Ken Thomson, University of Aberdeen, UK

PANEL A: AGRICULTURE (INCL. VET. SCIENCE)
The ‘Exercise’: General Observations

• Assessment of research (and development?), not teaching, advice, scholarship, etc.
• High scores only possible for “international” (or “global”) performance: very difficult!
• Agriculture is (?) “special”: national, cultural, environmental responsibilities
• Some (Agric./Vet.) submissions:
  – too detailed, e.g. many minor projects, and/or much “boilerplate”, i.e. standard copy/paste text
  – not enough KSPs (“key selling points”), i.e. research highlights
Average UoA Group Scores: All, Agriculture, Biomedicine

- Overall score
- Physical infrastructure
- Economic and social impact
- Development potential
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- Performance and Impact
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- B1&B2
- Agriculture
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Agriculture (and Vet) Scores

• Overall, almost the same as all other UoA groups
• Relatively good scores for physical infrastructure and socio-economic impact
• Not so good scores for scientific impact (primarily measured by journal papers)
• With better submissions (= ideas!), scores for “development potential” might be higher
• University UoAs more “open” than non-University ones: perhaps due to other UoA duties, or to ...?
• Some UoAs appeared to have less than “critical mass” necessary for several scientific directions
Agriculture: Quality/Impact vs. Management (and Development Potential)
Final Remarks & Recommendations: I

- State funding for research: limited, but also rigid?
- Maximise socio-economic (i.e. “political”!) impacts, perhaps with social-science colleagues
- For “international” research quality, partnerships (maybe junior, but more than “links”) with foreign centres are essential; so:
  - Identify your KSPs (main attractions), scientific and/or “regional”
  - Approach possible partnership leaders with specific proposals
Final Remarks & Recommendations: II

• Identify and approach your (few) most promising partners:
  – possibly Latvia and Estonia (but why?)
  – other Baltic countries for “regional” issues
  – other EU for Horizon2020 (and “eastern”? ) issues
  – “global” partners: USA/Canada, Russia, etc.

• Put less effort into scientific publications in Lithuanian language, more into ones in English

• Some excellent facilities; now use them!

• "Strengthen your strengths"
Final Remarks & Recommendations: III

for future research assessments:

• Limit text (section) lengths
• Request highlights (not every item)
• Request specification (e.g. by examples?) of:
  – “management” features (types)
  – “impacts” (scientific, social, economic)
  – “development” ideas
Thanks to my Panel colleagues! Thankyou for your attention! Good luck in the future!
## Average Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Performance and Impact</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Development potential</th>
<th>Economic and social impact</th>
<th>Physical infrastructure</th>
<th>Overall score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All UoAs</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td><strong>2.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.13</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.63</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1&amp;B2</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>