



Styre: Fakultetsstyret ved Det samfunnsvitenskapelige fakultet

Dato: 27.05.2020

Styresak: 41/20

Arkivsaksnr: 2019/24526-

Møtedato: 16.06.2020

EVEN

Opprykk til forsker kode 1183 etter kompetanse

Forsker Arjan Schakel ved Institutt for sammenliknende politikk har etter avtale med fakultetet søkt om opprykk til forsker kode 1183 den 10. oktober 2019. Han ble ansatt i fast stilling som forsker (kode 1109) fra 1. august 2019, der de første fire årene er finansiert av et rekrutteringsstipend gjennom prosjektet «*Strengthening Regional Democracy - Contributing to Good Democratic Governance*» ved Trond Mohn Stiftelse (TMS).

Etter forslag fra Institutt for sammenliknende politikk oppnevnte fakultetsstyret følgende sakkyndige komité for å bedømme Schakels søknad:

- Professor Gunnar Grendstad, Institutt for sammenliknende politikk
- Professor Ailsa Henderson, School of Social and Political Science, University of Edinburgh
- Professor Ulrik Kjær, Institut for Statskundskab, Syddansk Universitet

Gunnar Grendstad ble oppnevnt som leder for komiteen. Komiteen fikk opprinnelig frist til å levere sin rapport 31. mars, 2020, men rapporten ble først ferdig 27. mai. Forsinkelsen ble forårsaket av koronapandemien.

Den sakkyndige komiteen konkluderte i sin rapport enstemmig med at Arjan Schakel er kompetent for opprykk til forsker kode 1183 og skriver følgende:

“Based on our readings and evaluations of Dr. Schakel’s publications, including his CV, and based on the qualification requirements presented to the committee, we conclude that we find him fully qualified for the position of Researcher 1183 (professor). We also conclude that Dr. Schakel’s academic competence is clear and unequivocal and that he qualifies for the position in question. Our conclusion is unanimous.”

Det er ikke mottatt merknader fra søker til den sakkyndige vurderingen.

I henhold til Forskrift om endring i forskrift om ansettelse og opprykk i undervisnings- og forskerstillinger § 2-1 (15) skal søkers egen institusjon fatte vedtak om godkjenning av bedømmelsen og tildele opprykk.

Fakultetsledelsens merknader:

Schakel har vært fast ansatt som forsker (kode 1109) i eksternt finansiert stilling siden 1. august 2019 knyttet til TMS-prosjektet «*Strengthening Regional Democracy - Contributing to Good Democratic Governance*». Søkerne skal vurderes etter kravene til professorkompetanse eller forskerkompetanse på professornivå, se vedlagte regler.

Fakultetsledelsen anbefaler at den sakkyndige vurderingen godkjennes, og at Arjan Schakel tildeles opprykk og lønn som forsker kode 1183 fra 10. oktober 2019.

Forslag til vedtak:

Styret ved Det samfunnsvitenskapelige fakultet godkjenner den sakkyndige vurderingen av Arjan Schakel og tildeler ham opprykk og lønn som forsker kode 1183 fra 10. oktober 2019.

Jan Erik Askildsen
dekan

Alette Gilhus Mykkeltvedt
fakultetsdirektør

Vedlegg:
Sakkyndig vurdering
Retningslinjer for bedømmelse ved opprykk til professor
Retningslinjer for opprykk til forsker kode 1183

REPORT FROM THE EXPERT COMMITTEE ON THE ASSESSMENT FOR DR. ARJAN SCHAKEL'S APPLICATION TO PROMOTION TO RESEARCH PROFESSOR (RESEARCHER CODE 1183)

1. Introduction

On October 10, 2019, Dr. Arjan Schakel, Department of Comparative Politics, University of Bergen, applied to be appointed to Researcher 1183. By October 31, 2019, the members of the committee had accepted their commission. On December 17, 2019, The Faculty of Social Sciences appointed the following evaluation committee: Professor Ailsa Henderson, School of Social and Political Science, The University of Edinburgh; Professor Ulrik Kjær, Department of Political Science and Public Management, University of Southern Denmark; and Professor Gunnar Grendstad, Department of Comparative Politics, University of Bergen. The Faculty appointed Grendstad to lead the committee.

The mandate for the committee was given in accordance with *Assessment guidelines for promotion to professor*. The committee was not to evaluate practical pedagogical competence based on education or teaching and supervision. The committee was provided with *Qualification requirements for promotion to professor – Supplementary guidelines for assessment committees within the social sciences* prepared by the National Conference of Faculties of Social Sciences in December 2007, with adjustments approved April 23, 2013.

As to the qualification requirements of academic competence for the position in question, the document reads as follows:

Promotion to professor requires significant academic production beyond what is required for a doctorate. The research must be of a high quality and show both breadth and depth. The production must reflect an independent research profile and show an ability to address new questions. Consistent research activity is a prerequisite.

The following requirements should be met:

Scope: What constitutes “significant academic production” must be assessed in relation to disciplinary traditions and must be concretely based on the content of the publications and the efforts they are based on. A guiding norm can be that the academic production (including the doctorate) should be the equivalent of 8-12 full-length journal articles, or two or three books of good quality and different content. The applicant must have made significant contributions to all of the publications and must have had the main responsibility for the research and writing in the majority (two-

thirds) of the publications. In the event of more extensive co-authorship, the requirement to the number of publications may be raised.

Quality: The results must be well-supported and clearly expressed, as required for publication in reputable academic journals or by reputable academic publishers. Emphasis shall be placed on whether the work has been or may be significant to disciplinary developments or practice in the area. Emphasis shall also be placed on original questions, methods or data sources. The originality and significance requirements are clearly higher than for a doctorate, but it is sufficient that some of the publications meet these higher requirements.

Breadth: The requirement of breadth helps ensure that the applicant is qualified for teaching and supervision on a high level in more than one specialty. The academic production should include multiple classes of questions, topics and research methods. The applicant should have shown an ability to place their own work within a broader context.

Independence and collaboration: The applicant must document that they will be able to complete all central parts of a high-quality research project by themselves. This can be documented by single-authored publications (or first-authored publications in disciplines in which this means being in charge of the work), by declarations from co-authors and by project management experience. Research collaboration and project management shall generally be seen as positive.

Visibility: The academic work should be published (or accepted for publication) in channels that have satisfactory quality control and where they can reach other researchers who will build on or critique the results. This normally means publication in international channels, but when the topic so indicates publication in national channels is acceptable. Emphasis is placed on what the discipline considers a good publishing practice at the time of publication.

Relevance: The publications should relate to the forefront of research at the time of publication. Some of the publications should be produced within the past five years.

When assessing the scope and breadth, emphasis can be placed on the entire list of publication, including publications that were not submitted.

The academic competence must be clear and unequivocal to qualify for a position.

Dr. Arjan H. Schakel received his PhD in Political Science at *Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam* in 2009. He has been Newton International Fellow at University of Edinburgh (2009-2011), Assistant Professor in Research Methods at Maastricht University (2011-2019) and Researcher at the University of Bergen (2019-present) having received BFS-funding for the project *Strengthening Regional Democracy – Contributing to Good Democratic Governance*.

First, we assess the fifteen publications Dr. Schakel has submitted for review. Our assessment follows the sequence in Dr. Schakel's dossier of his application. Then we also consider his CV as to the totality of his academic activities with a view to reaching our conclusion on his promotion to Researcher 1183 (professor) based on the above stated criteria.

2. Comments on submitted publications

2.1 (a) Regional Government

In *Measuring regional authority. A postfunctionalist theory of governance. Volume I*, a book coauthored with Liesbet Hooghe, Gary Marks, Sandra Chapman, Sara Niedzwiecki, and Sarah Shair-Rosenfield, and published on Oxford University Press, Schakel provides and presents extensive measures of structure of governance and regional authority for 81 countries from 1950 to 2010. In the first part of the book, across 100 odd pages, the authors present their theoretical discussion, conceptual clarification as well as their scoring decisions. Basically, the authors argue that jurisdictional design has meaning for people. Jurisdictional design expresses identities about "who we are" and "who gets what." So, in order to get to these questions, the authors' goals are to define and measure a range of dimensions and to score the regions on these dimensions. The authors' immediate observation is that territorial governance reveals a landscape "in flux and diversity" (p.4), and that there is more variation in the regional authority index (RAI) that the authors use *within* than across geographical regions. The first part of the book is a detailed presentation and rigorous discussion of measurement: eg, transparency, cross-validation and application. In the second part, across app 400 pages, the authors summarize the data for each country by seven world regions whereby the 81 countries are presented by the ten dimensions of self-rule (institutional depth, policy scope, fiscal autonomy, borrowing autonomy and representation) and shared rule (law making, executive control, fiscal control, borrowing control and constitutional reform). All scores for all country regions are summarized in an exhaustive table. The book is a comprehensive and well-documented research effort that makes an impressive contribution to the research community on federalism and regional studies.

In the 2018 article "A world of difference: the sources of regional government composition and alternation" (with Emanuele Massetti, *West European Politics* 41 (3): 703-727), Schakel sets out to map the institutional variance that we find at regional level in Western Europe, and to explain multi-level government congruence and key features of regional government. The analysis is based on the author's *Regional Executive Government Dataset* consisting of data on regional elections and regional data in 13 Western European Countries since 1945. The results show that independent variables such as electoral systems and practices of consociationalism matter, and that the presence of strong regional parties tend to reduce government alternation, but that this effect is conditioned on the proximities of national and regional elections.

2.2 (b) *Regional elections*

Schakel has published extensively within the field of regional elections. Or to put it differently: he has in collaboration with close colleagues been instrumental in the establishment of regional elections *as* a research field. This position is based on the compilation of a large dataset on regional elections which has been exploited in several publications. Some of this data-gathering endeavor has been part of and facilitated by Schakel's involvement in several comparative book projects. Schakel has edited the book *Regional and national elections in Eastern Europe. Territoriality of the vote in ten countries*, published by Palgrave Macmillan, where the regional differences in voting behavior in ten Eastern European countries are analyzed. This compilation of case studies is supplemented not only with Schakel's (and Régis Dandoy's) analytical framework in the introduction but also with Schakel's concluding chapter where he analyses the full dataset for all of the countries. He uses this to conclude that the electoral dynamics at the regional level are different in this part of Europe from what is found in the Western part (more nationalized and at the same time more second ordered). The reason why Schakel can make this comparison is that the book is a follow up to the 2013 book (with Régis Dandoy) looking into 13 Western European countries, which makes the efforts to describe the electoral dimension of the regional political level even more impressive.

After covering these many countries Schakel has moved on to co-edit a yearly special issue of the journal *Regional and Federal Studies* on regional elections. This planned focus on regional elections is sketched out in the article "Towards a scholarship on regional elections" (with Valentyna Romanova), which in itself is not an original article but it points to the rigorous work done by Schakel in terms of getting the scholarly community to devote time and effort to regional elections and contributes to the impression of Schakel being a true academic entrepreneur.

This position of Schakel as Mr. Regional elections is built not only on a solid empirical foundation but also on an analytical ditto. The analytical strength is demonstrated in the article "Are regional elections really second-order?" (with Charlie Jeffery published in *Regional Studies*,) where the authors convincingly argue that sometimes the second-order model put forward by Reif and Schmitt is taken for granted in studies of the regional level and that this is questionable. In the article it is argued that the second-order election model theoretically has a nationalizing bias and even more convincingly is the second-order election model challenged when the study demonstrates that the empirical back-up for the claims for the model is very limited when regional elections are analyzed. The empirical argument for seeing regional elections as non-second-order elections is strong and the empirical analyses convincing. Only the conclusion that second-orderness is dependent on the presence of non-state-wide parties is less convincing, since it has a tautological element to it.

Impressive is also the sole-authored article "Congruence between regional and national elections" in *Comparative Political Studies* where Schakel demonstrates excellence in as well his theoretical overview as his skills to conduct advanced quantitative analyses. In this article he unfolds the concept of congruence between national and regional elections and make use not only of second-order election theory, but also – after having been critical to the

dominance of this theory in the aforementioned article – territorial cleavage theory and theories about institutional power (here, the degree of regional autonomy). The rigorous testing of different models on the large-scale data sets already commented upon leads Schakel in this article to conclude, that territorial cleavages matter to electoral congruence. And not least that timing of the regional elections matter – congruence decreased as the regional elections get decoupled from the national election cycle.

2.3 (c) *Regional Parties*

Schakel has published three articles addressing the policy positions of regional parties, each of them co-authored with Emanuele Massetti. All three make use of comparative datasets of the aggregate electoral performance of regionalist parties. His article “Ideology matters: why decentralization has a differentiated effect on regionalist parties fortunes in Western democracies” in *European Journal of Political Research* distinguishes between secessionist and autonomist parties, noting that while decentralization reforms improve the chances of the former they do not improve the electoral performance of the latter. The dataset used is of 77 regionalist parties across 11 states in elections from 1950 to 2010.

The 2015 *Party Politics* piece “From class to region: how regionalist parties link (and subsume) left-right into centre-periphery politics” makes use of the same dataset but extends it to elections in the 1940s. It retains the useful distinction between secessionist and autonomist parties but expands the range of possible determinants of electoral performance of regionalist parties. It adds two clusters of variables, the first on what might be considered elements of regional distinctiveness (including language, identity and geographical remoteness) while the second includes a range of contextual institutional or political variables such as the voting system or the competition from other parties in elections. The article find that the more radical parties are in their messaging, the more their electoral performance benefits from decentralization.

The 2016 *Party Politics* article “Between autonomy and secession: decentralization and regionalist party ideological radicalism,” offers two innovations on his previous work in this area. First, it triples the size of the dataset, studying almost 230 regionalist parties across an enlarged group of (18) states. It retains the focus on electoral performance at different territorial scales but seeks to explain *why* decentralization helps regional parties, linking this to processes of proliferation (a multiplier effect on the number of regionalist parties) and diffusion (the general adopting of regionalist policies from other parties). Each process helps to account for electoral success at the regional but not the national level.

The three articles are similar in their methodology and the data on which they draw but collectively offer nuanced takes on the impact of decentralization on parties, each article building on the findings of the first to explain whether, how and why decentralization affects the electoral performance of regionalist parties.

2.4 (d) *Multilevel electoral systems*

Schakel argues that election scholars have overlooked important dimensions of multilevel party systems. Scholars have tended to apply models and theories at the national level to aggregated data from sub-national elections. Schakel refers to this process as “methodological nationalism” whereby scholars take national elections as the natural unit of analysis. In so doing, scholars overlook or ignore electoral dynamics and interactions between electoral arenas, in so-called second-order elections (SOE) that take place at the sub-national level.

In the 2013 article “Nationalisation of multilevel party systems: A conceptual and empirical analysis” in *European Journal of Political Research*, Schakel argues that scholars’ failure to convincingly demonstrate the effects of decentralisation on nationalisation stems from methodological nationalism bias, but that the effect can be found when improving the conceptual analysis and when “the measurements of nationalisation are differentiated according to parties, regions and type of elections” (p.212). Empirically, Schakel demonstrates that regional authority has an effect on regional elections but not on parties, party systems and vote shares. One conclusion is that a party system needs to be conceptualised as a multilevel party system.

In the 2015 article “How to analyze second-order election effects? A refined second-order election model” in *Comparative European Politics*, Schakel suggests to better grasp SOE dynamics amending the standard procedures first by differentiating between party types and second relating vote share swings to fluctuations in the economy and not to time elapsed between elections. Schakel demonstrates that “the state of the economy is key to our understanding of SOE effects” (p.652), that the SOE models are part of a larger family of models that incorporates the effect of economy in elections, and that this effect is highlighted when differentiating between party types.

In a forthcoming article, “Regional spill-over into third-order European elections,” *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration and Institutions*, (in print), Schakel advances his findings from the above two studies with attempts to conceptualize and measure spillover between electoral arenas in multilevel governance systems. Schakel concludes that European integration and subnational decentralization have produced a European multilevel electoral system where European elections outcomes are affected by regional electoral arenas too. Specifically, Schakel shows that the “governmental status at the regional level modifies national spillover into European elections” (p.16). When surveying voters, scholars must look into multiple electoral arenas.

2.5 (e) *Multilevel governance*

Schakel has also authored two publications on multi-level governance, each of them book chapters in handbooks on the state of the discipline. That is to say that these are not typical book chapters but pieces offering a summary of the state of the art within political science. The first of these, “Multilevel governance and the state” in *The Oxford Handbook of Transformations of the State* by Oxford University Press, is coauthored with his PhD

supervisors and summarises the large literature on multi-level governance to which Liesbet Hooghe and Gary Marks themselves have contributed. The piece tracks the extent to which politics occurs at multiple territorial scales while seeking to identify reasons why we have seen this diffusion of political power to different levels. It uses the European Union as a case study and offers data tracking the extent of autonomy at the meso level, citing data that Hooghe, Marks and Schakel have previously collected. The piece as a whole offers a useful summary of a concept (multi-level governance) applied to a case study (Europe) with data to support its arguments. It could be considered a handy primer to students and academics alike.

In a departure from the first publication, Schakel sets out, in his chapter “Applying multilevel governance” for the *Handbook of Research Methods* published by Edgar Elgar, to evaluate the usefulness of multi-level governance as a tool used by political scientists to address a range of research questions with data. It retains the EU as a case study and discusses multi-level governance at the supra, state and meso-level. Borrowing arguments from Jeffery and Wincott, Schakel makes the case that multi-level governance helps scholars to understand the implicit methodological nationalism of their discipline in which states are assumed to be the primary container for political engagement and primary site for governance and citizenship.

2.6 (o) Other

As Associate Director and later Director of the Bachelor European Studies, together with his predecessor Patrick Bijsmans, Schakel took the opportunity to collect data and study the effect of students’ attendance on their BSA (binding study advice) score, ECTS (European Credit Transfer System) achievements, and GPA (Grade Point Average). The goal of their study, “The impact of attendance on first-year study success in problem-based learning” published in *Higher Education*, was whether and to what extent attendance matters for study success in Problem Based Learning (PBL) teaching and learning environment. Even though many factors for students’ success lie outside the influence of a university, the argument is that being part of a community is important for students to do well at the university.

Attendance is part of that community building. The authors refer to studies that report that students do not necessarily object to interventions that sets minimum requirements for attendance, but that students may perceive such interventions as a sign that the university cares for them. On the other hand, the argument goes that students should want to attend classes, instead of being forced to attend. Discussions on attendance are important because they can inform policy decisions regarding curriculum design in higher education.

Empirically, the authors show that attendance has a positive effect on meeting the BSA requirement, that students who attend more tutorials also tend to acquire more ECTS, and that attendance matters and impacts GPA, even for the highly motivated students. The authors’ research support that applying minimum attendance requirements for first-year students help to encourage good study and attendance habits from the start.

The committee also takes the liberty here to note Dr. Schakel’s extensive teaching experience on quantitative data analysis, research design, and modelling; on Dutch, European and European Union Politics, as well as on parties and party systems, voters and elections, federalism, and multilevel governance. Dr. Schakel has also supervised a number of students

at all levels – bachelor, master, PhD and postdoc. He also has extensive experience at educational programs level.

3. Evaluation

We organize our evaluation by the stated requirements.

As to Scope, and based on his submitted publications, we find that Dr. Schakel has an academic publication record above and beyond the “guiding norm (...) equivalent of 8-12 full-length journal articles, or two or three books of good quality and different content.” We also find that Dr. Schakel has “made significant contributions to all of the publications” and also that he has had *more* than “the main responsibility for the research and writing in the majority (two-thirds) of the publications.” We also note that Dr. Schakel’s CV and dossier list more than 50 publications: 12 level-2 single- and co-authored articles; 20 level-1 single- and co-authored articles; three level-2 single- and co-authored books and special issues; five level-1 co-authored books and special issues; and 13 level-2 single and co-authored book chapters. In addition, Dr. Schakel’s CV and dossier also list numerous book reviews, blogs and reports.

As to Quality, we find that Dr. Schakel’s research is of a very high quality. This is not least due to the combination of novel research questions (in some cases classic questions applied to a new field, namely regional governments) and very rigorous empirical analyses of impressively large dataset. Dr. Schakel has been instrumental in building datasets covering the regional political level which not just open up research into these important polities but also brings the regional level more onto the stage of European political science than hitherto seen.

As to Breadth, we find that even though Dr. Schakel empirically has been somewhat focused on regional government, he has been theoretical quite diverse and have participated in and contributed to a number of different discussions, as for instance party politics, electoral behavior, political decentralization, multi-level-democracy etc. Among Dr. Schakel’s main contributions to the profession is that he has been very active and insistent in the developing and maintenance of the *Regional Authority Index* (RAI) demonstrating organizational skills. But he has not been theoretically narrow in his own exploitation of this impressive dataset and the different amendments including other regional data.

As to Independence and collaboration we find that Dr. Schakel has demonstrated independent ability “to complete all central parts of a high-quality research project” in both single- and first-authored publications. In the dossier, Dr. Schakel attached ten signed declarations of authorship which support this conclusion. The range of co-authors also speaks to Dr. Schakel’s ability to participate in research collaboration.

As to Visibility, we find that that Dr. Schakel’s academic work has been published in reputable and high-quality international publications. Since some of his works are (co-)edited books where authors from a number of countries have been invited to contribute with case-

studies fitting into his general framework, he and his ideas has also become well-known in many countries in addition to establish academic networks.

As to Relevance, we find that Dr. Schakel's publications have been at the forefront of research and also that at least half of his publications was published within the past five years. It is not least impressive that he constantly updates his already impressive datasets, so that his newest publications are not based on a dataset closed years ago but on the newest available data.

Finally, we also note that Dr. Schakel's work is very consistent – it is easy to sense Schakel's modus operandi in his work – the signature being that the literature is engaged head on and used to formulate intriguing hypotheses which are tested in a detailed way using sophisticated methods. But also, that before getting to the analysis, Schakel goes data-hunting in a way where the ambitions as to the size of the datasets are very high but where these ambitions are also met. Dr. Schakel's devotion of time and effort to the research area of regional elections contributes to the impression of him being a true academic entrepreneur.

4. Conclusion

Based on our readings and evaluations of Dr. Schakel's publications, including his CV, and based on the qualification requirements presented to the committee, we conclude that we find him fully qualified for the position of Researcher 1183 (professor). We also conclude that Dr. Schakel's academic competence is clear and unequivocal and that he qualifies for the position in question. Our conclusion is unanimous.

Edinburgh, Odense, Bergen,

May 27, 2020



Professor Ailsa Henderson, Professor Ulrik Kjær, Professor Gunnar Grendstad,

studies fitting into his general framework, he and his ideas has also become well-known in many countries in addition to establish academic networks.

As to Relevance, we find that Dr. Schakel's publications have been at the forefront of research and also that at least half of his publications was published within the past five years. It is not least impressive that he constantly updates his already impressive datasets, so that his newest publications are not based on a dataset closed years ago but on the newest available data.

Finally, we also note that Dr. Schakel's work is very consistent – it is easy to sense Schakel's modus operandi in his work – the signature being that the literature is engaged head on and used to formulate intriguing hypotheses which are tested in a detailed way using sophisticated methods. But also, that before getting to the analysis, Schakel goes data-hunting in a way where the ambitions as to the size of the datasets are very high but where these ambitions are also met. Dr. Schakel's devotion of time and effort to the research area of regional elections contributes to the impression of him being a true academic entrepreneur.

4. Conclusion

Based on our readings and evaluations of Dr. Schakel's publications, including his CV, and based on the qualification requirements presented to the committee, we conclude that we find him fully qualified for the position of Researcher 1183 (professor). We also conclude that Dr. Schakel's academic competence is clear and unequivocal and that he qualifies for the position in question. Our conclusion is unanimous.

Edinburgh, Odense, Bergen,

May 27, 2020

(S)



Professor Ailsa Henderson, Professor Ulrik Kjær, Professor Gunnar Grendstad,

This text is available in Norwegian only

Regler for opprykk til forsker kode 1183

§1

Disse regler gjelder for forsker 1109 og 1110 i fast statlig stilling/åremålsstilling - og i eksternt finansiert stilling hvor tilsettingsforholdet har en varlighet på 3 år eller mer utover søknadstidspunktet - som søker om opprykk til forsker 1183 på grunnlag av kompetanseerklæring. Opprykk etter dette reglement er personlig og får ingen konsekvenser for innehaverens arbeidsoppgaver og for stillingens plassering ved ledighet. Arbeids- og administrasjonsdepartementet fastsetter nærmere bestemmelser om hvem ordningen gjelder for.

§2

Bedømmingen av søkere som ønsker opprykk til forsker 1183 gjennomføres av komiteer nedsatt av den enkelte institusjon og innen hvert enkelt fagområde/forskningsfelt. Søker kan også bedømmes av komite ved annen institusjon der det er åpenbart at komiteen har nødvendig kompetanse til å vurdere søkeren innen det aktuelle fagområde/forskningsfelt. Det er en forutsetning at søkerens egen institusjon godtar denne fremgangsmåten.

§3

Bedømmelseskomiteen skal bestå av minst 3 personer med professorkompetanse eller kompetanse på forsker 1183-nivå innen søkerens fagområde/forskningsfelt. Det utpekes en administrator for komiteen. Dersom denne ikke samtidig er medlem av komiteen, har vedkommende ikke avgjørelsesrett i komiteen. Så langt det er mulig, og på de fagområder/forskningsfelt det er naturlig, skal komiteen ha et medlem fra et annet land. Bare ett medlem av bedømmelseskomiteen kan være fra søkerens egen institusjon. Komiteen må om mulig ha begge kjønn representert.

§4

Kompetansekrav - innen de ulike fagområder/forskningsfelt er det etablert internasjonale og/eller nasjonale standarder for professorkompetanse eller forskerkompetanse på professornivå. Bedømmelseskomiteen må legge disse standarder til grunn ved bedømmingen. - Institusjoner/virksomheter som på bakgrunn av sin egenart har utfyllende regler om krav til forsker i toppstilling, kan ta disse i betraktning ved behandling av søknaden.

§5

En forsker 1109/forsker 1110 kan bare søke om personlig opprykk innen det fagområde/forskningsfelt der vedkommende er tilsatt. Når en komite avgir en kompetanseerklæring, skal denne alltid gi et eksplisitt uttrykk for hvilket fagområde/forskningsfelt og i hvilken spesialisitet søkeren har sin fordypning, der det er relevant. Uttalelsen skal alltid gi uttrykk for om kompetanseerklæringen er enstemmig og utvilsom. Styret, dvs. ledelsen hvis institusjonen ikke har eget styre, tildeler opprykk på grunnlag av godkjent kompetanseerklæring fra komiteen. Den sakkyndige komite må enstemmig tilkjenne vedkommende forsker 1183 kompetanse for at opprykk skal gis.

§6

Forsker 1109/1110 som er erklært professorkompetent ved norsk institusjon i løpet av de 6 siste år fra søknadstidspunktet (jf. § 5, første avsnitt) kan søke egen institusjon om opprykk til forsker 1183. I de tilfeller der det foreligger enstemmig og utvilsom professorkompetanseerklæring, kan opprykk skje uten ny bedømming, jf. § 5. Institusjoner/virksomheter som på bakgrunn av sin egenart har utfyllende regler om krav til forsker i toppstilling, kan ta disse i betraktning ved behandling av søknaden. Dersom kompetansen er gitt under tvil, eller ved uenighet mellom de sakkyndige, skal det foretas ny bedømming etter § 2. Også for de som har kompetanseerklæring eldre enn 6 år, skal søknad om opprykk behandles av bedømmelseskomite. Komiteen vurderer om ny fullstendig bedømming er påkrevd.

§7

Forsker 1109/1110 som har oppnådd utenlandsk professorkompetanse, kan søke om å få sin kompetanse vurdert som grunnlag for opprykk etter norske regler med søknadsfrist etter § 11. Bedømmelseskomiteen (etter § 2) vurderer om ny fullstendig bedømming er påkrevd.

§8

For forsker 1109/1110 som har oppnådd kompetanseerklæring for professor II-stilling eller tidligere dosentstilling, og som søker om opprykk, skal det foretas ny bedømming.

§9

Forsker 1109/1110 som ikke har vært bedømt for kompetanse som forsker 1183 ved norsk institusjon i løpet av de siste 2 år, kan kreve å få sin kompetanse bedømt.

§10

Det er anledning til å levere inn inntil 15 arbeider i forbindelse med bedømmingen. Søker skal levere inn fullstendig publikasjonsliste samt liste over andre vitenskapelige aktiviteter i tilknytning til eget fagområde/forskningsfelt. Listene kan kommenteres. Den enkelte institusjon bestemmer selv i eget reglement hva som skal gjelde som andre vitenskapelige aktiviteter.

§11

Søknaden sendes egen institusjon og skal bestå av 5 eksemplarer av både søknad, vedlegg og vitenskapelige arbeider. Frist for søknad om opprykk til forsker 1183 er 1. mai hvert år. Det er ikke anledning til å sende inn arbeider etter søknadsfristens utløp. Eventuelle opprykk vil gjelde fra samme dato.

Vis endringshistorikk

Dato	Kommentar	Lagt inn av
02. februar 2011 12:33:21	Lagt inn	Kathrine Brosvik Thorsen
12. januar 2011 14:00:01	Lagt inn	Kathrine Brosvik Thorsen
20. desember 2010 13:34:23	Lagt inn	Kathrine Brosvik Thorsen

eZ Publish™ copyright © 1999-2015 eZ Systems AS

Qualification requirements for promotion to professor – Supplementary guidelines for assessment committees within the social sciences

Prepared by the National Conference of Faculties of Social Sciences in December 2007, with adjustments approved April 23, 2013.

Personal promotion to professor on the basis of competence is regulated by Section 2-1 of "*Regulations regarding Changes to the Regulations concerning Appointment and Promotion to Teaching and Research Positions*" dated 23.7.2010.

General

The regulations provide the same minimum standards for awarding competence as professor as when applying for an advertised position (Section 1-2). The difference in the competence requirements for professors and associate professors is not primarily a difference in the requirements to the number of academic publications, but rather the heightened requirements to quality and breadth, as is common under national and international standards.

In accordance with section 2-1(12) of the regulations, the assessment committee shall "*take into consideration the criteria for appointment as a professor provided in section 1-2.*" For the social Sciences, this means that the requirements for becoming a professor are:

- Academic level in line with established international or national standards
- Documented relevant practical pedagogical competence based on education or teaching and supervision

Academic competence

Promotion to professor requires significant academic production beyond what is required for a doctorate. The research must be of a high quality and show both breadth and depth. The production must reflect an independent research profile and show an ability to address new questions. Consistent research activity is a prerequisite.

The following requirements should be met:

Scope: What constitutes "significant academic production" must be assessed in relation to disciplinary traditions and must be concretely based on the content of the publications and the efforts they are based on. A guiding norm can be that the academic production (including the doctorate) should be the equivalent of 8-12 full-length journal articles, or two or three books of good quality and different content. The applicant must have made significant contributions to all of the publications and must have had the main responsibility for the research and writing in the majority (two-thirds) of the publications. In the event of more extensive co-authorship, the requirement to the number of publications may be raised.

Quality: The results must be well-supported and clearly expressed, as required for publication in reputable academic journals or by reputable academic publishers. Emphasis shall be placed on whether the work has been or may be significant to disciplinary developments or practice in the area. Emphasis shall also be placed on original questions, methods or data sources. The originality and significance requirements are clearly higher than for a doctorate, but it is sufficient that some of the publications meet these higher requirements.

Breadth: The requirement of breadth helps ensure that the applicant is qualified for teaching and supervision on a high level in more than one specialty. The academic production should include multiple classes of questions, topics and research methods. The applicant should have shown an ability to place their own work within a broader context.

Independence and collaboration: The applicant must document that they will be able to complete all central parts of a high-quality research project by themselves. This can be documented by single-authored publications (or first-authored publications in disciplines in which this signals being in charge of the work), by declarations from co-authors and by project management experience. Research collaboration and project management shall generally be seen as positive.

Visibility: The academic work should be published (or accepted for publication) in channels that have satisfactory quality control and where they can reach other researchers who will build on or critique the results. This normally means publication in international channels, but when the topic so indicates publication in national channels is acceptable. Emphasis is placed on what the discipline considers a good publishing practice at the time of publication.

Relevance: The publications should relate to the forefront of research at the time of publication. Some of the publications should be produced within the past five years.

When assessing the scope and breadth, emphasis can be placed on the entire list of publication, including publications that were not submitted.

The academic competence must be clear and unequivocal to qualify for a position.

In the event of a promotion, the competence must be in the subject that the position is in. Work in other subject areas can count, but will be weighted based on what they say about the competence to do research and teaching in the subject in question. At least two-thirds of the scope requirement should be met by publications that are clearly within the subject area of the position, and some of these publications should have been produced within the past five years. If the subject area is a very narrow specialty, it may be acceptable for a larger share of the publications to be outside the subject area.

Pedagogical and other competencies

Section 1-2(3) of the regulations requires "documented competence in relevant educational theory and practice based on training or on teaching and supervision" for professorial competence. This means that the applicant must document basic pedagogical competence. Beyond this, it is also a requirement that the applicant has teaching and supervision experience at all levels, normally including the doctoral level.

Other competencies cannot compensate for deficiencies in the academic competence.