community in its present
composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition or a clear break-through.

The PPH aim is to maintain its category two status. Because the approach of the PPH is extremely wide, the RC deems that category two is an appropriate goal. The practicality of its primary focus precludes the RC from participating in extremely narrow academic research and publication that would be necessary to attain category one status.

Upon evaluation of the RC’s material it seems quite reasonable to have category two as the appropriate level of the RC. PPH should be commended for understanding its appropriate research level.

Numeric evaluation: 5 (Outstanding)

2.10 Short description of how the RC members contributed the compilation of the stage 2 material

The material presented to the evaluators indicates that two RC members compiled the information needed to answer the questions.

2.11 How the UH’s focus areas are presented in the RC’s research

Focus area 5: Welfare and safety

PPH research clearly pertains to the focus area of Social Justice.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

1. A more restrictive selection process for the philosophy doctoral program
2. Seek external funding to cover more full-time salaries
3. Review the rationale for philosophy for its inclusion in the Department of Political and Economic Studies
3 Appendices

A. Original evaluation material
   a. Registration material – Stage 1
   b. Answers to evaluation questions – Stage 2
   c. List of publications
   d. List of other scientific activities

B. Bibliometric analyses
   a. Analysis provided by CWTS/University of Leiden
   b. Analysis provided by Helsinki University Library (66 RCs)
NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Practical Philosophy (PPH)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Timo Airaksinen, Department of Political and Economic Studies, Social and Moral Philosophy

RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW:

- Material submitted by the RC at stages 1 and 2 of the evaluation
  - STAGE 1 material: RC’s registration form (incl. list of RC participants in an excel table)
  - STAGE 2 material: RC’s answers to evaluation questions

- TUHAT compilations of the RC members’ other scientific activities 1.1.2005-31.12.2010

NB! Since Web of Science (WoS)-based bibliometrics does not provide representative results for most RCs representing humanities, social sciences and computer sciences, the publications of these RCs will be analyzed by the UH Library (results available by the end of June, 2011)
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

1 RESPONSIBLE PERSON

Name: airaksinen, timo
E-mail: timo.airaksinen@helsinki.fi
Phone: 1911
Affiliation: Department of Political and Economic Studies, Social and Moral Philosophy
Street address: Unioninkatu 40 A, Helsinki

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Practical Philosophy
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): PPH
Description of the operational basis in 2005-2010 (eg. research collaboration, joint doctoral training activities) on which the RC was formed (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The motivation of the group is to create new knowledge about ethics, social and political philosophy, their history and applications. The constitution of the RC is wide, and it needs to be wide, in order to be practically viable. PPH works in an international field, which is presently the most active and creative of all the various fields of philosophy. To participate in this ever growing and changing field presents a challenge but also promises results which are not only theoretically interesting but also capable of implementation in various ways in various roles. This practicality is quite exceptional in philosophy. The Third Task of the University Helsinki is in this way served as fully as possible. The main approach of PPH is normative and analytical, and also historically informed. Ethics, one of the most important sub-fields of PPH is normative to the core, but the same can also be said of social and political philosophy which focuses on the notion of good society and just state. Applied ethics is also a large field today, and PPH has been researching it since early 1980’s. Here PPH has a true pioneering status. The group consists of a well balanced group of new and more experienced researchers, men and women, who have received their basic training by PPH. The community is internationally famous with an exceptional network of active contacts all over the word. For instance, the contacts with South-American Hobbes-research is active and fruitful. PPH also edits an international journal. Also contacts with Japan are active. This network is truly international. The experts of PPH are also in high demand in the larger society which has shown keen interest in its work now over two decades. PPH educates new Ph.Ds and MA’s who continue its successful tradition and expand its activities in the service of both the national and international community.

3 SCIENTIFIC FIELDS OF THE RC

Main scientific field of the RC’s research: social sciences
RC’s scientific subfield 1: Ethics
RC’s scientific subfield 2: Philosophy
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

RC’s scientific subfield 3: Political Science
RC’s scientific subfield 4: --Select--
Other, if not in the list: History of Philosophy

4 RC’S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

Participation category: 2. Research of the participating community is of high quality, but the community in its present composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition or a clear break-through

Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Most suitable in the case of PPH.

Some of the research of PPH is clearly cutting-edge but its general approach is so wide and practical that the description of cutting-edge may not apply to it, for purely technical reasons. PPH also has its practical aims of socially implementable research and knowledge.

5 DESCRIPTION OF THE RC’S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING

Public description of the RC’s research and doctoral training (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): See above.

PPH’s research and doctoral training conforms to the guidelines of the department, faculty and university with no special features.

Significance of the RC’s research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): PPH’s role at the University Helsinki is unique and crucially important, for instance because PPH’s contribution to research ethics research, which otherwise would lack its expert normative aspect. PPH also educates the research community to understand the demands of normativity in a critical perspective and to allow political science research to understand better the difficult and essentially contested notion of justice, fairness, and equality, without which no picture of the good society can be formed. PPH is in a key role in many aspects of critical and practical social and human sciences. PPH has made a determined effort to create knowledge which serves other research communities in the University of Helsinki.

Keywords: ethics, justice, fairness, applied ethics, normativity, good society, history of ethics

6 QUALITY OF RC’S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING

Justified estimate of the quality of the RC’s research and doctoral training at national and international level during 2005-2010 (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Very good. Best in Finland. The longest tradition in Finland. Large and ambitious program. Good Ph.D. work by candidates who have later had successful careers both in research and practical life.
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RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

Comments on how the RC's scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Methods of assessing: personal interviews of teachers, researchers, and students. Reading the doctoral theses and research papers, becoming familiar with the tradition, strategy, and the ethos of PPH. Strong qualitative approach is needed as well as quantitative. Learning to understand the true impact of PPH to the Finnish society. The last mentioned task is crucial and requires a special effort from the experts. Mapping the international network of PPH.

Publishing: no local publications, except some doctoral dissertations. PPH has no publication series for its own internal use. All publications are required to be through refereeing. Strong emphasis on international, top level journals, publishers, and selected conference proceeding - in this order. Publications are produced within international research communities and networks, in order to guarantee quality, topicality, and an up-to-date character.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>PI-status (TUHAT, 29.11.2010)</th>
<th>Title of research and teaching personnel</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airaksinen</td>
<td>Timo</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnason</td>
<td>Gardar</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babushkina</td>
<td>Dina</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gylling</td>
<td>Heta</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Häyrý</td>
<td>Matti</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Research Director</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaila</td>
<td>Eero</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klockars</td>
<td>Kristian</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>University Lecturer, Professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocnovaite</td>
<td>Liuda</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyllönen</td>
<td>Simo</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laakso</td>
<td>Marjukka</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leppänen</td>
<td>Joonas</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindfors</td>
<td>Tommi</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loukola</td>
<td>Olli</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>University Lecturer, Professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuvonen</td>
<td>Markus</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noponen</td>
<td>Niko</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siltonen</td>
<td>Arto</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takala</td>
<td>Tuija</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toppinen</td>
<td>Pilvi</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toppinen</td>
<td>Teemu</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitikainen</td>
<td>Annamari</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Political and Economic Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

Name of the RC's responsible person: airaksinen, timo
E-mail of the RC's responsible person: timo.airaksinen@helsinki.fi
Name and acronym of the participating RC: Practical Philosophy, PPH

The RC’s research represents the following key focus area of UH: 5. Hyvinvointi ja turvallisuus – Welfare and safety

Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area: TEKES project on individual safety (Airaksinen).
Long tradition in Welfare related studies.
Also 9 and 10 are highly relevant to PPH.

**FOCUS AND QUALITY OF RC’S RESEARCH (MAX. 8800 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)**

- Description of the RC’s research focus, the quality of the RC’s research (incl. key research questions and results) and the scientific significance of the RC’s research for the research field(s).
  See “Description of the participating researcher community” in the Stage 1 Registration Form.

  Research focus: Philosophical studies of a wide range of ethical problems in a systematic and historical perspective. Special focus on practical relevance, e.g. justice, toleration, safety and security, welfare. The focus is determined both by the practical relevance and international research trends.

  Quality: Internationally recognizable research whose results can be communicated accordingly. Lack of focus on national publication fora, e.g. departmental publication series. Close co-operation with international colleagues.

  Significance: international focus, well informed of international trends, international publications.

- Ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research.
  More opportunities for sabbatical for senior faculty, not so much focus on doctoral dissertation as top level research, more visiting scholars to Helsinki, better research funding, more active early career researchers.

  More time for research and teaching doctoral students, less for reacting to the administration’s projects and requirements.
## 2 Practises and Quality of Doctoral Training (max. 8800 characters with spaces)

- How is doctoral training organised in the RC? Description of the RC’s principles for recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates, supervision of doctoral candidates, collaboration with faculties, departments/instutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes, good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training, and assuring good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates.

  Recruitment: requirement MA, minimal grade Good. Should be changed to a more restrictive approach. Many MA’s start but a few finish their Dr.

  Normal supervision on the bases of the work done by the PHD candidates.

  Collaboration with Philosophy in Humanistic and Theological Depts. We have a number of foreign Docents.

  We emphasize foreign language publication and activity in international research community. PhD topics must be relevant to current research trends in the field.

  No career perspectives in Finland except short terms grants and temporary research jobs. We emphasize foreign job opportunities. This should be changed as soon as possible, but PPT cannot do anything about it.

- RC’s strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.

  Strenghts: very high level doctoral dissertation. Many start the work, they take a very long time to finish, but the results are then very high quality, if compared to the international level. The best work is thoroughly professional. Our students also publish internationally before their PhD.

  Plans: restriction on the intake of the students, more classes and formal requirements, even if our students resist these measures very strongly.

  Out PHD students do not fail, they just drop out. The long time required to finish PhD depends on the structure of funding, not PPT. The students do not want to finish because they got good grants now, and this is most important to them. We need to consider tuition fees and limited time frames -- not dependent on PPT but party politics in the Finnish parliament.

## 3 Societal Impact of Research and Doctoral Training (max. 4400 characters with spaces)
Description of how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).
Very high impact as PPT’s expertise is needed in media, education, politics, and social life. PPT produces highly relevant knowledge for the Finnish society which should be disseminated as widely as possible.
Members of PPT write popular articles, appear at TV and give lectures over a wide range of topics.

Ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.
We also have maximal impact which cannot be strengthened. Much depend on media-fashions and general trends in politics.

Description of the RC’s research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities and how the RC has promoted researcher mobility.
Collaboration:
theology and humanities faculties, also law and medicine (applied topics).
PPT has actively send students to study abroad. We have active and extremely large international research network. We travel more than most RCs in the faculty, a fact which has not always pleased our superiors.

RC’s strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.
We need travel funds, which the Dept. or Faculty do not provide. No sabbticals any more. All travel funds are highly competed, and soon practically unavailable.
PPT has been extremely mobile in recent years, but we do not know how we can fund it in the future. Planning is difficult as we do not know about financing. We have learned that only administration is allowed to travel in the future.

Description of the operational conditions in the RC’s research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).
Research infra: 4 permanent faculty, graduate students. Teaching is mandatory according to the faculty regulations. PPH has only 3-4 permanent positions, which is far too little. We try to support a large number of PhD Students. PhD students are supposed to participate in teaching, but this cannot be a permanent solution, or even an acceptable solution. PhD students can not be made responsible teachers in any demanding sense. Students are not teachers. The blind are supposed to lead the blind. The University just wants to save money to create more administration.
Teaching duties for the regular faculty are not too bad.
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- RC's strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.
  Operational conditions do not depend on PPH.

6 LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT IN THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- Description of the execution and processes of leadership in the RC, how the management-related responsibilities and roles are distributed in the RC and how the leadership- and management-related processes support high quality research, collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC, the RC's research focus and strengthening of the RC's know-how.

Small unity where leadership is not an issue. Researchers are independent. In a small unit, leadership is not an issue. All regular faculty are more or less independent, dependent only on the department's chair and the dean. We cannot help if their leadership fails.

Students in PPT often enjoy to be rebellious which is encouraged. Basically they want to be left alone as they are philosophers and know their field already. They accept very little direct teaching, which we will change soon.

- RC's strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes.
  This does not apply to PPH which is a community of independent agents. The leadership is in the Dept and Faculty. PPH is directly dependent on the dept. chair and the dean. Ask them about their leadership. We have very little independence administratively.

Much depends on what kind of external funding we can get. This is all totally unpredictable. As PhD's have their own funding, they are independent agents.

This question shows a typical bias of the admin. What is leadership supposed to mean here?

7 EXTERNAL COMPETITIVE FUNDING OF THE RC

- Listing of the RCs external competitive funding, where:
  - the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and
  - the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki

- Academy of Finland (AF) - total amount of funding (in euros) AF has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: 1362405
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- Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation (TEKES) - total amount of funding (in euros) TEKES has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: 339357

- European Union (EU) - total amount of funding (in euros) EU has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: 27704

- European Research Council (ERC) - total amount of funding (in euros) ERC has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: 156376

- International and national foundations - names of international and national foundations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the foundations: HY rahasto
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: 38581

- Other international funding - names of other international funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the funding organizations: NordForsk
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 48813

- Other national funding (incl. EVO funding and Ministry of Education and Culture funded doctoral programme positions) - names of other national funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
  - names of the funding organizations: CIMO
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 8798

8 RC'S STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN FOR 2011–2013 (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

9 SHORT DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE RC MEMBERS HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE COMPILATION OF THE STAGE 2 MATERIALS (MAX. 1100 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES).

Prof. Timo Airaksinen, Senior tenured professor
Prof. Heta Gylling, Head of discipline.
1 Analysis of publications

- Associated person is one of Timo Airaksinen, timo.airaksinen@helsinki.fi, Gardar A. Arnason, gardar.arnason@helsinki.fi, Dina Babushkina, dina.babushkina@helsinki.fi, Heta Gylling, heta.gylling@helsinki.fi, Matti Häyrinen, mati.hayrinen@helsinki.fi, Eero Kaila, eero.kaila@helsinki.fi, Kristian Klockars, kristian.klockars@helsinki.fi, Louisa Krogsholm, louisa.krogsholm@helsinki.fi, Simo Kyllonen, simo.kyllonen@helsinki.fi, Marjukka Laakso, marjukka.laakso@helsinki.fi, Jorma Leppänen, jorma.leppalainen@helsinki.fi, Tommi Lindfors, tommi.lindfors@helsinki.fi, Olli Loukola, olli.loukola@helsinki.fi, Markus Neuvonen, markus.neuvonen@helsinki.fi, Niko Noponen, niko.noponen@helsinki.fi, Arto Sitonen, arto.sitonen@helsinki.fi, Tuula Takala, tuula.takala@helsinki.fi, Päivi Toppinen, paivi.toppinen@helsinki.fi, Teemu Muona, teemu.muona@helsinki.fi, Teemu Toppinen, teemu.toppinen@helsinki.fi, Annemari Villikainen, annemari.villikainen@helsinki.fi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication type</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total Count 2005 - 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Refereed journal article</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceedings or special issue of journal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Article in professional hand or guide book or in a professional data system, or text book material</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Published development or research report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Popular monograph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005


Takala, T 2005, 'Demagogues, firefighters, and window dressers: who are we and what should we be?', Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics, vol 14, no. 4, pp. 385-388.


2006


2007
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A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)

2005


Häyry, M 2005, ‘Forget autonomy and give me freedom!’, in M Häyry, T Takala, P Herissone-Kelly (eds), Bioethics and Social Reality, Rodopi, Amsterdam and New York, pp. 31-37.


2009


2010


2005


Häyry, M 2005, ‘Forget autonomy and give me freedom!’, in M Häyry, T Takala, P Herissone-Kelly (eds), Bioethics and Social Reality, Rodopi, Amsterdam and New York, pp. 31-37.
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2006


2007


2008
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2010

Airaksinen, T 2010, 'New life forms: min or max cyborgs?', in T Takala, P Herisson-Keely, S Holm (eds), Cutting through the surface. philosophical approaches to bioethics., Value inquiry boos series, no. 211, Rodopi, Amsterdam, pp. 231-246.


Häyry, M 2010, 'An analysis of some arguments for and against human reproduction', in M Häyry, T Takala, P Herisson-Keely, G Árnason (eds), Arguments and Analysis in Bioethics, Rodopi, Amsterdam & New York, pp. 167-175.


A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)

2005


2006
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2007


2008

2010

B1 Unrefereed journal article

2005


2006


2007

2008


2009

2010
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B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)

2006

2008

2009


Neuvonen, M, Loukola, O 2009, 'Ja laitamme heidät ajattelemaan', in T Joutsenvirta, A Kukkonen (eds), Sulautuva opetus - uusi tapa opettaa ja opiskella, Helsingin yliopisto, Koulutus- ja kehittämiskeskus Palmenia, Helsinki, pp. 73-84.


Airaksinen, T 2010, 'Ako aplikovat' aplikovanú filozofiu: osobný názor', Aplikovaná etika vo vzdelávani a praxi, Filozofia a sociálné vied University Mateja Bela, Banská Bystrica, pp. 57-63.


B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings

2007
PPH/Airaksinen T

C1 Published scientific monograph

2006
Airaksinen, T 2006, Ihmiskoneen tulevaisuus, WSOY, Helsinki.

2007

2010

C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal

2005

2006

2007

2008

2009

2010
Babushkina, D (ed.) 2010, Бракли ФГ Этнических исследований, RHGA, Saint-Petersburg.

D2 Article in professional hand or guide book or in a professional data system, or text book material
P4 Published development or research report

2005

2006

Kyllönen, S 2006, Kanssamväliten ilmastopolitiikan tulevaisuuden näkymät, Ympäristöministeriö, Helsinki.

2008

D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary

2005

2006

2007
Klockars, K 2007, Öppna frågor 4: Samhällsfilosofi, vol. 4, Samhällsfilosofi, Söderström, [Helsingfors].

2008


E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2005

2006

2007


2009
PH/Airaksinen T

2005

2006

2007

2008

2009

2010

E2 Popular monograph

2006
Airaksinen, T 2006, Onnellisuuden opas, Johnny Kniga, Helsinki.

2008

2010
1 Analysis of activities 2005-2010

- Associated person is one of Timo Airaksinen, Timo.Airaksinen@helsinki.fi, Gardar A. Arnason, gardar.arnason@helsinki.fi, Dina Babushkina, dina.babushkina@helsinki.fi, Helena Gylling, Helena.Gylling@helsinki.fi, Matti Häyry, Matti.Häyry@helsinki.fi, Eero Kaila, eero.kaila@helsinki.fi, Kristian Klockars, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi, Luula Kivinen, luula.kivinen@helsinki.fi, Simo Kyllönen, Simo.Kyllonen@helsinki.fi, Marjukka Laakso, Marjukka.Laakso@helsinki.fi, Joonas Leppänen, joonas.leppanen@helsinki.fi, Tommi Lindfors, tommi.lindfors@helsinki.fi, Olli Loukola, Olli.Loukola@helsinki.fi, Markku Neuvonen, markku.neuvonen@helsinki.fi, Niko Noponen, Niko.Noponen@helsinki.fi, Antti Sillanpää, Antti.Sillanpaa@helsinki.fi, Tuula Takala, Tuula.Takala@helsinki.fi, Pilvi Toppinen, pilvi.toppinen@helsinki.fi, Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, teemu.toppinen@helsinki.fi, Teemu.Toppinen@helsinki.fi, Annamari Vitikainen, Annamari.Vitikainen@helsinki.fi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of series</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of candidates for academic posts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in review committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in research network</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public/Finland or international organisation</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

**Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis**

**Kristian Klockars** , Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
- Supervision of Doctoral Student: Charles Sion, Kristian Klockars, 2007 → ..., Finland
- Supervision of Doctoral Student: Antti Sadimaa, Kristian Klockars, 2009 → ..., Finland
- Supervision of Doctoral Student: Jenny Martikainen, Kristian Klockars, 2009 → ..., Finland
- Supervision of Doctoral Student: Joonas Leppänen, Kristian Klockars, 2009 → ..., Finland
- Supervision of Doctoral Student: Vlad Navitski, Kristian Klockars, 2009 → ..., Belarus
- Co-Supervision of Doctoral Student: Pilvi Toppinen, Kristian Klockars, 2010 → ..., Finland
- Supervision of Doctoral Student: Hanna Lukkar, Kristian Klockars, 2010 → ..., Finland
- Supervision of Doctoral Student: Sanna Tirkkonen, Kristian Klockars, 2010 → ..., Finland

**Olli Loukola** , Olli.Loukola@helsinki.fi
- Thesis supervision, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2010 → 12.12.2010, Finland
- Thesis supervision, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland
- Thesis supervision, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland
- Thesis supervision, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland
- Thesis supervision, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Iceland

**Arto Siitonen** , Arto.Siitonen@helsinki.fi
- Supervision of doctoral thesis, Arto Siitonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

**Tuija Takala** , Tuija.Takala@helsinki.fi
- Supervisor, Tuija Takala, 01.08.2006 → 31.01.2010, United Kingdom
- Supervision of doctoral thesis, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
- Supervision of doctoral thesis, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
- Supervision of doctoral thesis, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Prizes and awards
Kristian Klockars, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
Encouragement prize, Kristian Klockars, 2010

Editor of research journal
Timo Airaksinen, Timo.Airaksinen@helsinki.fi
Journal of Value Inquiry, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United States
Journal of Value Inquiry, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United States

Heta Gylling, Heta.Gylling@helsinki.fi
Ajatus, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Bioethics, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Bioethics, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Health Care Analysis, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Health Care Analysis, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Value Inquiry, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Value Inquiry, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Ethical Theory and Moral Practice, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Ethical Theory and Moral Practice, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Health Care Analysis, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Journal of Global Ethics, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007

Matti Häyry, Matti.Hayry@helsinki.fi
Ajatus – Yearbook of the Philosophical Society of Finland/Societas Philosophica Fennica, Matti Häyry, 01.06.1997 → …
Bioethics, Matti Häyry, 01.01.2002 → …
Ethical Theory and Moral Practice – An International Forum, Matti Häyry, 01.01.2002 → …
Journal of Medical Ethics, Matti Häyry, 01.01.2002 → …
Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics, Matti Häyry, 01.01.2002 → …
Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics, Matti Häyry, 01.01.2007 → …
Studies in Ethics, Law, and Technology/The Berkeley Electronic Press, Matti Häyry, 01.01.2007 → …
Journal of Bioethical Inquiry, Matti Häyry, 01.01.2008 → …
Mount Sinai Journal of Medicine, Matti Häyry, 06.01.2008 → …
Studia Philosophica Estonica, Matti Häyry, 01.01.2008 → …, Estonia

Simo Kyllönen, Simo.Kyllonen@helsinki.fi
Journal of Institutional Economics, Simo Kyllönen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom
Metalliteos aiakauskirja, Simo Kyllönen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Olli Loukola, Olli.Loukola@helsinki.fi
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Pihlajamäki, Teppo


Hobbes Studies, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Netherlands


Ethical theory and practice (Rodopi), Olli Loukola, 01.11.2008 → 31.12.2008, Netherlands

Hobbes Studies (Brill), Olli Loukola, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Netherlands


Arto Siitonen, Arto.Siitonen@helsinki.fi


Tuula Takala, Tuula.Takala@helsinki.fi

Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom


Journal of Medical Ethics, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005

Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United States

Values in Bioethics Special Book Series, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Netherlands

Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United States

Journal of Medical Ethics, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom

Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Netherlands

Value Ingenuity Book Series, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United States

Values in Bioethics Special Book Series, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United States

Bioethics, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United States

Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom

Clinical Interventions in Aging, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Australia

Genomics, Society and Policy, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom

Journal of Child Health Care, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom


Medical Law International, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom

Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Netherlands

Values in Bioethics Special Book Series, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United States

Values in Bioethics Special Book Series, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United States

Dilemata, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009, Spain

Philosophical Studies from the University of Helsinki, Tuula Takala, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Pilvi Toppinen, pilvi.toppinen@helsinki.fi

Journal of Global Ethics, Pilvi Toppinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, United Kingdom


Usko, Suomen Filosofisen yhdistyksen koulutusjulkaisu, Pilvi Toppinen, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009, Finland
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Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, teemu.toppinen@helsinki.fi, Teemu.Toppinen@helsinki.fi

Ajatus, Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Philosopha, Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008
Sats, Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008
Science Studies, Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008

Annamari Vitikainen, Annamari.Vitikainen@helsinki.fi
Journal of Global Ethics, Annamari Vitikainen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom

Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings
Kristian Klockars, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
Editor of Chiasmatic Encounters, Kristian Klockars, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, United States

Peer review of manuscripts
Heta Gylling, Heta.Gylling@helsinki.fi
Journal for Value Inquiry, Heta Gylling, 2010 → ..., United States

Kristian Klockars, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
Journal for Value Inquiry, Kristian Klockars, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom
Nin & Nät, Kristian Klockars, 01.10.2006 → 31.10.2006, Finland
Journal of Value Inquiry, Kristian Klockars, 2007 → 2010, Germany
Journal of Value Inquiry, Kristian Klockars, 09.04.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom

Tuija Takala, Tuija.Takala@helsinki.fi
Bioethics, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010
Genomics, Society, and Policy, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, United Kingdom

Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, teemu.toppinen@helsinki.fi, Teemu.Toppinen@helsinki.fi
Ajatus (Yearbook of the Philosophical Society of Finland), Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, 10.2007 → ...
Philosopha - Philosophical Quarterly of Israel, Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, 10.2007 → ...
Sats - Nordic Journal of Philosophy, Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, 12.2008 → ...
Science Studies, Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, 08.2008 → ...

Tiede & Edistys, Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, 04.2010 → ...

Editor of series
Matti Häyry, Matti.Hayry@helsinki.fi
Nordic Value Studies, Matti Häyry, 01.01.1995 → ...
Value Inquiry Book Series (VIBS) Rodopi, Matti Häyry, 01.01.1995 → ...
Values in Bioethics, Matti Häyry, 01.01.1999 → ...

Olli Loukola, Olli.Loukola@helsinki.fi
Ethical theory and practice (ETP), Olli Loukola, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Netherlands

Tuija Takala, Tuija.Takala@helsinki.fi
Value Inquiry Book Series, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2001 → ...
Assessment of candidates for academic posts

Matti Häyry, Matti.Haery@helsinki.fi
Professor, Matti Häyry, 01.08.2005, United Kingdom
Professor, Matti Häyry, 01.07.2007, United States
Professor, Matti Häyry, 01.09.2009, Israel
Professor, Matti Häyry, 30.03.2010, United States

Membership or other role in review committee

Olli Loukola, Olli.Loukola@helsinki.fi
Evaluator, Olli Loukola, 01.12.2010, Belgium

Membership or other role in research network

Kristian Klockars, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
Member of North American Sartre Society, Kristian Klockars, 1999
Member of International Association for Philosophy and Literature, IAPL, Kristian Klockars, 2000
Member of Nordic Society for Phenomenology NoSP, Kristian Klockars, 2001

Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board

Timo Airaksinen, Timo.Airaksinen@helsinki.fi
SFY, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Tallinnan korkeakoulujen filosofian opetuksen arviointipaneeli, Timo Airaksinen, 15.05.2005 → 22.05.2005, Estonia
International Berkeley Society, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United States
International Berkeley Society (IBS), Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Suomen filosofinen yhdystys, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
International Berkeley Society, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United States
International Berkeley Society, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Suomen filosofinen yhdystys, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Suomen filosofinen yhdystys, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009, Finland
Suomen filosofinen yhdystys, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009, Norway

Heta Gylling, Heta.Gylling@helsinki.fi
EuroPHEN (European Public Health Network), Heta Gylling, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Argentina
Filosofian tutkijakoulu, johdyhmän jäs, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Norway
Suomen filosofinen yhdystys, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Suomen oikeusfilosofinen yhdystys, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
The Committee for the Evaluation of the Ethics Programme at the University of Oslo, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Helsingin yliopiston Biokäteetiedellinen tutkijakoulun seurantaryhmä, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Helsingin yliopiston Biokäteetiedellinen tutkijakoulun seurantoryhmä, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Eu-Australia Degree Network, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Europe
Europeanized Criminal Justice Forum: Eurooppalaistuvan rikosoikeuden foorumi, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Europe
Pool of Experts University of Helsinki, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Europe
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University of Dar es Salaam and Muhimbili Hospital, Consultant in Bioethics, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Tanzania
Suomen oikeusfilosofinen yhdistys, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2008 → ...
Tutkimuseettinen neuvoiläikunta / HYMY II -työryhmä, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Suomen filosofinen yhdistys, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2009 → ...
board member, Heta Gylling, 2010 → ..., Finland
board member, Heta Gylling, 2010 → ..., Finland

Matti Häyry, Matti.Hayry@helsinki.fi
Member of the Peer Review College, Matti Häyry, 01.01.2006 → ..., United Kingdom

Kristian Klockars, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
Philosophical Society of Finland, Board member, Kristian Klockars, 2000 → 2010, Finland
Board of Department of Social and Moral Philosophy, Member, Kristian Klockars, 2004 → 2009, Finland
Local Organising Committee, International Association for Philosophy and Literature, IAPL 2005 Chiasmatic Encounters, Helsinki, Kristian Klockars, 01.01.2005, United States
Vice-Head of Department, Kristian Klockars, 09.2008 → 12.2009, Finland
Head of Subject, Social and Moral Philosophy, Kristian Klockars, 01.01.2010 → 31.10.2010, Finland

Olli Loukola, Olli.Loukola@helsinki.fi
The Vardö-Seminar Foundation - International Institute for Art and Culture, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Sweden
BalPhiN, Baltic Philosophy Network, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
European Humanities University, Vilnius, Liettua, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Governing Board of European Humanities University, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Lithuania
The Vardö-Seminar Foundation - International Institute for Art and Culture, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Sweden
The Vardö-Seminar Foundation - International Institute for Art and Culture, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Sweden
Finnish-Russian Philosophy Symposium, Olli Loukola, 13.06.2010 → 15.06.2010, Finland

Arto Siitonen, Arto.Sitonen@helsinki.fi
Valiokoneen tiedekunnan tutkimusmäärärahan arviointipaneeli, Arto Siitonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Yliopistotutkijakoulutuksen virkakunta, Arto Siitonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Filosofian Valtakunnallinen tutkijakoulu, Arto Siitonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008

Tuija Takala, Tuija.Takala@helsinki.fi
European Society for Philosophy of Medicine and Health Care, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
European Society for Philosophy of Medicine and Health Care/ Executive Committee, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
European Society for Philosophy of Medicine and Health Care, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2010
European Society for Philosophy of Medicine and Health Care, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2010

Annamari Viltikainen, Annamari.Viltikainen@helsinki.fi
Board member, Annamari Viltikainen, 2008 → 2010
Board member, Annamari Viltikainen, 2009 → 2010

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization
Timo Airaksinen, Timo.Airaksinen@helsinki.fi
Yliopistotutkivalmistelulautakunnan jäsen, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Yliopistotutkivalmistelulautakunta, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
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Ylioppilastutkintolautakunta, Filosofian osa-alue, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Ylioppilastutkintolautakunta, elämänkatsomustiedon osa-alue, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Ylioppilastutkintolautakunta, elämänkatsomustiedon osa-alue, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008
Ylioppilastutkintolautakunta, filosofian osa-alue, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008

Heta Gylling, Heta.Gylling@helsinki.fi
Stadia, sosiaali- ja terveydenhuollon etenisen asioiden neuvottelukunta, Heta Gylling, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Konsultaatio, Codes of Conduct-projekti, Heta Gylling, 06.06.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom
Sosiaali- ja terveysalan toimintatarkastajan koulutusohjeilman neuvottelukunnan jäsen, Heta Gylling, 01.08.2006 → 31.07.2008, Finland

Kristian Klockars, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
Member of Demokratiforum - Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam, Kristian Klockars, 2003 → ...
Member of Network for International and Global Democratization, NIGD, Kristian Klockars, 2006 → ...

Simo Kyllönen, Simo.Kyllonen@helsinki.fi
Maa- ja metsätalousministeriön ilmastoryhmä, Simo Kyllönen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Maatalouden bioenergia maaseudulla (BIOAGRE) -tutkimusryhmän ohjausryhmä, Simo Kyllönen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Kansallisen metsähallinnon päätösluonnostelun työryhmän jäsen, Simo Kyllönen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Maa- ja metsätalousministeriön ilmastoryhmä, Simo Kyllönen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Maatalouden ilmasto- ja maaseudun-ympäristöalueen ilmastoryhmä, Simo Kyllönen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Maatalouden bioenergia maaseudulla (BIOAGRE) tutkimusryhmän ohjausryhmän jäsen, Simo Kyllönen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton energia- ja ilmastovaliokunnan jäsen, Simo Kyllönen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Ympäristöministeriö, asiantuntija-artikkelin kirjoittaminen, Simo Kyllönen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Olli Loukola, Olli.Loukola@helsinki.fi
Ylioppilastutkintolautakunta (YTL), Filosofian ja elämänkatsomustiedon ylioppilaskokeiden arvostelija, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Ylioppilastutkintolautakunta (YTL), Filosofian ja elämänkatsomustiedon ylioppilaskokeiden arvostelija, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Maatalouden bioenergia maaseudulla (BIOAGRE) -tutkimusryhmän ohjausryhmän jäsen, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Maatalouden ilmasto- ja maaseudun-ympäristöalueen ilmastoryhmä, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Maatalouden ilmasto- ja maaseudun-ympäristöalueen ilmasto- ja maaseudun-ympäristöalueen ilmastoryhmä, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
European Humanities University (EHU), johtokunnan jäsen, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Lithuania
Ylioppilastutkintolautakunta (YTL), Filosofian ja elämänkatsomustiedon ylioppilaskokeiden sensori, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Coordinator, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland
Ethical specialist, Olli Loukola, 01.09.2010 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Head of the network, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

Timo Airaksinen, Timo.Airaksinen@helsinki.fi
Suomen filosofinen yhdistys, Timo Airaksinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007

Simo Kyllönen, Simo.Kyllonen@helsinki.fi
Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton energia- ja ilmastovaliokunnan jäsen, Simo Kyllönen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Arto Siitonen, Arto.Siitonen@helsinki.fi
Helsingin yliopiston dosenttiyhdysys, Arto Siitonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Participation in interview for written media

Heta Gylling , Heta.Gylling@helsinki.fi


Vapaa-ajattelijan keskustelutilaisuus, Heta Gylling, 07.05.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Kirurgian toimialan kehittämispäivät, Heta Gylling, 18.05.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Eero Kaila , eero.kaila@helsinki.fi

Asiantuntijahaastattelu, Eero Kaila, 20.08.2010

Kristian Klockars , Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi

Debattkväll: Liberal fundamentalism, Kristian Klockars, 10.08.2005, Finland

Kyrkpressen, Kristian Klockars, 08.09.2005, Finland

FST Debatt, Kristian Klockars, 01.10.2006, Finland

Simo Kyllönen , Simo.Kyllonen@helsinki.fi

Koulutustilaisuus "Ympäristö- ja yhteiskuntavastuun raportit" Dipolissa, Simo Kyllönen, 20.05.2002 → 31.12.2011, Albania


Kansallisen kestävän kehityksen toimikunnan kokous, Simo Kyllönen, 14.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Kokon hankemekanismit kustannustehokas mahdollisuus?: seminaari, Simo Kyllönen, 15.09.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Eduskunnan globaalirymä, Simo Kyllönen, 02.06.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Helsingin kaupungin ekologista kestävyyden ohjelmaa ja toimintaa, Simo Kyllönen, 13.03.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Vihreä lanka 37/06, Simo Kyllönen, 28.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Yleisötilaisuus "Imatongimuutos ja köyhyyden vähentäminen kohtaavat", Simo Kyllönen, 28.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Olli Loukola, Olli.Loukola@helsinki.fi
Haastattelu vlihralta politiikasta, Helsingin Sanomat, Olli Loukola, 17.10.1999 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Helsingin kaupungin koulutus- ja kehittämiskeskus Studia Generalia-luentosarja, Olli Loukola, 16.05.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Helsingin kaupunginkanslian Ajankohtaispäivä henkilöstöhallinnon asiointipäällikkö, Olli Loukola, 23.03.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Vihreä Lanka (30), Olli Loukola, 27.07.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Espoon keskustan kevyteen kehitysleiriin, Olli Loukola, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Forums, # 45, 2003, Olli Loukola, 05.11.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Helsingin Sanomin haastattelu, Markus Neuvonen, 17.06.2008, Finland

Arto Siitonen, Arto.Siitonen@helsinki.fi
Kirkoksoukon tilaisuudessa 10-vuotisjuhlapäivä, Arto Siitonen, 30.08.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Kuvaisten kirjastotilaisuudesta 100-vuotisjuhlapäivä, Arto Siitonen, 12.02.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Sylv:n juhlauseminaari, Siuntio, Arto Siitonen, 03.10.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Kaukametsä-Opisto, Kajaani, Arto Siitonen, 19.03.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Estelämä ylioppilasiltaan, Helsinki, Arto Siitonen, 25.05.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Humaniystydys, Helsinki, Arto Siitonen, 09.09.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Hämeen kesäopisto, Riihimäki, Arto Siitonen, 04.02.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Itä-Helsingin kulttuurikeskus Stoa, Helsinki, Arto Siitonen, 06.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Keskeli-Pohjanmaan kesäopisto, Kokkola, Arto Siitonen, 14.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Ruusutorpan koulu, Espoo, Arto Siitonen, 16.03.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Tuija Takala, Tuija.Takala@helsinki.fi
Eläintarvikekoneiden terveysriskit - seminaari, Kuopion yliopisto, Tuija Takala, 29.05.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Helsingin Sanomin haastattelu, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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SLGY:n nuorten tutkijoiden päivä, Tuija Takala, 24.03.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Turun Sanomat, Tuija Takala, 28.01.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland


The Royal Society, Pharmacogenetics Dialogue, Tuija Takala, 02.03.2005 → 31.12.2011, Sweden

Apen konferens om etik och stamcellforskning, University of Oslo, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Blog Tiede-lehdessä, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Helsingin Sanomat, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Tiedotustaitojen tilon järjestämä biopankki-seminaari, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Blog Tiede-lehdessä, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Sweden

Turun kansainvälistä Kirja- ja tiedemessut, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Sweden

Tutkimus, aineistot ja avoimmuuden rajat seminaari. Tutkimuseettinen neuvottelukunta, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Sweden

Pilvi Toppinen, pilvi.toppinen@helsinki.fi

Studia STOA - Antiikista nykyaikaan, Pilvi Toppinen, 01.12.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland


Ikäihmisten yliopisto/Espoo, Pilvi Toppinen, 18.04.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Ikäihmisten yliopisto/Lahti, Pilvi Toppinen, 16.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Suomen sosiaalifoorumi, Pilvi Toppinen, 28.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, teemu.toppinen@helsinki.fi, Teemu.Toppinen@helsinki.fi

Ikäihmisten yliopisto/Lahti, Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, 02.10.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Ikäihmisten yliopisto/Porvoo, Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, 15.03.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

People in the Best Country, Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, 23.09.2010, Finland

Participation in radio Programme

Timo Airaksinen, Timo.Airaksinen@helsinki.fi

onnellisuus elämänlaatu ja kirjallisuus, Timo Airaksinen, 26.02.2010, Finland

saasta, Timo Airaksinen, 07.10.2010

Kristian Klockars, Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi

Radio Suomi, Kristian Klockars, 23.08.2005, Finland

Vallan vaiheilla, Ylen Radio 1, Kristian Klockars, 19.01.2006, Finland

Intervju, radionprogrammeriä Fönnur, Radio Vega, Kristian Klockars, 2008, Finland

Simo Kyllönen, Simo.Kyllonen@helsinki.fi

Hautastelu Lähiradiossa, Simo Kyllönen, 16.11.2010

Tuija Takala, Tuija.Takala@helsinki.fi

Yle Radio 1, Uutiset, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen , teemu.toppinen@helsinki.fi , Teemu.Toppinen@helsinki.fi
Minkälaista on hyvä elämä?, Teemu Mauno Matias Toppinen, 30.11.2010

Participation in TV programme
Kristian Klockars , Kristian.Klockars@helsinki.fi
TV-sarja Suomi vuonna 2030, Yle TV2, Kristian Klockars, 2008, Finland

Tuija Takala , Tuija.Takala@helsinki.fi
TV 2, Ajankohtainen Kaikkonen, Tuija Takala, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Appendix B.b.

Maria Forsman, Chief Information Specialist, DSocSc
Helsinki University Library 7.7.2011

The bibliometric analyses by Helsinki University Library (HULib)

Background: The bibliometric analyses – especially citation analyses – have raised a lot of discussion and critics among researchers in social sciences and humanities. Researchers view that bibliometric analyses are often unfair to these fields of sciences because they do not give a good enough picture of the publishing. Citation databases – Web of Science and Scopus – cover only weakly the main publications in these fields. Also, in humanities and social sciences monograph is still the main form of publishing, and it does not include in these article databases.

At the University of Helsinki, the above mentioned concerns have been taken into account in the evaluation. The Evaluation Office has ordered analyses from the Helsinki University Library (HULib) for the participating researcher communities that are weakly represented in Web of Science. The database for the HULib analyses is TUHAT (https://tuhat.halvi.helsinki.fi/portal/en/) including all the publications that the researchers have considered important.

Based on this data, information specialists at HULib have carried out the following analyses:

1) Number of authors/publication/year as a table; a pie of authors/publication in the period 2005-2010;
2) Language of publication/year; a pie of language of publication in the period 2005-2010;
3) Articles/journal/year; journals have been compared by ISSN with the Norwegian, Australian and ERIH (2007-2008) journal ranking lists; number of articles in ranked journals;
4) Publisher/monograph type (according to TUHAT database); monographs have been compared with the Norwegian publisher ranking list. According to this, it has been counted how many monographs are published by a leading scientific publisher (2) or a scientific publisher (1).
5) Conference publications (from TUHAT database) especially in computer sciences; compared with the Australian conference ranking list.

Where relevant, some additional analyses and notes concerning the publication culture of a scientific field have been added. Overall, these analyses complement the other evaluation material and lists of the publications of the participating researcher communities.

If the publications of the RCs were less than 50 or/and the internal coverage less than 40 percentage, the WoS analyses were considered not reliable. These RCs were 58 altogether.

In addition, both Leiden and Library analyses were done to the RCs if WoS analyses covered less than 40 per cent of the peer review (A+C) publications of the RC. These RCs were 8 altogether.

The appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.
Analysis of publications by Helsinki University Library – 66 RCs altogether

Biological, Agricultural and Veterinary Sciences
Luukkanen, Olavi – VITRI
Valsta, Lauri – SUVALUE

Natural Sciences
Abrahamsson, Pekka – SOFTSYS
Kangasharju, Jussi – NODES
Ukkonen, Esko – ALKO
Väänänen, Jouko – HLG

Humanities
Aejmelaeus, Anneli – CSTT
Anttonen, Pertti – CMVG
Dunderberg, Ismo – FC
Havu, Eva – CoCoLoC
Heikkinen, Markku – RCSP
Heinämaa, Sara – SHC
Henriksson, Markku – CITA
Janhunen, Juha – LDHFTA
Kajava Mika, – AMNE
Klippi, Anu – Interaction
Knuuttila, Simo – PPMP
Koskenniemi, Kimmo – BAULT
Lauha, Aila – CECH
Lavento, Mika – ARCH-HU
Lukkarinen, Ville – AHCI
Lyytikäinen, Pirjo – GLW
Mauranen, Anna – LFP
Meinander, Henrik – HIST
Nevalainen, Terttu – VARIENG
Pettersson, Bo – ILLC
Pulkkinen, Tuula – Gender Studies
Pyrhönen, Heta – ART
Ruokanen, Miikka – RELDIAL
Saarinen, Risto – RELSOC
Sandu, Gabriel – LMPS
Tarasti, Eero – MusSig
Vehmas-Lehto, Inkeri – TraST
Östman, Jan-Ola – LMS

Social Sciences
Airaksinen, Timo – PPH
Engeström, Yrjö – CRADLE
Granberg, Leo – TRANSRURBAN
Haila, Anni – Sociopolis
Hautamäki, Jarkko – CEA
Heinonen, Visa – KUMU
Helén, Ilpo – STS
Hukkinen, Janne – GENU
Jallinoja, Riitta – SBII
Kaartinen, Timo – SCA
Kettunen, Pauli – NordSoc
Kivinen, Markku – FCREES
Koronen, Juhani – DEVERELE
Koskenniemi, Martti – ECI
Kullti, Klaus – EAT
Lahtela, Elina – KUFE
Lanne, Markku – TSEM
Lavonen, Jari – RCMSER
Lehtonen, Risto – SocStats
Lindblom-Ylänne, Sari – EdPsychHE
Nieminen, Hannu – MECOL
Nuotio, Kimmo – Law
Nyman, Göte – METEORI
Ollikainen, Markku – ENFIFO
Pirttilä-Backman, Anna-Maija – DYNASOBIC
Rahkonen, Keijo – CulCap
Roos, J P – HELPS
Simola, Hannu – SOCE-DGI
Sulkunen, Pekka – PosPus
Sumelius, John – AG ECON
Vaattovaara, Mari – STRUTSI
Vainio, Martti – SigMe

The next appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.

PUBLICATION DATA 2005-2010

RC/PPH/T. Airaksinen

Category: 2. The research of the participating community is of high quality, but the community in its present composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition or a clear break-through.

Number of authors in publications/year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of authors in publications

- 1 author: 74%
- 2 authors: 14%
- 3 authors: 6%
- 4 authors: 4%
- 5 authors: 1%
### Language of publications / Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>en_GB</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi_FI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv_SE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de_DE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mult</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>es_ES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ru_RU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>und</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>206</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Language of publications

- **en**: 52%
- **fi**: 41%
- **es**: 1%
- **sv**: 3%
- **ru**: 1%
- **mult**: 1%
- **de**: 1%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Medical Ethics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioethics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homo oeconomicus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nin &amp; näin : filosofinen aikakauslehti.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Ethics, Law, and Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiede &amp; edistys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable use of renewable natural resources : from</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakseologia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Perspectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal for General Philosophy of Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oikeus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Environmental Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revue Philosophique de la France et de l’Etranger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethique et economique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbes Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansalliskiasto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ny Tid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peda-Forum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing world bioethics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophica : revista del Instituto de Filosofia de la</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy in review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kever : ammattikorkeakoulututkimuksen verkkolehti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res Publica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teorie Vedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silva Fennica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tieteessä tapahtuu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen UNIFEM : Naiset ja ilmastonmuutos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDSM alumni/alumne newsletter.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Policy and Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ympäristö</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kriterion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topos : filosofsko-kulturologicheskij zhurnal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Law International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valtiotehtäsi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine, health care and philosophy : a European journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metsäliitteen aikakauskirja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Journal ranking

Norway ranking
Level 2 = highest scientific, Level 1= scientific

Australian ranking

A*
Typically an A* journal would be one of the best in its field or subfield in which to publish and would typically cover the entire field/subfield. Virtually all papers they publish will be of a very high quality. These are journals where most of the work is important (it will really shape the field) and where researchers boast about getting accepted. Acceptance rates would typically be low and the editorial board would be dominated by field leaders, including many from top institutions.

A
The majority of papers in a Tier A journal will be of very high quality. Publishing in an A journal would enhance the author’s standing, showing they have real engagement with the global research community and that they have something to say about problems of some significance. Typical signs of an A journal are lowish acceptance rates and an editorial board which includes a reasonable fraction of well known researchers from top institutions.

B
Tier B covers journals with a solid, though not outstanding, reputation. Generally, in a Tier B journal, one would expect only a few papers of very high quality. They are often important outlets for the work of PhD students and early career researchers. Typical examples would be regional journals with high acceptance rates, and editorial boards that have few leading researchers from top international institutions.

C
Tier C includes quality, peer reviewed, journals that do not meet the criteria of the higher tiers.

ERIH ranking 2007-2008

Purpose of The European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH) is to develop and to maintain an impact assessment tool for European research journals. Journal classification processes are conducted by discipline-specific expert panels. In the ERIH 2007 Initial List there are three categories:

A = international publications, both European and non-European, with high visibility and influence among researchers in the various research domains in different countries, regularly cited all over the world.

B = international publications, both European and non-European, with significant visibility and influence in the various research domains in different countries.
C = European publications with a recognized scholarly significance among researchers in the respective research domains in a particular readership group in Europe; occasionally cited outside the publishing country, though the main target group is the domestic academic community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>EHR History and Philosophy</th>
<th>EHR Religious and Philosophy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Medical Ethics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 A</td>
<td>B A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioethics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 A*</td>
<td>B B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homo oeconomicus.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nii &amp; nain : filosofinen aikakauslehti.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Ethics, Law, and Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prakseologia.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Perspectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td>C B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal for General Philosophy of Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Environmental Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revue Philosophique de la France et de l’Etranger</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbes Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing world bioethics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy in review.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res Publica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teorie Vedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silva Fennica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Policy and Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kriterion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Law International</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine, health care and philosophy : a European</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metsätieteen aikakauskirja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Amount of ranked articles (Norway)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amount of ranked articles (Australian)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A*</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Book publishers
C1 Published scientific monograph (3)
C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal (16)
D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary (7)

Publisher ranking (based on Norwegian ranking list)
2 = leading scientific
1 = scientific
no = non-scientific or not ranked

The total amount of monographs is 26, of which 7 are published by a leading scientific publisher and 2 by a scientific publisher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rodopi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Söderström</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hameen ammattikorkeakoulu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accedo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudeamus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin yliopisto, filosofian laitos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin yliopisto, teoreettisen filosofian ja filosofian (ruotsinkiel.) sekä käytännöllä</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olkeusministerio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opetus Hallitus : Filosofian ja elämänkatsomustiedon opettajat ry : Suomen humanitas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otava</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHGA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societas philosophica Fennica</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomalainen lakimiesyhdistys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction Publishers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSOY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yliopistopaine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>