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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.
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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 Communites. 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. TUHAT\(^3\) compilations on publications and other scientific activities\(^4\)
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.

---

\(^3\) 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 panelists 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
     - 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.

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

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”.

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”.
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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) 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
3. External peer review May–September 2011
4. Published reports March–April 2012
   - University level public report
   - 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 RC research focus is oriented to urban and regional issues and particularly on metropolitan regions. It deals with spatial social differentiation, urban change and innovation, segregation and immigration problems.

The RC has a prominent position in urban studies even if it appears little coordinated with other groups working on similar topics at HU.

In order to improve the quality of the RC it would be important to connect better with other scientific communities working on the same topics and to profit more from the international connections.

Members of the RC are responsible of specific focus areas of the Metropolitan Studies Program.

The RC has a careful and multilevel strategy of publications, although international publications from younger researcher may be expanded. The standard of refereed publications per year per researcher is reasonable (1.46) even if the RC should try to expand publications with prestigious international journals and publishers.

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

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 practises 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

The doctoral students appear to be well selected and trained even if relatively little exposed to international mobility. The labour perspectives for doctorates are reasonably good but relatively confined to the local-national milieu. The challenge is to maintain stable funding.

PhD students should be perhaps more involved in international research projects.

Selection procedures include interviews.

Recruitment of PhD students seems to be only linked to the needs of research projects.

The RC is involved in several doctoral training programs coordinated with other Finnish universities, what provides a crucial support to the multidisciplinarity of the RC approach.

There is no clear record of how many degrees have been awarded in the years 2005-2010.
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

The RC has a very good level of interaction with the national and local authorities on issues of metropolitan development and the peculiarity of the city region in the Nordic Welfare model. The senior members of the RC publish extensively on the subject and are well-known. Moreover they participate often in public debates on important issues of urban and regional policy.

RC research has been particularly influential on housing policies of the city of Helsinki.

Members of the RC are consultant for several Finnish ministries, as well as in international perspectives (France, Corea?)

Dissemination of scientific results looks good, as contacts with national media.

Numerical 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

The RC collaborates successfully in various national and international research networks even if there is no clear evidence that this high level of commitment in research is fruitful also to doctoral students and training.

The RC should find way to promote more international research mobility and find ways of using research results and discussion for the upgrading of all the RC and for doctoral training.

The doctoral students are encouraged to spend time abroad (6–12 months), but the RC is aware that they students should be pushed to take more advantage of the RC wide international network of collaborations.

There is one position for a foreign postdoc researcher, and future plans for recruiting more international members.

Numerical evaluation: 3 (Very good)

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

The RC operates through a great number of research projects with advisory boards of experts. The research focus appears prevalent on teaching and highly successful. The RC structure being spread over 2 Departments of UH and the Finnish Environment Institute, some organizational problems may occur and ways for strengthening the RC structural autonomy may be taken into consideration by the University.

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

There is no bureaucratic structure and the leadership is established within research projects though principal investigators. The RC relates on the Departments structure and reflects the management rules of the Departments.

Probably a stronger internal management of the RC could help to diffuse better within the group the benefits of the very intensive and interesting research activities.

It is unclear whether the support systems of participating institutions on which the management depends is enough coordinated or a more autonomous management structured would benefit to the RC. A sign of this comes when future challenges are mentioned in terms of more integration, information and mutual collaboration.

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

Very good level of research funding with substantial funding from the EU. It may be difficult to maintain this level in the future.
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

The RC planning strategies is a bit conservative, based on the continuation of the kind of research activities they have been involved in the recent past and on the diffusion of research results.
From 3 to 5 PhD students are expected to finish their studies before 2013.
Decisions about new doctoral schools will be made in 2011. It would be interesting to know about this.

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 5. The research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact.

The RC is certainly successfully active in various flows of urban research. The research projects appear not enough interactive one with the other (leaving an impression of segmentation) and not enough used with the goal of improving doctoral training.
The category this RC claims for itself is 5: Research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact. The category seems appropriate to the RC activity.

Numerical evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

The RC committee used a collaborative word processing tool in order to involve all researchers in the compilation of stage 2 material.

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

Focus area 10: Globalisation and social change

Issues concerning UH Focus area 10 Globalization and social change are certainly presented in the RC’s research.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

- Expand the internal cohesion and the connection between different research projects in order to elaborate a Unitarian theoretical and educational background.
- Expand the involvement of doctoral students in research projects and mobility of researchers.
- Organizational structure may be improved.
2.13 RC-specific conclusions

One of the problems of this RC is due to the necessity to improve the coordination between its component groups.

Moreover the doctoral formation should be improved through more regular systematic training and more international mobility of students, the recruitment strategies of doctoral candidates should become more autonomous from PIs' individual research projects.

The publication strategy should be improved in qualitative terms encouraging the young members to publish articles in prestigious refereed international journals or monographs and chapters with international publishers in order to increase the impact factor and the international visibility of the RC.
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:
Structural development and differentiation of city-regions (STRUTSI)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Mari Vaattovaara, Department of Geosciences and Geography

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: Vaattovaara, Mari
E-mail: mari.vaattovaara@helsinki.fi
Phone: 050 - 4154861
Affiliation: Department of Geosciences and Geography
Street address: Gustav Hällströmin katu 2

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Structural development and differentiation of city-regions
Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): STRUTSI
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): We have had unstructured but intensive joint research activities during the last 15 years among our RC. Thereafter Mari Vaattovaara (professor 2002 - ), Matti Kortteinen (professor 2007 - ) and Harry Sculman (professor 2006 -) have become professors in the University of Helsinki. The collaboration with Tommi Inkinen (professor 2008 -) has also existed before his position in the university. These collaborations show in joint publications and research agreements within various research projects and programmes. The group is working under the theme Structural development and differentiation of city-regions: innovations, segregation and urban form. An active group of post docs, doctoral students and international research fellows have joint the team advancing from their particular in-depth perspectives understanding of the processes behind the metropolitan developments. All together there are 4 professors, 6 Post Docs or senior researchers and 11 researchers in this group. Not only are we active in our own graduate schools, but also a major share of master’s students within the departments are selecting these subjects and have conducted their Masters theses from the field

3 SCIENTIFIC FIELDS OF THE RC

Main scientific field of the RC’s research: social sciences
RC’s scientific subfield 1: Urban Studies
RC’s scientific subfield 2: Geography
RC’s scientific subfield 3: Planning and Development
RC’s scientific subfield 4: Social Sciences, Interdisciplinary
Other, if not in the list:
4 RC’S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

Participation category: 5. Research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact

Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The series of empirical research articles published by the leading members of the research group (Vaattovaara 1998, Kortteinen & Vaattovaara 1999, Vaattovaara & Kortteinen 2003, Kortteinen al. 2005, Vaattovaara & al. 2010) has introduced the concept of metropolitan development to the national and regional political debate: showed how this new development is restructuring a peculiarly mixed city region in a Nordic Welfare State. The following debates have, among other things, lead to a reformulation of housing policies of the city of Helsinki, opened the discussions on developing city’s new strategy (on promoting the creative industries) and metropolitan policies (regional governance) both to empirical analysis and to international comparisons. A major attempt has been made to introduce the concept of socially integrated reconstruction of high-rise suburbs into national discussion, which has aroused great interest not only in ministries and municipalities but also among private actors (chamber of commerce, construction companies). The international perspective and comparisons in the analysis have aroused interest also in further audiences (a request by the Prime Minister of France, National Housing Institutions in Soul etc). The requests to join public discussions have been made, for example by the Prime Minister of Finland. In terms of innovation studies and concerning urban and regional structures the research has been conducted in collaboration with several other societal actors such as SITRA, TEKES and private companies (Inkinen 2009a; 2009b; Inkinen & Kuru 2004). The research has been applied in the work of Prime Ministers’ Information Society Policy Programme (2003–2008) and by the Advisory Board for Sectoral Research. Several members from our RC have actively been involved in executive boards and steering committees of research projects, foundations and other organs including organizations from public, private and non-governmental organizations. In addition several media appearances and even a prime-time television series (TV1) have relied strongly on the knowledge and appearance of the RC members. These all have impacted the society based on research.

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): The research activities of the RC are related to (1) spatial and social differentiation of urban areas (Vaattovaara 1998, Kortteinen&Vaattovaara 1999, Vaattovaara & Kortteinen 2003, Vaattovaara & al 2010), (2) structural changes in urban form (Schulman & Jaakola 2009, Schulman 2011) and (3) urban city regions as innovative environments (Inkinen 2005; 2010; Inkinen & Suorsa 2010). Research is focused mainly on structural processes (segregation, migration, immigration, sustainability, social cohesion, the rise of creative industries), but the development of cities is also investigated using subjective experiences and emotions of individuals or as arenas for human social interaction.

Our RC has intensely developed doctoral training in collaboration with national and international actors. We have had our small Graduate School on Housing Studies and Social Change funded by the Ministry of Education and led by Professor Mari Vaattovaara (2006-2009). Thereafter the school merged into a Graduate School of the Built Environment – led by professor Kauko Viitanen from Aalto University, where prof. Vaattovaara is the vice chair. A new graduate school by prof. Inkinen is also in the process of
application. In addition we are also involved in graduate schools and new graduate school applications coordinated by other universities. A major share of the funding for full time doctoral students still comes from EU-projects, Tekes, Ministry of Environment and the Finnish Academy – thus the collaboration between the university and the different actors in the society is embedded in the doctoral training.

Significance of the RC's research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):
The research group has formed a small, coherent and independent nucleus in the urban research network, based on the urban research program formed by the University of Helsinki jointly with the six cities. The members of the RC have had an active role in the collaboration as responsible holders of specific focus areas of the Metropolitan Studies Program. Stable, continuous and vibrant relations of cooperation and consultation have been formed between this research group, the six cities and at least the ministries of Environment and Interior and Finance. Special attention must be paid to the fact that – through the workings of this group academically based, scientific and refereed analysis has overtaken a leading role in advising and consulting the cities on matters of urban policies. This is in accordance with the University’s strategic goal to strengthen the societal cooperation with outside public and private actors and in acquiring outside funding.

The strategies of the university are highlighting more and more the labor market approach, the measurements of employment etc. In general, our research discipline has a good record in labour markets. The graduate employment level in geography exceeds 90% (within a year after graduation). This is the highest employment figure among Finnish departments of geography and regional studies, and definitely among the highest in the Faculty.

Keywords: Structural development, socio-economic differentiation, city-regions, innovations, segregation, urban form

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): Our research community (RC) has a prominent position in urban and regional studies in Finland. This concerns key indicators such as external funding, number of researchers, number and quality of publications together with impact and interaction with the society. The RC has collected significant research funding from external resources during 2005–2010. The total amount exceeds easily 4 million Euros, which within just few years from its establishment is a high share. It also is a high amount among social sciences in general. In terms of research, our team has produced an extensive amount (over 150) of research publications to various forums. In addition to international peer-reviewed publications, our RC has produced monographs (both international and national), commentaries, reviews, edited volumes and journals, together with articles popularizing science and professional contributions.

RC’s research on urban planning and development, structural changes, and regional innovation systems has impacted the rest of the society. The theoretical and empirical A1, A2 and A3 publications, directed to the academic community, is actively popularized to help practitioners such as local officials, regional planners and other public sector officers (and offices) to understand urban and regional developments. Members of our RC have participated in several applied research and development programs, evaluations, panels, workshops and media-broadcasts as partners and experts.
The RC’s research focus supports the goals set in the strategy of the University of Helsinki, in particular, the goals of research and doctoral education (University of Helsinki 2010a: 47–48). Furthermore, the research policy of the University of Helsinki (2010b: 39) states that: “Research focus areas will be defined at the University, faculty and departmental level”. Our research topic is one of focus areas of the university but also the department of Geosciences and Geography and the Faculty of Science.

Our doctoral education has been active and currently the RC includes 12 doctoral students. They have engaged international discussion in seminars and research meetings around the world. Doctoral stu
dents

Comments on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Our scientific productivity involves a balanced mixed of publications (from all categories of TUHAT) and an extensive participation to interactions with the rest of the society. We apply category 5 (high impact on society) and therefore recommend also to consider C-, D- and E-category publications listed in TUHAT. Our RC has produced a significant amount of applied science reports that are used in public sector development. They are, in most cases, the most relevant categories for societal impacts, because majority of publications in these categories are written in Finnish and targeted to national public audience and practitioners.

Our researchers are extensively connected to several key panels and workgroups that involve organizations and individuals from private and public sectors. These contributions (as societal impacts of research) are, in some cases, highly difficult to measure. For example, if the mayor of a major city or even the Prime Minister applies our research in his/her work in minutes or orally in working groups – how to illustrate that with numerical measures? Or even how to obtain knowledge of these impacts? Therefore we recommend that the evaluation process (and panel) considers also the amount of public appearances and participation in public panels or expert organizations as an important contributor to “societal impacting”.

Our publication strategy relies on international scientific publications (A-class). It is the basis for popular level publications of D- and E class. Publication process (as a part of the strategy) involves that senior researchers (principal investigators) oversee and, if needed, participate in the production of the A-category publications. Post-doc researchers and PhD-students are producing their related work in the collaboration or when needed with the principal investigators. We apply strategic goals set by the department of Geosciences and Geography concerning publication volumes. Our RC’s aim is to exceed these average goals in terms of quantity and quality. We also want to keep the “publication type” profile extensive so that the societal impact results would continue to be high.
## LIST OF RC MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:</th>
<th>STRUTSI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RC-LEADER</td>
<td>M. Vaattovaara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>Vaattovaara</td>
<td>Mari</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schulman</td>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkinen</td>
<td>Tommi</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kortteinen</td>
<td>Matti</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linko</td>
<td>Maarja</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>Open University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>Gareth</td>
<td>Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yousfi</td>
<td>Saara</td>
<td>Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tynkkynen</td>
<td>Veli-Pekka</td>
<td>Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ristimäki</td>
<td>Mikaela</td>
<td>Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Finnish Environment Institute, Environmental Policy Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Söderman</td>
<td>Tarja</td>
<td>Research Director</td>
<td>Finnish Environment Institute, Environmental Policy Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernelius</td>
<td>Venla</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhalmann</td>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eskelä</td>
<td>Elina</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faehnle</td>
<td>Maija</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepsu</td>
<td>Kaisa</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makkonen</td>
<td>Teemu</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merisalo</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norppa</td>
<td>Mikaela</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponto</td>
<td>Helmi</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratvio</td>
<td>Rami</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilkama</td>
<td>Katja</td>
<td>Doctoral candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Department of Geosciences and Geography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

Name of the RC’s responsible person: Vaattovaara, Mari
E-mail of the RC’s responsible person: mari.vaattovaara@helsinki.fi

Name and acronym of the participating RC: Structural development and differentiation of city-regions, STRUTSI

The RC’s research represents the following key focus area of UH: 10. Globalisaatio ja yhteiskunnan muutos - Globalisation and social change

Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area: As one of the strongholds of the Nordic Welfare state Finland has experienced rapid changes over the past decades. The Helsinki region is a kind of a laboratory of what happens to urban differentiation when economic globalisation and ICT-driven economic development occur under a strong Nordic welfare state and local policies of social mixing. This structural differentiation and social change has been the focus of our research for decades now, developing from single empirical research articles in the late 90's to a bigger RC and to an overall interpretation with substantial political relevance, used at present by major local actors and by all the national political parties.

1. 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).

The research activities of the RC are related to (1) spatial and social differentiation of urban areas (Vaattovaara 1998, Kortteinen & Vaattovaara 1999, Vaattovaara & Kortteinen 2003, Vaattovaara & al 2010), (2) structural changes in urban form (Schulman & Jaakola 2009, Schulman 2011) and (3) urban city regions as innovative environments (Inkinen 2005; 2010; Inkinen & Suorsa 2010). Research is focused mainly on structural processes (segregation, migration, immigration, sustainability, social cohesion, the rise of creative industries), but the development of cities is also investigated using subjective experiences and emotions of individuals or as arenas for human social interaction.

The RC’s research focus supports the goals set in the strategy of the University of Helsinki, in particular, the goals of research and doctoral education (University of Helsinki 2010a: 47–48). Furthermore, the research policy of the University of Helsinki (2010b: 39) states that: "Research focus areas will be defined at the University, faculty and departmental level". Our research topic is one of focus areas of the university but also the department of Geosciences and Geography and the Faculty of Science.

Our research community (RC) has a prominent position in urban and regional studies in Finland. This concerns key indicators such as external funding, a number of researchers and quality of publications together with positive impacts and interaction on society. The RC has collected significant research funding from external resources during 2005–2010. The total amount far exceeds 4 million Euros, which within just few years from its establishment is a high share. It also is a high amount among social sciences in general. In terms of research, our team has produced an extensive amount (over 150) of research publications to various forums. In addition to international peer-reviewed publications, our RC has produced monographs (both international and national), commentaries, reviews, edited volumes and journals, together with articles popularizing science and professional contributions.

The research group has formed a small, coherent and independent nucleus in the urban research network, based on the urban research program formed by the University of Helsinki jointly with the six
The members of the RC have had an active role in the collaboration as responsible holders of specific focus areas of the Metropolitan Studies Program. Stable, continuous and vibrant relations of cooperation and consultation have been formed between this research group, the six cities and at least the ministries of Environment and Interior and Finance. Special attention must be paid to the fact that, through the workings of this group academically based, scientific and refereed analysis has overtaken a leading role in advising and consulting the cities on matters of urban policies. This is in accordance with the University’s strategic goal to strengthen the societal cooperation with outside public and private actors and in acquiring outside funding.

- Ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC’s research.

Our publication strategy relies on international scientific publications (A-class). It is the basis for popular level publications of D- and E class. Publication process (as a part of the strategy) involves that senior researchers (principal investigators) oversee and, if needed, participate in the production of the A-category publications. Post-doc researchers and PhD-students are producing their related work in the collaboration or when needed with the principal investigators. We apply strategic goals set by the department of Geosciences and Geography concerning publication volumes. Our RC’s aim is to exceed these average goals in terms of quantity and quality. We also want to keep the “publication type” profile extensive so that the societal impact results would continue to be high.

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/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes, good practices and quality assurance in doctoral training, and assuring good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates.

Recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates

All PhD students will be recruited in two-stage recruiting process when positions become available. An electronic application procedure will be used. The first selection round will be based on written applications and the second on interviews. All applicants are treated equally in the selection process. In the case of evenly qualified applicants, priority will be given to females and foreigners. The evaluation of written applications involves:

1) Evaluation of the quality of the research plan (5 pages maximum) and its potential contribution to economic geographical research.

2) The match with the aims of the RC research design. (Our goal is to find a satisfactory balance between the research interests of the prospective students and the programme’s research aims so as to result in the selection of most talented students with creative solutions to the research challenges at hand).

3) Success of the applicant in prior studies and career so far.

4) Previously acquired research skills (potential publications; recommendations; teaching experience).

Face-to-face interviews of the short-listed applicants aims to evaluate:

1) The motivation of the applicant.

2) Expected potential to complete the work within the programme operation period.

3) The suitability of the applicant’s research plans to the department to which the applicant applies.
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4) The ability of the applicant to work as a member of a research programme and research team(s).

The final selection of the students will be done by the principal investigator whose project is recruiting a new PhD student. Selection criteria will be explicit and a feedback letter will be sent to all applicants. All recruiting processes follow the identified path and therefore it is standardized.

Supervision

The supervisors (principal investigators) are responsible for monitoring the progress of their students. All PhD students are expected to report and discuss their research progress with their supervisors. The supervisors other than RC’s principal investigators are selected on the basis of their familiarity of the study subjects and their previous track record. All participating supervisors are high class scholars and professionals. The RC will invite additional supervisors on the need basis.

Collaboration

Our RC has intensely developed doctoral training in collaboration with national and international actors. We have had our small Graduate School on Housing Studies and Social Change funded by the Ministry of Education and led by Professor Mari Vaattovaara (2006-2009). Thereafter the school merged into a Graduate School of the Built Environment – led by professor Kauko Viitanen from Aalto University, where Prof. Vaattovaara is the vice chair. The Graduate School of the Built Environment brings together seven universities and two research institutes from different disciplines (University of Helsinki, Aalto University, Hanken School of Economics, Tampere University of Technology, University of Oulu, Turku School of Economics and Business Administration, University of Eastern Finland, VTT and Finnish Geodetic Institution). A new graduate school by Prof. Inkinen is also in the process of application. In addition we are also involved in graduate schools and new graduate school applications coordinated by other universities. A major share of the funding for full time doctoral students still comes from EU-projects, Tekes, Ministry of Environment and the Finnish Academy. Thus, the collaboration between the university and the different actors in society is embedded in the doctoral training.

Good practices and quality assurance

Ethics code: All RC members are committed to good scientific practice and ethics. All data handling procedures and collection are performed according to the standards required by National Research Ethics Council of Finland. Any discrimination targeted against gender, age or ethnicity will not be tolerated.

Gender issues: In the recruiting process female candidates are encouraged to apply. RC aims to supports women researcher education.

Feedback and handbook: Feedback from the students and correction procedures are implemented actively. Students are expected to engage their supervisors (principal investigators) when needed and feedback is directed to the programme management when needed. Programme management will disseminate correction plans and emerging new practices when necessary. Department of Geosciences and Geography has a departmental handbook on good practices and conduct. It will be applied as a guide for the RC’s practices.

Assuring good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctors

The strategies of the university are highlighting more and more the labor market approach, the measurements of employment etc. In general, our research discipline has a good record in labour markets. The graduate employment level in geography exceeds 90% (within a year after graduation).
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This is the highest employment figure among Finnish departments of geography and regional studies, and definitely among the highest in the Faculty.

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

The strength in doctoral supervision is the extensive professional network and high quality senior and principle researcher staff of our RC. In addition a direct collaboration with the new graduate school of the Built Environment (in Aalto University) strengthens the interdisciplinary nature of the doctoral training. Our research field has close connections with development and planning and therefore the contents of our research are expected to remain attractive. An additional strength of our PhD recruitment is the good quality student flow through the departments of geosciences and geography and sociology. The challenge is to maintain stable funding and provision of competitive and attractive salaries for capable young professionals.

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).

The series of empirical research articles published by the leading members of the research group (Vaattovaara 1998, Kortteinen & Vaattovaara 1999, Vaattovaara & Kortteinen 2003, Kortteinen al. 2005,Vaattovaara & al. 2010) has introduced the concept of metropolitan development to the national and regional political debate. They demonstrate how this new development is restructuring a peculiarly mixed city region in a Nordic Welfare State. The following debates have, among other things, lead to a reformulation of the housing policies of the city of Helsinki, opened up new discussions on city’s new strategies (on, for instance, promoting the creative industries and on metropolitan policies and regional governance). A major attempt has been made to introduce the concept of socially integrated reconstruction of high-rise suburbs into national debates. The concept has aroused great interest not only in ministries and local municipalities but also among private actors (chamber of commerce, construction companies, and local actors). A special focus has also been on informational development, regional innovation systems and planning in conditions of digitalisation (see Inkinen, Schulman).

The requests to join public debates and discussions have been made, for example by the Prime Minister as well as by the Minister of Housing. Professors Vaattovaara and Kortteinen have been acting as consultants for the Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Employment and the Economy, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Interior and for the Cities in the Helsinki Region. The international perspective and comparisons in these analyses have aroused interest from audiences further afield (a request by the Prime Minister of France, the Government and National Housing Institutions in Soul etc.).

RC’s research on urban development, structural changes, regional innovation systems and planning has, thus, had a significant impact on both scientific, political and public discussions in the country. The results of the scientific (A1, A2 and A3) publications have actively been popularized to help national and local practitioners (Ministries,City planning offices, local officials, regional planners and other public sector officers and offices) to understand their message and significance on urban and regional developments. Members of our RC have participated in several applied research and development programs, evaluation, panels, workshops and media-broadcasts both as partners and experts.

Several members from our RC have actively been involved in executive boards and steering committees of research projects, foundations and other organs including organizations from public, private and non-governmental organizations. In addition several media appearances and even a prime time television...
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series (TV1) have relied strongly on the knowledge and appearance of the RC members. All these involvements and appearances have impact on society based on academic research of the RC.

- **Ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC's research and doctoral training.**

  The strategic goal is to continue with the approach described above but with carefully specified issues (the neighbourhood-effects of spatial differentiation, accumulation of poverty and the renovation of prefabricated high-rise housing, problems of security and safety, and of local health care in areas of accumulated poverty, housing policies and the spatial accumulation of ethnic minorities, problems of trafficking with urban sprawl, the growth and differentiation of the local elites, ICT and housing policies, urban renaissance and urban renewal - which both deepen the analysis and, at the same time, are linked with the practical problems of politics, administration and private actors. With specified questions the field and range of cooperation and partners will be expanded. This strengthening of social impact is being linked with the classic traditions of academic teaching and education (specifically: by producing PhDs on these subjects, linked with the on-going research projects). At the same time we are producing experts for the local actors which again strengthens the network.

- **Description of the RC's research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities and how the RC has promoted researcher mobility.**

  The RC is well represented in the national and international networks of universities, research institutes and other societal actors. In terms of urban geography the RC has been a key research partner in projects funded by TEKES, Academy of Finland, ministries and private companies. The RC engages in close research collaboration with AALTO University, Technical Research Centre of Finland, The Housing Finance and Development Centre of Finland and municipalities. The RC is a research partner in MetrOP - project with Universities of Turku and Tampere, National Institute for Health and Welfare, and Finnish national board of education. Other national examples include KatuMetro -project in Urban Studies and Metropolitan Policy -programme and a project with Finnish Environmental Institute and Finnish Forest Research Institute. The RC has also been an initiator of the Research Programme on the Future of Housing and Living 2011. The RC's research has been applied by a wide range of societal actors, including the Parliament of Finland, Finnish Government and regional councils.

  In terms of innovation studies concerning urban and regional structures the research has been conducted in collaboration with several other societal actors such as SITRA, TEKES and private companies. One of the main topics includes analysis of R&D and innovation activities and their impacts on regional development. The research has been also applied in the work of Prime Ministers’ Information Society Policy Programme (2003–2008) and by the Advisory Board for Sectoral Research.

  In the international perspective the RC participates actively in the leading forums, including work in IGU, AAG and RSA. The RC is/has been a key research partner in several international research projects, such as ACRE (Accommodating Creative Knowledge). ACRE network consists of universities in 13 European Metropolitan Regions. The RC has also been an active participant in the Cost Action C20 Urban Knowledge Arena. It is also a coordinator in Nodes-project (Nordic welfare states and the dynamics and effects of ethnic residential segregation) in which Prof. Vaattovaara is a Principal Investigator. Other research partners in this project are Finnish National Institute for Health and Welfare, Danish Building Research Institute, Oslo University, Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research and Uppsala University. The RC has also conducted research project "Urban spatial differentiation and neighbourhood effects" together with Prof. Sako Musterd (University of Amsterdam). Through public
space research the RC collaborates with Universities of Strathclyde, Heriot-Watt and Edinburgh in UK, National University of Ireland and University of Syracuse (USA). RC has developed doctoral training in collaboration with national and international actors. It has organized several joint doctoral training courses together with international research community. For example, in 2006, Nordic-Baltic Doctoral Research Course in collaboration with Oslo School of Architecture and Design, Chalmers University of Technology (Sweden), Tallinn University of Technology and HUT Centre for Urban and Regional Studies. In 2007, International Ph.D. Colloquium for European Ph.D. students was organized with Bauhaus, Weimar and Italy.

- RC’s strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.

The RC’s current strengths include extensive national and international research collaboration. The RC engages in close co-operation with wide network of universities, research institutes and other public and private actors.

A challenge for the RC is to promote the international research mobility. Currently, doctoral students are encouraged to spend time abroad (6-12 months) so as to gain experience in carrying out research in a foreign university. Even thought, RC has wide international research networks, researchers haven’t utilised this possibility to the best extent. At the moment, the RC has a foreign post-doc researcher. Also in the future, the RC can aspire to recruit more international members by announcing the open positions internationally. However, it also brings up challenges - it is not the easiest task to get involved in these national discussions and debates on topics with high societal relevance. Not only the language, but there are also other obstacles in deep understanding on foreign societies.

**Operational Conditions (Max. 4400 Characters with Spaces)**

- Description of the operational conditions in the RC’s research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).

Our RC’s institutional resources for supporting research including institutional administration, management and support services (e.g. information technology and library services) are in good shape. The RC has members from two departments from the University of Helsinki and from the Finnish environment institute (SYKE). The RC has expertise on different fields of geography, sociology and urban planning. The RC constitutes a balanced combination of senior researchers and doctoral students. In addition RC works in close connection of co-operation partners from many other universities and urban regions and provincial authorities in Finland and many other European countries.

Between research, teaching and various societal activities our RC base represents different dimensions of urban development. Research of the RC is a broad topic covering many areas of the University of Helsinki’s target programme 2011 – such as the changing environment, welfare and safety, globalization and social change.

- RC’s strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.

Strengths: The RC has strong societal ties and social networks, a wide - ranging and broad - based approach to urban development. In many projects we have advisory boards consisting of experts from Finland and other countries. The purpose of advisory boards is to connect the research work to international research context and also obtain information of national research needs and knowledge demands.
Challenges: Perceptions of wanted urban development include tensions and even conflicting goals. The academic research of the RC must base on general focus areas, such as in the performance agreement between the University of Helsinki and the Ministry of Education and Culture for the period 2010-2012. Our main focus areas are welfare, environmental changes, globalisation and social change.

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.

The research community does not have a formal executive board or other bureaucratically build structure as such. The RC is a network structure based on research contents and free collaboration of key persons who have worked together several years before the evaluation period. The RC leadership is based on equality of principal investigators. The RC’s research relates strongly to the departments of Geosciences and Geography and Department of Social Policy. The management processes follows the guidelines identified in the operational handbooks of the departments. Our RC’s main research fields have their responsible researchers (Professors Inkinen, Kortteinen, Schulman and Vaattovaara). In daily work they discuss and envision in collaboration the current situations taking place among the researchers working in the RC.

The management of RC activities is tight to faculty and department support systems of participating institutions. In practice the financial management is directed by the project leaders and is further operationalised by the financial secretaries of the faculties of Science and Social Sciences. The human resources management is done by each principal investigator. The principal investigators also act as researchers’ superiors and conduct normal supervisor tasks including development discussions, ensuring the progress of research and building motivation. The research themes are decided among principal investigators. Post doctoral and PhD students are forming the main operational research layer. In addition, we consider all members of the RC as colleagues avoiding hierarchical categorizations to workers, supervisors or managers.

How the leadership- and management-related processes support

- High quality research: The main principle in egalitarian research community is to give opportunities to potential and motivated researchers across all academic career levels. The low hierarchical ethos that we have enables the development of ideas as well as emergence of new research tasks within parameters of main disciplines included in our RC. Joint collaboration between researchers internally and externally enables further emergence of new research themes that have societal importance.

- Collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC: As indicated, researchers and principal investigators have interaction in everyday work. Collaboration is supported by all principal investigators and particularly PhD students are encouraged to engage in interdisciplinary collaborations nationally and internationally. These collaborations show in the joint article publications of the RC.

- The RC’s research focus: The RC has formed over the years and our research focus is automatically connected to research interests of principal investigators. Low barrier interaction within the RC enhances and develops new research questions and gives a detailed focus for research.
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- Strengthening of the RC’s know-how: The RC members are involved in several projects in which participants experience knowledge exchange and growth in know-how. The RC applies also various methodological tools enabling the know-how to be further distributed.

- RC’s strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes.

The excellent functioning of low hierarchy structure of management requires motivated and self driven persons who also are able to function as a team. This is the greatest strength and also the greatest challenge. Therefore, the recruitment of motivated and highest quality young researchers is one of the main challenges. Also the career progression of the more experienced PhD holders is a challenge. RC’s management strengths also include flexibility in collaboration arrangements concerning new funding opportunities and project formulations. Our RC is also flexible and interdisciplinary due to content based “Just-in-Time” management process.

The actions to develop the management process involve integration and open information dissemination from principal investigators to researchers. We also aim to enhance mutual collaboration between RC’s researchers working on different aspects of our core competence. Finally, principal investigators responsible for project managements continue to enhance good HR practices.

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: 1104759

- 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: 360000

- 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: 2364266

- 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:

- 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: Helsinki University
  - Centre for Environment, HENVI
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: 100 000

- 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:
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- total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations:

- **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: Ministry of transportation and communications, Housing Finance and development center of Finland, City of Helsinki, Metropolitan area Municipalities (Katumetro), City of Espoo, Ministry of the Environment, Municipality of Riihimäki, Ministry of Education and Culture (6 doctoral programme positions)
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 503335

8 RC’s strategic action plan for 2011-2013 (max. 4400 characters with spaces)

- Description of the RC’s future perspectives in respect to research and doctoral training.

  As mentioned (see part 3 above) the RC will continue with its approach with specified issues that broaden and deepen the scope of research, networking and partnerships. This strategy is linked with the following on-going research projects of both academic and practical merit:

  - A project on the metropolisation of the Helsinki Region and the differentiation of social well-being within the area. The data is based on a survey in 2011, spatially clustered sample of about 20 000 inhabitants of the region, conducted as a follow-up of a previous survey in 2002. The problem is focused on the possible neighbourhood effects of the on-going spatial differentiation on a large number of specific issues (psycho-social well-being, health, addictions, insecurity, migration patterns and their local back-grounds). Funded both by the University of Helsinki and by the cities of the region the project will lay the ground for a number of future PhDs.

  - A project on the renovation of prefabricated high-rise housing areas built in the 60’s and 70’s. One fifth of the country’s population lives in these high-rise housing areas built using pre-fabricated elements. This housing stock has reached the end of its technical life span. The project, planned in cooperation with ARA, is planned on developing a practical tool for the interpretation of the social element in future, socially integrated reconstruction projects.

  - A project on amenable mortality both nationally and within the city of Helsinki, linking both individual and spatial data in an analysis on how and why amenable mortality is significantly higher in a number of health center districts within the City of Helsinki. The analysis is being done in close collaboration with the City in its attempt to construct its first Strategy on Health.

  - A project on issues of urban safety and insecurity (AATU), financed by Tekes, University of Helsinki and Aalto University with, conducted as a part of academic teaching (a research course), in collaboration with the City of Vantaa in its attempt to develop the surroundings of Tikkurila and of the Helsinki-Vantaa Airport, being a hot spot of regional unsafety. The project is also an attempt to develop best practices in line with the newly built Strategy on Urban Safety by the Ministry of Interior.

  - A project on ethnic minorities in Nordic welfare state, including both regionally specific empirical analysis on the relation of the local policies of housing with the spatial accumulation of ethnic minorities, white avoidance and white flight (a PhD), and a separate international project (NODES) on comparing the different political practices in different Nordic Welfare regimes, their effects and social significance.
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- A project on spatial differentiation on the educational outcomes and well-being of youth, including both a PhD centering on the Helsinki Region and a larger comparative project on (...). The work is being planned and executed in cooperation with the (which institution?).

- Projects on housing creative industries and highly skilled experts working in these new growing industries (ACRE). The results give impetus to new deepened analysis, including comparisons of Helsinki and Tallinn from the perspective of high-class international experts (a PhD).

- Separate studies, articles and/or PhDs on metropolitain governance, urban renaissance and urban renewal, and problems of traffic and commuting.

By doing this our RC will strengthen and stabilize its position as the leading cluster of researchers on this field in Finland. Doctoral training continues during the following 2-year period through the work of the current PhD students. It is expected that from 3 to 5 PhD students should finish their studies before 2013. Our principal investigators Inkinen (main applicant of the graduate school of Economic Geography), Schulman and Vaattovaara (partners in the applications for graduate schools of “Advanced Urban Modelling” and “Design for Sustainability”) are also involved in large doctorate school applications that would further strengthen doctoral training on RC’s research field as identified in section 2. The decisions of these new doctorate schools will be made in 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHORT DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE RC MEMBERS HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE COMPILATION OF THE STAGE 2 MATERIALS (MAX. 1100 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The RC used the collaborative word processing tool “PiratePad” on the internet to produce the co-written material. PiratePad allowed all members of the RC to participate in the modifications and additions to requested sections. All members of the RC were informed extensively regarding the need to modify the texts via email and face-to-face. Principal investigators also encouraged PhD students and post-docs to participate in the production of the materials. The majority of the material is produced by the principal investigators but the contribution of other members is significant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 1 Analysis of publications

- Associated person is one of Mari Vaattovaara, Mari.Vaattovaara@helsinki.fi, Harry Schulman, harry.schulman@helsinki.fi, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, tommi.inkinen@helsinki.fi, Matti Kortesniemi, matti.kortesniemi@helsinki.fi, Maarit Linko, Maarit.Linko@helsinki.fi, Gareth Rice, gareth.rice@helsinki.fi, Saara Yousfi, saara.yousfi@helsinki.fi, Val-Pekka Tynkkynen, Val-Pekka.Tynkkynen@helsinki.fi, Miia Ritamäki, Miia.Ritamaki@helsinki.fi, Tarja Stelzerman, verita.stelzerman@helsinki.fi, Hanna Dähkänen, hanna.dahkainen@helsinki.fi, Elin Eskelä, elin.eskelae@helsinki.fi, Maija Elina Faehnle, maija.faehnle@helsinki.fi, Kaisa Kepsu, kaisa.kepsu@helsinki.fi, Teemu-Antti Makkonen, teemu.makkonen@helsinki.fi, Marja Anräät, marja.anraat@helsinki.fi, Maria Mattila, maria.mattila@helsinki.fi, Mikko Norppa, mikko.norppa@helsinki.fi, Riita Pinto, riita.pinto@helsinki.fi, Rami Pakko, ramipakko@helsinki.fi, Katja Viikstra, katja.viikstra@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>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Review in scientific journal</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Article in professional journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></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>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Published development or research report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Popular monograph</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005

2006

2007

2008
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STRUTSI/Vaattovaara

2009


Vaattovaara, M 2009, ‘The emergence of the Helsinki Metropolitan area as an international hub of the knowledge industries’, Built Environment, vol 35, no. 2, pp. 204-211.

2010


A2 Review in scientific journal

2009

INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

STRUTSI/Vaattovaara

2010


A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)

2005


2006


2007


2008


INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI
RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

STRUTSI/Vaattovaara


2009


2010


Vaattovaara, M 2010, 'How develop sustainable urban regeneration process?', in Königshausen, Neumann (eds), Bauhaus and the City. A contest heritage for a challenging future.

A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)

2007

B1 Unrefered journal article

2006

INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI
RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

STRUTSI/Vaattovaara

2007

2008
Linko, M 2008, 'Fredrika Runebergin pöydän ääressä', Tieteessä tapahtuu, no. 3-4, pp. 70-72.

2009

2010
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

STRUTSI/Vaattovaara


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

2006

2008
Vaattovaara, M, Huovinen, K 2008, 'Affordable housing in Finland: chapter 8', Affordable housing. Diana Fitzsimons and John McPeake (editors)., IFHP,, Hague , the Netherlands, pp. 63-68.

2009


2010


INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010


B3 Unrefereed article in conference proceedings

2009

2010

C1 Published scientific monograph

2005

2006


2007
Inkinen, T, Vaattovaara, M 2007, Technology and knowledge-based development: Helsinki metropolitan area as a creative region: pathways to creative and knowledge-based regions. ACRE report, no. 2.5, AMDIS, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.

Kangasoja, J, Schulman, H 2007, Arabianrantaan!: uuden kaupungin maihinnousu, Helsingin kaupungin tietokeskus, [Helsinki].

2009


2010
INTRODUCTION EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUJAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

STRUTSI/Vaattovaara


Linko, M 2010, Asiantuntija vai julkis?: Tietokirjailijoiden ja tietokirjallisuuden näkemyksen edistymisestä suomalaisessa ympäristössä, Suomen tietokeskus, Helsinki.


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

2005


2006


2007


2009


D1 Article in professional journal

2005


2006


2007
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RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

STRUTSI/Vaattovaara


2008

2009


2010


2005

2008


2009

2010
D4 Published development or research report

2005

2007

2008
Kepsu, K. Vaattovaara, M. 2008. Creative knowledge in the Helsinki Metropolitan Area: understanding the attractiveness of the metropolitan region for creative knowledge workers. ACRE report, no. 5.5, AMIDSt, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.
Kepsu, K. Vaattovaara, M. 2008. Location factors of creative knowledge companies in the Helsinki Metropolitan Area. ACRE report, no. 6.5, AMIDSt, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.

2009

2010

D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary

2009

E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2006

2007

2008
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

STRUTSI/Vaattovaara


2009

2010

E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2005

2006

E2 Popular monograph

2008
1 Analysis of activities 2005-2010

- Associated person is one of Mari Vaattovaara, Mari.Vaattovaara@helsinki.fi, Harry Schulman, harry.schulman@helsinki.fi, Tommi Aaloksi, tommi.aalokki@helsinki.fi, Matti Kortelainen, matti.kortelainen@helsinki.fi, Maaria Linko, maaria.linko@helsinki.fi, Gareth Rice, gareth.rice@helsinki.fi, Saara Youafi, saara.youafi@helsinki.fi, Veli-Pekka Tyrväinen, veli-peka.tyrvainen@helsinki.fi, Mari Ristimäki, mari.ristimaki@helsinki.fi, Terja Stolman, terja.stolman@helsinki.fi, Vesa Bernotaus, vesa.bernotaus@helsinki.fi, Aapo Hermonen, aapo.hermonen@helsinki.fi, Elina Eskelä, elina.eskel@helsinki.fi, Majsa Eteläinen, majsa.etalainen@helsinki.fi, Kaisa Kortes, kaisa.kortes@helsinki.fi, Outi Anttinen, outi.anttinen@helsinki.fi, Maria Anttila, maria.anta@helsinki.fi, Mika Norppa, mika.norppa@helsinki.fi, Kaija Vilkama, kaija.vilkama@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>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of series</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of special theme number</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of candidates for academic posts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in review committee</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in research network</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other tasks of an expert in private sector</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for web based media</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

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

Mari Vaattovaara, Mari.Vaattovaara@helsinki.fi

- Tohtorikoulutettava (Rami Ratvio), Mari Vaattovaara, 2005 – ...
- Tohtorikoulutettavan ohjaus, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.05.2005 – ...
- Tohtorikoulutettavan ohjaus (Venla Bernelius), Mari Vaattovaara, 2006 – ...
- Tohtorikoulutettavan osittainen ohjaus (Maari Kahila), Mari Vaattovaara, 2006 – ...
- Tohtorikoulutettavan ohjaus (Katja Villkama), Mari Vaattovaara, 2007 – ...
- Tohtorikoulutettavan ohjaus (Antti Vasanen), Mari Vaattovaara, 2008 – ...
- Tohtorikoulutettavan ohjaus (Miika Norppa), Mari Vaattovaara, 2008 – ...
- Tohtorikoulutettavan ohjaaminen (Elina Eskilä), Mari Vaattovaara, 2009 – ...
- Tohtorikoulutettava (Hel Ponto), Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2010 – ...

Harry Schulman, harry.schulman@helsinki.fi


Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, tommi.inkinen@helsinki.fi

- PhD supervision, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 15.12.2007
- PhD supervision, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 31.10.2009

Maaria Linko, Maaria.Linko@helsinki.fi

- Supervisor of Ph.D. thesis, Maaria Linko, 2008 – ...

Tarja Söderman

**Maija Elina Faehnle, maija.faehnle@helsinki.fi**
Opinnäytetyön ohjaus, Maija Elina Faehnle, 2009
Opinnäytetyön ohjaus, Maija Elina Faehnle, 2010

**Prizes and awards**

Mari Vaattovaara, Mari.Vaattovaara@helsinki.fi
Neljäs palkinto kansainvälisessä Great Helsinki Vision 2050-ideakilpailussa, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007

Harry Schulman, harry.schulman@helsinki.fi
Leadership of the Helsinki Tomorrow program diploma, Harry Schulman, 2005 → 2006

Maija Elina Faehnle, maija.faehnle@helsinki.fi
Best Poster Award, Maija Elina Faehnle, 2010, South Korea

Miika Norppa, miika.norppa@helsinki.fi
Helsinki-palkinto, Miika Norppa, 2007

**Editor of research journal**

Mari Vaattovaara, Mari.Vaattovaara@helsinki.fi
Terra, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Urban Studies, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Urban Studies, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Geoforum, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United States
Terra, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Urban Studies, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United Kingdom

Harry Schulman, harry.schulman@helsinki.fi
Terra, Harry Schulman, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, tommi.inkinen@helsinki.fi
Terra. Maantieteellinen aikakauskirja, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2010 → ...

Gareth Rice, gareth.rice@helsinki.fi
Antipode (City of Exception: The Dutch Revanchist City and the Urban Homo Sacher), Gareth Rice, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008

Maija Elina Faehnle, maija.faehnle@helsinki.fi
Yhdyuskuntasuunnittelulle-lehden toimitusiohtee, Maija Elina Faehnle, 12.2007 → ...

Kaisa Kepsu, kaisa.kepsu@helsinki.fi
Terra, Kaisa Kepsu, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Katja Vilkama, katja.vilkama@helsinki.fi
Journal of Housing and Built Environment, Katja Vilkama, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Netherlands
Terra, Katja Vilkama, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

**Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings**

Harry Schulman, harry.schulman@helsinki.fi
Helsingin metropolialue innovaatioympäristöinä, Harry Schulman, 2007 → 2011, Finland

Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, tommi.inkinen@helsinki.fi
Lapsuus mediamaailmassa. Näkökulmia lasten tietoyhteiskuntaan, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2005 → ...

Tietoyhteiskunta. Myötä ja todellisuus, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2005 → ...
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RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF OTHER SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES 2005-2010

STRUTSI/Vaattovaara

Tietoyhteiskunnan maantiede (kokoomateoskirja), Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Peer review of manuscripts

Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, tommi.inkinen@helsinki.fi

Computing, Communications and Control Technologies (proceedings), Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United States

Encyclopaedia of Digital Government, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United States

Information, Communication &amp; Society, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, United Kingdom

Alue- ja ympäristö, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Creative Urban Regions: Harnessing Urban Technologies to Support Knowledge City Initiatives, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United States

Economic Geography, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United States

Encyclopaedia of Information Science and Technology, 2nd edition., Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United States


International Journal of Electronic Government Research, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, United States

Member of an editorial board, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2007 → …, United States

NETCOM. Networks and Communications Studies., Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France

Vaasan yliopiston julkaisuja., Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland

Economic Geography, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United States


Journal of Urban Technology, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom

Member of an editorial board, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2008 → …, France

NETCOM. Networks and Communications Studies, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2008 → …, France

NETCOM. Networks and Communications Studies, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, France


Strategies for Local E-Government Adoption and Implementation: Comparative Studies, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United States

Member of an editorial board, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2009 → …, Switzerland

Computing, Communications and Control Technologies (CCCT) Congress, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2010

Economic Geography, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2010

European Planning Studies, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2010

European Urban and Regional Studies, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2010

Information Systems Analysis and Synthesis (ISAS) Congress, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2010

Information, Communication &amp; Society, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2010, United Kingdom

International Journal of Knowledge-Based Development, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2010

Journal of Urban Technology, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2010

Knowledge Generation, Communication and Management (KGCM) Congress, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2010
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STRUTSI/Vaattovaara

Political Geography, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2010
Regional Studies, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2010
Springer Science+Business Media, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2010, United States

Matti Kortteinen , matti.kortteinen@helsinki.fi
Yhteiskuntapolitiikka, Matti Kortteinen, 1996 → ...

Hanna Dhalmann , hanna.dhalmann@helsinki.fi
Vertaisarviointi Terra -lehteen, Hanna Dhalmann, 2007 → ...
Vertaisarviointi Journal of Housing and the Built Environment -lehteen, Hanna Dhalmann, 2007 → ...
Vertaisarviointi Alue & Ympäristö -lehteen, Hanna Dhalmann, 2010 → ...

Maija Elina Faehnle , maija.faehnle@helsinki.fi
Arvioitsija Suomen ympäristö -sarjan julkaistui, Maija Elina Faehnle, 2010
Vertaisarviointi Alue & Ympäristö -lehdelle, Maija Elina Faehnle, 2010

Editor of series
Matti Kortteinen , matti.kortteinen@helsinki.fi
Research Series of the National Institute of Welfare and Health, Matti Kortteinen, 1998 → 2006, Finland

Editor of special theme number
Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen , tommi.inkinen@helsinki.fi

Maija Elina Faehnle , maija.faehnle@helsinki.fi

Assessment of candidates for academic posts
Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen , tommi.inkinen@helsinki.fi
Evaluator for docentship, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2010, Finland

Maaria Linko , Maaria.Linko@helsinki.fi
Assessment of academic expertise for Adjunct professorship, Maaria Linko, 27.03.2007, Finland

Membership or other role in review committee
Mari Vaattovaara , Mari.Vaattovaara@helsinki.fi
Kansainvälisten arviointityöryhmän jäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 2006 → 2008
Ympäristöministeriön kode tuleman asuinmisen asiantuntijaryhmän jäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 2006 → 2007
Jäsentäytäntöihin arviointiryhmään, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.06.2007 → 31.12.2010
Asiantuntijatyöryhmän jäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 2008 → ...
Ohjaustyöryhmän jäsen Pääjät-Dandeli -kokouksessa, Mari Vaattovaara, 2008 → 2009
Osaajatunniksi asiantuntijapaneelin, Mari Vaattovaara, 2009
RYY'tutkimusvalikoimen arviointiryhmä, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.03.2009 → ...
Asiantuntijatyöpajapanaarin jäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.10.2010 → ...
Jäsen Tekniikan Akatemia -säätiön projektitutkimustyöryhmässä, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.03.2010 → ...
Kansainvälinen tieteilijöiden arviointiryhmän jäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.02.2010 → 31.05.2010
Kansainvälisen tieteellisen osanomitusarviointiryhmän jäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2010 → ...
Tilastotain uudistamista valmisteluviihdytymän jäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 2010 → ...
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STRUTSI/Vaattovaara

Maaria Linko , Maaria.Linko@helsinki.fi
Assessment of academic expertise for Adjunct professorship, Maaria Linko, 01.12.2010

Membership or other role in research network

Mari Vaattovaara , Mari.Vaattovaara@helsinki.fi
Jäsentys kansainvälisessä tutkimusverkostossa, Mari Vaattovaara, 2007 → ...
Kansainvälisen EUKN-tutkimusverkoston jäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 2007
Osallistuminen kansainvälisessä tutkimusverkostoon, Mari Vaattovaara, 2007 → 2008
Columbia University, Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation, Mari Vaattovaara, 2008
KatuMetro-tutkimushankkeen kotipesän koordinaattorin tehtävät, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2010 → ...
RVM-tutkimushankkeen johtoryhmän jäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 2010
RVM-tutkimushankkeen varajohtaja, Mari Vaattovaara, 2010 → ...
Tutkimushankkeen johtoryhmäjäsenyys, Mari Vaattovaara, 10.10.2010 → 10.10.2013

Harry Schulman , harry.schulman@helsinki.fi
EuroCities Working Group member, Harry Schulman, 2002 → 2006
KARA-tutkimusverkosto, Harry Schulman, 2005 → 2010
Membership, Harry Schulman, 2008 → 2010, Finland

Maija Elina Faehnle , maija.faehnle@helsinki.fi
CARe-FOR-US-network, Maija Elina Faehnle, 2007 → ...
Kokemuksellisen tiedon hyödyntäminen kaupungin suunnittelussa -verkosto, Maija Elina Faehnle, 2007 → ...
Social Network Analysis in Urban Social-Ecological Studies -network, Maija Elina Faehnle, 2009 → ...
ViherKARA-verkosto, Maija Elina Faehnle, 03.2009 → ...

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

Mari Vaattovaara , Mari.Vaattovaara@helsinki.fi
EU COST C 20 Urban Knowledge Arena, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
EU COST C 20 Urban Knowledge Arena, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
EU COST C 20 Urban Knowledge Arena the management committee, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
EU COST C 20 Urban Knowledge Arena, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Asiantuntijajäsen kansainvälisessä tieteellisessä järjestössä, Mari Vaattovaara, 2007 → ..., Netherlands
Helsingin yliopiston tutkimustornihankkeen arviointi, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
IFHP International Federation of Housing and Planning, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Netherlands
SFHP Suomi Finland Housing and Planning, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
The Swedish Research Council for Environment, Agricultural Sciences and Spatial Planning (FORMAS), Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Sweden
World Bank and Chilean National Commission for Science and Technology Research (CONICYT) Bicentennial Program for Science and Technology (BPST), Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Chile
Asiantuntijajäsen kansainvälisessä tieteellisessä järjestössä, Mari Vaattovaara, 2008 → ..., Chile
IFHP International Federation of Housing and Planning, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Netherlands
SFHP Suomi Finland Housing and Planning, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Tieteellisen seuran jäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 2008 → ...
World Bank and Chilean National Commission for Science and Technology Research (CONICYT) Bicentennial Program for Science and Technology (BPST), Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Chile
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Kansainvälisen tieteellisen toimielimen jäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 2009 → ...
Kansainvälisen yhdistyksen puheenjohtaja, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2009 → ...
EU-tutkimushaun valmistelukomitean kansallis ryhmän jäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 25.08.2010 → ...
Helsingin Yliopiston World Design Capital -hankeryhmän jäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 2010 → ...
Kansainvälisen tieteellisen toimikunnan jäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 2010 → ...
Laitosneuvoston jäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2013
Tiedekuntaneuvoston varajäsen, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2013
Työvaliokunnan jäsen kansainvälisessä tieteellisessä järjestössä, Mari Vaattovaara, 2010 → ..., Finland

Harry Schulman , harry.schulman@helsinki.fi
Euricur Board member, Harry Schulman, 2002 → 2006, Netherlands
Membership in board, Harry Schulman, 2010 → 2012, Finland

Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen , tommi.inkinen@helsinki.fi
Suomen maantieteellinen seura, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Board member, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2009, Finland
International Geographical Union, Information Society Commission, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Secretary, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2009, Finland
Suomen Maantieteellinen Seura, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Suomen Maantieteellinen Seura, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
IGU Commission on Global Information Society, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2008 → 2012
Suomen Maantieteellinen Seura, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Suomen Maantieteellinen Seura, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Evaluator, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2009, Georgia

Maaria Linko , Maaria.Linko@helsinki.fi
Board member, ESA Sociology of the Arts Research Network, Maaria Linko, 2004 → 2011
Valtion kirjastopalvelututkimuskeskuksen varajäsen, Maaria Linko, 2009 → 2011, Finland
Board member of the Wandel prize, Maaria Linko, 02.2010 → 06.2010, Finland
Member of prize committee: Tietopöllö prize, Maaria Linko, 02.2010 → 06.2010, Finland

Gareth Rice , gareth.rice@helsinki.fi

Kaisa Kepsu , kaisa.kepsu@helsinki.fi
Nordensklofd-samfundet i Finland, Kaisa Kepsu, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Maantieteen kansainvälinen unionin Suomen kansalliskomitea, Kaisa Kepsu, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Nordensklofd-samfundet i Finland, Kaisa Kepsu, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Maantieteen kansainvälinen unionin Suomen kansalliskomitea, Kaisa Kepsu, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Nordensklofd-samfundet i Finland, Kaisa Kepsu, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Maantieteen kansainvälinen unionin Suomen kansalliskomitea, Kaisa Kepsu, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Nordensklofd-samfundet i Finland, Kaisa Kepsu, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Teemu Antero Makkonen , teemu.makkonen@helsinki.fi
Geographical Society in Finland, Teemu Antero Makkonen, 2010 → …

Katja Vilkama , katja.vilkama@helsinki.fi
Suomen Pakolaisavun Kotilo-projektin ohjausryhmä, Katja Vilkama, 01.01.2009 → ..., Finland

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization

Mari Vaattovaara , Mari.Vaattovaara@helsinki.fi
Helsingin kaupunki, muuttoliike ja verotulot työryhmä, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Väestötiloitto, perheasumisen asiantuntijaseminaari, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Ympäristöministeriön Asumisen osaamiskeskusohjelman valmistelutyöryhmä, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
asumismarkkina-seminarit, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
seminaari kuntavirkaiden reforminäkymistä, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Espoon kaupungin Histan alueen suunnitteluasian tukevien ryhmä, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Espoon kaupungin Suurpellon rakentamisprojektin ohjausryhmä, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Sisä- ja ympäristöministeriöstön Asumisen osaamiskeskusohjelman valmistelutyöryhmä, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Ympäristöministeriöstön asumisen perustutkimusohjelman ohjausryhmä, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
SFHP Asumtopäivätoimikunta, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Suomen Asuntoliiton hoitotILA, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Ympäristöministeriön Asumisen asumispäätösluonnontöiden ohjausryhmä, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Vallioneuvoston määräaikainen erityisohjelma, Asumisen klusteri-ohjelma - Uudenmaan asumisen osaamiskeskusohjelman ohjausryhmä, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Vallioneuvoston määräaikainen erityisohjelma, Asumisen klusteri-ohjelma - Uudenmaan asumisen osaamiskeskusohjelman ohjausryhmä, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Ranskan pääministerin pyynnöllä osallistua "European year for struggle against poverty and social exclusion" -hankkeeseen, Mari Vaattovaara, 16.06.2010

Harry Schulman , harry.schulman@helsinki.fi
Ympäristöministeriön asettama lähiöohjelma, Harry Schulman, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008

Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen , tommi.inkinen@helsinki.fi
Euroopan unioni (eTen, Public-Privat-Partnerships, citizen portals), Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Oulun yliopisto, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Member of an executive board, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 01.05.2010 → 31.03.2014, Finland

Venla Bernelius , venla.bernelius@helsinki.fi
EU:n COST C20 (Urban Knowledge Arena) -ohjelma, Venla Bernelius, 20.09.2006 → 23.09.2006, Sweden
EU:n COST C20 (Urban Knowledge Arena) ohjelman Junior Network-verkosto, Venla Bernelius, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2009, Sweden
EU:n COST C20 –ohjelma (Urban Knowledge Arena), Venla Bernelius, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2009
Sorsa-säätiön Osaamisyhteisön tutkimushanke, Venla Bernelius, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
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Helsingin kaupungin opetusvirasto - PD-mallin luominen, Venla Bernelius, 12.05.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Sorsa-säätiön Osaamisyhteiskunta-tutkimushankke, Venla Bernelius, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Teemu Antero Makkonen, teemu.makkonen@helsinki.fi
Tulevaisuuden tekijät - working group, Teemu Antero Makkonen, 06.2009 → 11.2009, Finland
Rami Ratvio, Rami.Ratvio@helsinki.fi
VTT, Ennistuva asumisen tutkimushankke, Asumisen virtoineen työpaja (osallistuminen työpajaan kutsuttuna), Rami Ratvio, 14.06.2006 → 08.09.2006, Finland
VTT, Ennistuva asumisen Asumisen foresight -päätöstyöpaja. Kutsuttuna asumisen tulevaisuuden kehitystä selvittävissä työpajissa, Rami Ratvio, 01.03.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Ympäristöministeriö, Asumisen tulevaisuuden tutkimusohjelman ohjelma-aloitteen laatiminen Suomen Akatemialle yhdessä muun kirjoittajaryhmän kanssa, Rami Ratvio, 19.01.2007 → 27.02.2007, Finland

Katja Vilkama, katja.vilkama@helsinki.fi
Asiantuntijaesitelmä Helsingin kaupungin Asuminen kaupungin vuokrataloissa – nyt ja tulevaisuudessa -seminaarissa, Katja Vilkama, 13.03.2007, Finland
Asiantuntijaesitelmä Helsingin seudulla -seminaarissa, Katja Vilkama, 13.03.2008, Finland
Asiantuntijana paneelissa Monikulttuurisen kaupunkisuunnittelun toimintakäytössä, Katja Vilkama, 13.03.2008, Finland
Asiantuntijaesitelmä Monikulttuurisuuksien ja Monikulttuurisyyden teorialäähestyminen, Katja Vilkama, 09.06.2008, Finland
Helsingin kaupungin maahanmuuttotegalastuksen työpaja: Asumisen teema, Katja Vilkama, 10.04.2008, Finland
Helsingin metropolialueen kaupunkitutkimuksen tutkimusohjelman ja yhteisöjärjestöjen valmistelutyöpajat, Katja Vilkama, 17.11.2008 → 15.12.2008, Finland
Asiantuntijaesitelmä Espoon kaupungin Monikulttuurisuus -työpajasssa, Katja Vilkama, 15.01.2009, Finland
Asiantuntijaesitelmä Sisäasiainministeriön Yhdenvertaisuus asumisessa -hankkeen johtoryhmän kokouksessa, Katja Vilkama, 12.03.2009, Finland
Asiantuntijaesitelmä Vantaan kaupungin monikulttuurisuusasiaan neuvottelututkimuksen kokouksessa, Katja Vilkama, 16.04.2009, Finland
Asiantuntijaesitelmä Yhdenvertaisuusinstituutin seuran 50-vuotisjuhlaseminaarissa, Katja Vilkama, 23.11.2009, Finland
Asiantuntijaesitelmä Monikulttuurisuustutkimuksessa asumistutkimusseminarissa, Katja Vilkama, 18.11.2009, Finland
Asiantuntijaesitelmä Helsingin kaupungin MA-ohjelman suhteista kokouksessa, Katja Vilkama, 10.03.2010, Finland
Asiantuntijaesitelmä Helsingin kaupungin Maahanmuutto- ja kotoutumisasioiden neuvottelukunnan kokouksessa, Katja Vilkama, 25.03.2010, Finland
Asiantuntijaesitelmä Lähö-ohjelman Asukkaana maahanmuuttaja -seminaarissa, Katja Vilkama, 27.05.2010, Finland

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation
Mari Vaattovaara, Mari.Vaattovaara@helsinki.fi
International Federation of Housing and Planning Suomen alaosastoa(SFHP), Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
Suomen asuntolitto, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005
International Federation of Housing and Planning Suomen alaosastoa(SFHP) hallitus, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006
Suomen asuntolitto, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006

Other tasks of an expert in private sector
Mari Vaattovaara, Mari.Vaattovaara@helsinki.fi
VVO:n strategian laatiminen, Mari Vaattovaara, 2009 → ...
Participation in interview for written media
Mari Vaattovaara, Mari.Vaattovaara@helsinki.fi

Centrois Oy palkkatutkimusseminaari, Mari Vaattovaara, 22.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Vantaan kaupungin yleiskaasumatseminaari, Mari Vaattovaara, 10.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Espoon aluekehitys seminaari, Mari Vaattovaara, 15.06.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin kaupungin virastopalvelutöityöpäivity, Mari Vaattovaara, 30.10.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Pääläkäytöpäivityö kaupunginosien kehittämisverkostoa, Mari Vaattovaara, 08.05.2003 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Asuntopolitiikkaa neuvottelupäivity, Mari Vaattovaara, 05.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin Sanomat, Mari Vaattovaara, 12.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin Sanomat, Mari Vaattovaara, 14.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ilta-Lehti, Mari Vaattovaara, 10.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ilta-Sanomat, Mari Vaattovaara, 10.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Ilta-Sanomat, Mari Vaattovaara, 11.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kauppalehti, Mari Vaattovaara, 12.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kauppalehti, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kauppalehti, Mari Vaattovaara, 01.01.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kaupunkisuunnitteluseminaari, Mari Vaattovaara, 04.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Länsi-Sanomat, Mari Vaattovaara, 15.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Metro, Mari Vaattovaara, 12.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Nelosen uutiset, Mari Vaattovaara, 11.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Rakennuslehti, Mari Vaattovaara, 11.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Rakentaminen ja kaupunkisuunnittelun teemaseminaari, YIT, Mari Vaattovaara, 23.11.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Rakentaminen ja kaupunkisuunnittelun teemaseminaari, YIT, Mari Vaattovaara, 23.11.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
STT, Mari Vaattovaara, 10.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Uotani, Mari Vaattovaara, 11.11.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Uskiosuuslehti, Mari Vaattovaara, 11.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Uskiosuuslehti, Mari Vaattovaara, 12.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Verkkoasutuslehti, Mari Vaattovaara, 10.10.2004 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelu lehdeissä, Mari Vaattovaara, 15.12.2005
Haastattelu lehdeissä, Mari Vaattovaara, 2005
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Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 09.10.2005
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 06.03.2005
Espoon kaupunki, Mari Vaattovaara, 02.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 2006
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 29.09.2006
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 04.03.2006
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 03.06.2006
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 2006
Järvenpään kaupunginhallituksen kokous, Mari Vaattovaara, 09.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kaupunkimaantieteen opiskelijat aidosti kiinni seudun kehitykseen, Mari Vaattovaara, 2006
Kotkan kaupungin strategiaseminaari, Mari Vaattovaara, 10.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kulosaaren yhteiskoulun maantieteen tutkimusprojektit, Mari Vaattovaara, 27.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 2007
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 2007
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 26.04.2007
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 15.07.2007
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 09.12.2007
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 2007
Haastattelu lehtiartikkelissa, Mari Vaattovaara, 19.07.2007
Haastattelu lehtiartikkelissa, Mari Vaattovaara, 09.12.2007
Tutkimus projectin maininta Helsingin Sanomien pääkirjotuksessa, Mari Vaattovaara, 09.12.2007
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 16.01.2008
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 19.10.2008
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 25.08.2008
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 12.02.2008
Haastattelu lehteen, Mari Vaattovaara, 19.10.2008
Haastattelu lehtiartikkelissa, Mari Vaattovaara, 2008
Haastattelu lehtiartikkelissa, Mari Vaattovaara, 12.03.2008
Nyt pitäisi joihinkin kirkko rakennetaan torin pieleen, Mari Vaattovaara, 12.03.2008
Puheenvuoro esitetään sanomalehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 16.03.2008
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 10.01.2009
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 30.01.2009
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 10.01.2009
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 08.2009
Haastattelu lehtiartikkelissa, Mari Vaattovaara, 2009
Haastattelu lehtiartikkelissa, Mari Vaattovaara, 2009
Haastattelu lehtiartikkelissa, Mari Vaattovaara, 2009
Haastattelu lehtiartikkelissa, Mari Vaattovaara, 2009
Tutkimushanke mainitaan lehtiartikkelissa, Mari Vaattovaara, 2009
Haastattelu lehdessä, Mari Vaattovaara, 19.09.2010
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Haastattelu Vasabladet-sanomalehdessä, Venla Bernelius, 09.11.2009
Hanna Dhalmann, hanna.dhalmann@helsinki.fi
Haastattelu lehdessä, Hanna Dhalmann, 29.09.2006
Haastattelu lehdessä, Hanna Dhalmann, 17.10.2007
Haastattelu lehdessä, Hanna Dhalmann, 11.02.2008
Haastattelu lehdessä, Hanna Dhalmann, 27.09.2009
Haastattelu lehdessä, Hanna Dhalmann, 30.04.2010
Haastattelu lehdessä: Itäinen lähiöni, Hanna Dhalmann, 20.08.2010

Elina Eskelä, elina.eskela@helsinki.fi
Haastattelu Luottolista-lehdessä 12/2009, Elina Eskelä, 01.06.2009 → 30.06.2009
Haastattelu lehdessä, Elina Eskelä, 25.09.2009
Haastattelu Tiede-lehdessä, 8/2009, Elina Eskelä, 01.08.2009 → 31.08.2009
Kaisa Kepsu, kaisa.kepsu@helsinki.fi

Rami Ratvio, Rami.Ratvio@helsinki.fi
Helsingin Sanomat 1.10.2006, Rami Ratvio, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Maantiteen olympiaaasten valmennuskurssiluukiosille, Rami Ratvio, 31.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Valtakunnallinen asumistutkimusseminaari Valkaassa talossa Haagassa, Rami Ratvio, 28.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Tieteen Päivät, Rami Ratvio, 11.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Katja Vilkama, katja.vilkama@helsinki.fi
Maahannustajat ovat keskitymassa samoihin kaupungin vuokrataloihin, Katja Vilkama, 29.09.2006, Finland
Muutamisista tuli naapurita, Katja Vilkama, 04.12.2008, Finland
Alt längre från Rastböle till Eira, Katja Vilkama, 28.03.2010, Finland
Itäinen lähiöni, Katja Vilkama, 20.08.2010, Finland
Mellä kotona, Katja Vilkama, 14.12.2010, Finland

Participation in radio programme
Mattit Kortteinen, matti.kortteinen@helsinki.fi
Mattit Kortteisen ja Johanna Hänkisen radiohaastattelu lähiöistä Radio Pali 23.2.2007, Matti Kortteinen, 23.02.2007
Venla Bernelius, venla.bernelius@helsinki.fi
Haastattelu YLE:n englanninkielisissä radio-ohjelmissa, Venla Bernelius, 20.09.2009, Finland
Haastattelu YLE:n radio-ohjelmissa, Venla Bernelius, 01.12.2009, Finland
Haastattelu YLE:n radio-ohjelmissa, Venla Bernelius, 19.10.2009 → 20.10.2009, Finland
Rami Ratvio, Rami.Ratvio@helsinki.fi
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**Participation in TV programme**
Mari Vaattovaara, Mari.Vaattovaara@helsinki.fi
Esintyminen asiantuntijana Joka kodin asuntomarkkinat -tv-ohjelmassa, Mari Vaattovaara, 09.09.2006
Esintyminen asiantuntijana Joka kodin asuntomarkkinat -tv-ohjelmassa, Mari Vaattovaara, 16.09.2006
Esintyminen asiantuntijana Joka kodin asuntomarkkinat -tv-ohjelmassa, Mari Vaattovaara, 23.09.2006
Esintyminen asiantuntijana Joka kodin asuntomarkkinat -tv-ohjelmassa, Mari Vaattovaara, 30.09.2006
Esintyminen asiantuntijana Joka kodin asuntomarkkinat -tv-ohjelmassa, Mari Vaattovaara, 07.10.2006
Esintyminen asiantuntijana Joka kodin asuntomarkkinat -tv-ohjelmassa, Mari Vaattovaara, 14.10.2006
Esintyminen asiantuntijana Joka kodin asuntomarkkinat -tv-ohjelmassa, Mari Vaattovaara, 21.10.2006
Esintyminen asiantuntijana Joka kodin asuntomarkkinat -tv-ohjelmassa, Mari Vaattovaara, 28.10.2006
Esintyminen asiantuntijana Joka kodin asuntomarkkinat -tv-ohjelmassa, Mari Vaattovaara, 04.11.2006
Esintyminen asiantuntijana Joka kodin asuntomarkkinat -tv-ohjelmassa, Mari Vaattovaara, 11.11.2006
Esintyminen asiantuntijana Joka kodin asuntomarkkinat -tv-ohjelmassa, Mari Vaattovaara, 18.11.2006
Esintyminen asiantuntijana Tehtävän lähiössä -TV-ohjelmassa, Mari Vaattovaara, 05.12.2010
Esintyminen asiantuntijana Tehtävän lähiössä -TV-ohjelmassa, Mari Vaattovaara, 19.12.2010

**Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, tommi.inkinen@helsinki.fi**
Asiantuntija haastattelu, Tommi Aleksanteri Inkinen, 2006, Finland

**Venla Bernelius, venla.bernelius@helsinki.fi**
Haastattelu YLE:n englanninkielisessä uutislääteyksessä, TV1, Venla Bernelius, 20.09.2009
Haastattelu YLE:n tv-päätuluutetähetyksessä, Venla Bernelius, 19.10.2009, Finland
Haastattelu YLE:n tv-uutisiin, Venla Bernelius, 24.01.2009, Finland

**Participation in interview for web based media**
Mari Vaattovaara, Mari.Vaattovaara@helsinki.fi
Haastattelu lehteen, Mari Vaattovaara, 18.03.2010
Helsingin Yliopiston verkkotoimituksen haastattelu, Mari Vaattovaara, 04.03.2010

Maaria Linko, Maaria.Linko@helsinki.fi
Asiantuntija va julkkis? Tietokirjallisuus ja bolokirjallijat mediassa, Maaria Linko, 23.11.2010, Finland
YLE (National Broadcast Radio), Maaria Linko, 18.11.2010, Finland

Venla Bernelius, venla.bernelius@helsinki.fi
YLE:n internetsivut, Venla Bernelius, 08.05.2008, Finland
Haastattelu YLE:n uutissivullia, Venla Bernelius, 24.01.2009, 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 – CoCoLaC
Heikkilä, Markku – RCSP
Heinämäa, Sara – SHC
Henriksson, Markku – CITIA
Janhunen, Juha – LDHFTA
Kaja, Mika – AMNE
Klippi, Anu – Interaction
Knuuttiala, 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, Tuja – 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 – TRANSURBAN
Haila, Anne – Sociopolis
Hautamäki, Jarkko – CEA
Heinonen, Visa – KUMU
Helén, Ilpo – STS
Hukkanen, Jari – GENU
Jallinoja, Riitta – SBII
Kaartininen, Timo – SCA
Kettunen, Pauli – NordSoc
Kivinen, Markku – FCRES
Koponen, Juhani – DEVERELE
Koskenniemi, Martti – ECI
Kultti, Klaus – EAT
Lahelma, Elina – KUFE
Lanne, Markku – TSEM
Lavonen, Jari – RCMER
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.
Structural development and differentiation of city-regions (STRUTSI)
Participation category: 5 The research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact.

Basic indicators

Out of 207 articles 54 were published in other countries.

Quite a big part of the group’s publications are refereed articles in scientific journals (43) or books (30) as well as scientific monographs (15). The societal impact of the research can be seen in large amount of unrefered writings in scientific journals (35), professional journals (16), and research reports (11). Contributions of the group got popularity quite often in the press and mass media.
### Number of Authors per Article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count/No. of authors</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average count of authors per publication is 2.07.
## Language of the publications

<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>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language of the publications**

- **English**: 65%
- **Finnish**: 34%
- **Swedish**: 1%

![Language of the publications chart](chart.png)
### Publications in specific journals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>ERIH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yhteiskuntapolitiikka</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yhdyskuntasuunnittelu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kvartti</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin Sanomat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Urban Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kymen Sanomat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asu ja Rakenna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Forestry &amp; Urban Greening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Planning Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fennia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tieto&amp;Trendit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geografiska annaler. Ser. B, Human geography.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alue ja ympäristö</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Forestry Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosiologia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National identities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International journal of cultural policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tieteessä tapahtuu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Knowledge Management Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistilka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Environmental Planning and Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen lääkärilehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Finnish studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turun Sanomat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of housing and the built environment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liikenne/Kaupunki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Transport Geography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muistiota / Helsingin kaupungin tietokeskus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Urban Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natura</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eetvartti, Espoon toimintaympäristökatsaus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2 A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Research and Practice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia. Vuosikirja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norwegian ranking | Number of articles
--- | ---
Level 1 | 21
Level 2 | 4

Australian ranking | Number of articles
--- | ---
A* | 1
A | 5
B | 10
C | 2

ERICH journal ranking | Number of articles
--- | ---
ERIH History, 2007 | 1
ERIH Art, Architectural and Design History (2008) | 1

Norway ranking (NO)
Level 2 = highest scientific, Level 1 = scientific

Australian ranking (AU)
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.
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.

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.

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.
### Issued Books by Type of Publication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>D4</th>
<th>D5</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Helsinki Urban Facts (research centre)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMIDSt, University of Amsterdam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical Society of Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Geosciences and Geography HU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampere University Press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Turku</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uudenmaan liitto (county authority)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edita Publishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsevier Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Funding and Development of Housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Finances</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Environmental Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalevi Sorsa Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Science Writers (Society)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISSR - University of Amsterdam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaudeamus Publishing House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Espoo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **C1** Scientific book
- **C2** Edited book
- **D4** Research report
- **D5** Text book
- **E2** Public monograph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norwegian ranking of Publishers (NO)</th>
<th>Count of publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Norway ranking (NO)**

Level 2 = highest scientific, Level 1 = scientific

Most of book publishers are Finnish institutions such as administrative bodies, scientific societies, and universities.