

OUTLINE

# Sweden Impact Award

*to be presented at  
“Impact of Science 2017”*

*12 June 2017  
Stockholm, Sweden*

Organised by

## AESIS

NETWORK FOR  
ADVANCING & EVALUATING THE SOCIETAL IMPACT OF SCIENCE



Partners



STIFTELSEN för  
STRATEGISK FORSKNING



VETENSKAPSRÅDET  
THE SWEDISH RESEARCH COUNCIL



The Swedish Research Council for Environment,  
Agricultural Sciences and Spatial Planning



Swedish Research Council for  
Health, Working Life and Welfare



KUNGL. INGENJÖRSVETENSKAPSÅKADEMIEN

AESIS Network  
Anika S. Duut van Goor, General Manager  
Thiebault Oudendijk, Project Manager  
Mauritskade 5  
2514 HC The Hague  
Tel: +31 70 2172018  
Email: [a.duutvangoor@aesinet.com](mailto:a.duutvangoor@aesinet.com)  
[t.oudendijk@aesinet.com](mailto:t.oudendijk@aesinet.com)

# OUTLINE FOR THE SWEDEN IMPACT AWARD

## BACKGROUND

Since societal impact has become a standard task in most of the scientific world, a great deal of attention has been focused on how to demonstrate this impact. Accountability has led to the need of measurable indicators and preferably international standards. An award, organised by an international, independent organisation outside the science policy areas, can contribute to and support the development of such standardised and measurable indicators, by organising an award which rewards the synergy between world class research and societal impact.

## WHY SWEDEN

The “Impact of Science” conference and “Impact Award” will be held in Sweden, because there is a political momentum in which impact evaluation is a main point of discussion. Many stakeholders are looking for methods to structure the landscape of impact of science. This context provides the perfect opportunity to organise the first “Impact Award” in Sweden by an international expert network: AESIS. ScienceWorks, the bureau that manages the AESIS Network, has experience with awarding science based manifestations in society on a national level in the United States, United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Sweden (see picture).



*Most entrepreneurial scientist of Sweden: winner Mathias Uhlen in 2009  
(in the picture is Stefan Ståhl receiving the price in his stead)*

## SWEDEN IMPACT AWARD 2016-17

The winner of the “Sweden Impact Award” will be announced on 12 June 2017 in Stockholm, during the AESIS annual conference “Impact of Science”. There will be four categories and for every category the university can nominate one project:

- ✓ Physical sciences and Engineering
- ✓ Medical and Life sciences
- ✓ Social sciences
- ✓ Arts & Humanities

In each of these categories a winner will be selected by a jury of Swedish and international experts in the field of societal impact of science. The winner will receive € 5.000,- in prize money.

A nomination should be a research project, for which the objectives and outputs can be clearly specified. Nominations should not entail an entire research programme, or one specific person’s (life’s) work. The research project should have been visibly set in motion no longer than 20 years ago (1996 to 2016). Outside from these basic assumptions, you are free to nominate any project.

## NOMINATION PROCEDURE

- ✓ The central management of all the main public research organisations in Sweden will be asked to nominate world class research projects with the highest impact.
- ✓ After all nominations have been received by AESIS (deadline 15 March), top 5’s will be selected based on a quantitative analysis of the submitted information.
- ✓ The projects in this shortlist will be asked to submit evidence of their impact.
- ✓ Based on the submitted information and evidence put forward the jury will select a winner.

## INDICATORS

The Research Excellence Framework (REF) process in the UK has set a new international standard on measuring societal impact. Therefore the AESIS award selection procedure will include the combination of qualitative and quantitative criteria conceptualised by the REF to evaluate impact. Research projects will be awarded, not researchers or institutes. There will be a clear partition between quantitative and qualitative indicators, which will determine the winner in each of the four categories of the award. In order to become influential, the winner should not only have great impact on society, but should also have a good scientific reputation. Please see the Appendices for the criteria per discipline.

## JURY MEMBERS

### Chairs per category

Category	Chair
Medical & Life Sciences	: Peter Allebeck, <i>Secretary General at Forte</i>
Social Sciences	: Erik Roos, <i>Senior Analyst at Formas</i>
Physical Sciences & Engineering	: Christina Ullenius, <i>Chair Education &amp; Research Policy at IVA</i>
Arts & Humanities	: Wiljan van den Akker, <i>Director of the Centre for the Humanities, Utrecht University, the Netherlands</i>

### General members of the jury

Name	Organisation
David Sweeney	: Director (Research, Education and Knowledge Exchange) at the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) and Advisory Board member of the AESIS network
Susan Renoe	: Director of the Broader Impacts Network, USA of the University of Missouri and Advisory Board member of the AESIS network
Lars Hultman	: Chief Executive Officer at Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research (SSF)
Koenraad Debackere	: General Manager K.U. Leuven, Belgium and Chair of the Advisory Board of the AESIS network
Sven Stafström / Kerstin Sahlin (tbc)	: Director General of the Swedish Research Council / Secretary General of Humanities and Social Sciences at the Swedish Research Council

## TIMELINE

### ✓ **October and November 2016**

#### Criteria

*AESIS together with experts in the Swedish research community will develop the criteria with which the projects will be evaluated.*

#### Approaching and confirming jury members

*In order to form a high quality jury, international and Swedish experts in the field of policy and science will be approached by AESIS to be a member of the jury.*

### ✓ **December 2016**

#### Finalising the format and indicators

*AESIS, together with the members of the Jury, will decide on the final format and indicators of the award*

### ✓ **January 2017**

#### Nomination procedure

*AESIS, together with the Chairs of the Jury and conference, will address the central management for nominations from all main public research organisations in Sweden.*

### ✓ **March 15, 2017**

#### Nomination deadline

### ✓ **March-April 2017**

#### Making a shortlist

*Nominations are processed by AESIS and analysed put forward a preliminary ranking of projects.*

### ✓ **April 15, 2017**

#### The shortlist (top 5) will be announced

*Proof of impact will be asked from the projects that made it to the shortlist.*

### ✓ **May 1, 2017**

#### Proof of Impact deadline

### ✓ **May 2017**

#### Selecting the winners

*Based on the filled out form and submitted evidence the jury will announce a top 3 from the shortlist.*

### ✓ **June 12, 2017**

#### Award ceremony

*AESIS will organise a festive award ceremony during the conference "Impact of Science" 2017, representatives from the top 3 research projects per discipline are cordially invited to the ceremony and conference*

# Impact Criteria for Physical sciences & Engineering

Max. points

## Research quality

200

- ✓ Number of citations in scientific publications *H-index*
- ✓ Scientific awards received
- ✓ Internal reviews

## Funding

200

- ✓ Funding from users of the research project; government
- ✓ Funding from users of the research project; semi-government
- ✓ Funding from users of the research project; private

## Quantitative

300

*This is an exemplary list, the list is neither exhaustive nor exclusive. Other ways of impact may be described.*

- ✓ Activity created leading to new jobs
- ✓ Generated a new company or NGO *turnover created*
- ✓ Income from intellectual property rights
- ✓ Impact awards received
- ✓ Public engaged with research and expertise; *number of people engaged*
- ✓ Operations of a business or public service changed to achieve green objectives;
- ✓ Project enhanced performance of business; *production increase or waste decrease*
- ✓ Policy or policy debate been influenced; *governmental level, citations in legislative documents or parliamentary documents*
- ✓ Influenced school or HEI curriculum or syllabus other than where the project was conducted
- ✓ Citations in popular and professional literature
- ✓ Joint publications with experts in the field, excluding scientific publications
- ✓ New drug, treatment, diagnostic or medical technology developed or existing one lowered in cost; *number of patients life's improved and by how much or money saved*
- ✓ Other quantitative proofs of impact on society

## Qualitative

300

*This is an exemplary list, the list is neither exhaustive nor exclusive. Other ways of impact may be described.*

- ✓ Design of new products and services
- ✓ New sector or activity created or planned
- ✓ Public awareness, attitude or understanding of risks improved
- ✓ Business sector adopts new technology
- ✓ Support for development 'small scale' technologies improved
- ✓ Quality or productivity of professional or public service improved
- ✓ Public health or quality of life improved
- ✓ NGO or charitable organisation influenced
- ✓ Project lowered risks to the security of nation states
- ✓ Decisions of health services informed
- ✓ User experience has improved
- ✓ Changes to professional or technology standards, guidelines or training informed
- ✓ Professional bodies and learned societies used research
- ✓ Expert and legal work or forensic methods were informed
- ✓ Project has improved the (natural) environment
- ✓ Management or conservation of natural resources influenced
- ✓ Management of environmental risk or hazard changed
- ✓ Changes in environmental or architectural design standards or general practice
- ✓ Influence of professional practice or codes
- ✓ Other qualitative proofs of impact on society

# Impact Criteria for Medical & Life Sciences

Max. points

## Research quality

200

- ✓ Number of citations in scientific publications *H-index*
- ✓ Scientific awards received
- ✓ Internal reviews

## Funding

200

- ✓ Funding from users of the research project; government
- ✓ Funding from users of the research project; semi-government
- ✓ Funding from users of the research project; private

## Quantitative

300

*This is an exemplary list, the list is neither exhaustive nor exclusive. Other ways of impact may be described.*

- ✓ Activity created leading to new jobs
- ✓ Generated a new company or NGO *turnover created*
- ✓ Income from intellectual property rights
- ✓ Public engaged with research and expertise; *number of people engaged*
- ✓ Impact awards received
- ✓ Operations of a business or public service changed to achieve green objectives;
- ✓ Project enhanced performance of business; *production increase or waste decrease*
- ✓ Policy or policy debate been influenced; *governmental level, citations in legislative documents or parliamentary documents*
- ✓ Influenced school or HEI curriculum or syllabus other than where the project was conducted
- ✓ Citations in popular and professional literature
- ✓ Joint publications with experts in the field, excluding scientific publications
- ✓ New drug, treatment, diagnostic or medical technology developed or existing one lowered in cost; *number of patients life's improved and by how much or money saved*
- ✓ Other quantitative proofs of impact on society

## Qualitative

300

*This is an exemplary list, the list is neither exhaustive nor exclusive. Other ways of impact may be described.*

- ✓ Design of new products and services
- ✓ New sector or activity created or planned
- ✓ Business sector adopts new technology
- ✓ Support for development 'small scale' technologies improved
- ✓ Public awareness, attitude or understanding of risks improved
- ✓ Quality or productivity of professional or public service improved
- ✓ Public health or quality of life improved
- ✓ Control of the disease was changed (medically)
- ✓ Animal health and welfare enhanced
- ✓ Decisions of health services informed
- ✓ User experience has improved
- ✓ Changes to professional or medical standards, guidelines or training informed
- ✓ Professional bodies and learned societies used research
- ✓ Professional research capabilities improved
- ✓ Project has improved the (natural) environment
- ✓ Management or conservation of natural resources influenced
- ✓ Management of environmental risk or hazard changed
- ✓ Changes in environmental or architectural design standards or general practice
- ✓ Influence of professional practice or codes
- ✓ Other qualitative proofs of impact on society

# Impact Criteria for Social sciences

Max. points

## Research quality

200

- ✓ Number of citations in scientific publications *H-index*
- ✓ Scientific awards received
- ✓ Internal reviews

## Funding

200

- ✓ Funding from users of the research project; government
- ✓ Funding from users of the research project; semi-government
- ✓ Funding from users of the research project; private

## Quantitative

300

*This is an exemplary list, the list is neither exhaustive nor exclusive. Other ways of impact may be described.*

- ✓ Activity created leading to new jobs and turnover
- ✓ Generated a new company or NGO *turnover created*
- ✓ Income from intellectual property rights
- ✓ Impact awards received
- ✓ Public engaged with research and expertise; *number of people engaged*
- ✓ Operations of a business or public service changed to achieve green objectives;
- ✓ Project enhanced performance of business; *production increase or waste decrease*
- ✓ Policy or policy debate been influenced; *governmental level, citations in legislative documents or parliamentary documents*
- ✓ Influenced school or HEI curriculum or syllabus other than where the project was conducted
- ✓ Citations in popular and professional literature
- ✓ Joint publications with experts in the field, excluding scientific publications
- ✓ Other quantitative proofs of impact on society

## Qualitative

300

*This is an exemplary list, the list is neither exhaustive nor exclusive. Other ways of impact may be described.*

- ✓ Design of new products and services or new ways of thinking
- ✓ New sector or activity created or planned
- ✓ Public awareness, attitude or understanding of risks improved
- ✓ Impact on democratic participation
- ✓ Improved social, cultural and environmental sustainability
- ✓ Understanding, developing and adopting alternative economic models
- ✓ NGO, charitable or commercial organisation influenced
- ✓ Production of cultural artefacts
- ✓ Improved access to justice and other opportunities
- ✓ Improved access to public services
- ✓ Social welfare, equality or social inclusion improved
- ✓ Improvements to legal frameworks, regulatory environment or governance of business entities
- ✓ Influential contributions to campaigns for social, economic, political or legal change
- ✓ Research into minorities helping governments, NGOs etc. to respond to their needs
- ✓ Helping professionals and organisations adapt to changing cultural values
- ✓ Project lowered risks to the security of nation states
- ✓ Legislative change, development of legal principle or effect on legal practice
- ✓ Health services were improved
- ✓ Development of ethical standards
- ✓ Changes to professional standards, guidelines or training informed
- ✓ Professional bodies and learned societies used research
- ✓ Professional research capabilities improved
- ✓ Influence on professional practice or codes
- ✓ Practitioner debate informed or stimulated
- ✓ Project challenged conventional wisdom, stimulating debate among stakeholders
- ✓ Project has improved the (natural) environment
- ✓ Management or conservation of natural resources influenced
- ✓ Management of environmental risk or hazard changed
- ✓ Other qualitative proofs of impact on society



# Impact Criteria for Arts & Humanities

Max. points

## Research quality

200

- ✓ Number of citations in scientific publications *H-index*
- ✓ Scientific awards received
- ✓ Internal reviews

## Funding

200

- ✓ Funding from users of the research project; government
- ✓ Funding from users of the research project; semi-government
- ✓ Funding from users of the research project; private

## Quantitative

300

*This is an exemplary list, the list is neither exhaustive nor exclusive. Other ways of impact may be described.*

- ✓ Activity created leading to new jobs
- ✓ Generated a new company or NGO *turnover created*
- ✓ Income from intellectual property rights
- ✓ Impact awards received
- ✓ Public engaged with research and expertise; *number of people engaged*
- ✓ Project enhanced performance of business; *production increase or waste decrease*
- ✓ Policy or policy debate been influenced; *governmental level, citations in legislative documents or parliamentary documents*
- ✓ Influenced school or HEI curriculum or syllabus other than where the project was conducted
- ✓ Citations in popular and professional literature
- ✓ Joint publications with experts in the field, excluding scientific publications
- ✓ Other quantitative proofs of impact on society

## Qualitative

300

*This is an exemplary list, the list is neither exhaustive nor exclusive. Other ways of impact may be described.*

- ✓ Design of new products and services or new ways of thinking
- ✓ New sector or activity created or planned
- ✓ Public awareness, attitude or understanding of risks improved
- ✓ Impact on democratic participation
- ✓ Quality or productivity of professional service improved
- ✓ Improved social, cultural and environmental sustainability
- ✓ Understanding, developing and adopting alternative economic models
- ✓ NGO, charitable or commercial organisation influenced
- ✓ Informing or influencing the development of export systems
- ✓ Heritage preservation, conservation and presentation enhanced
- ✓ Developing stimuli to tourism and contributing to the quality of tourism
- ✓ Contributing to processes of commemoration, memorialisation and reconciliation
- ✓ Production of cultural artefacts
- ✓ Creating, inspiring or supporting new forms of expression (like artistic, literary etc.)
- ✓ Contributing to continuing personal and professional development
- ✓ Improved access to justice, health services and other opportunities
- ✓ Social welfare, equality or social inclusion improved
- ✓ Improvements to legal frameworks, regulatory environment or governance of business entities
- ✓ Influential contributions to campaigns for social, economic, political or legal change
- ✓ Research into minorities helping governments, NGOs etc. to respond to their needs
- ✓ Influencing the methods, ideas or ethics of a profession
- ✓ Legislative change, development of legal principle or effect on legal practice
- ✓ Development of ethical standards
- ✓ Changes to professional standards, guidelines or training informed
- ✓ Professional bodies and learned societies used research
- ✓ Professional research capabilities improved
- ✓ Influence on professional practice or codes
- ✓ Practitioner debate informed or stimulated
- ✓ Project challenged conventional wisdom, stimulating debate among stakeholders
- ✓ Project has improved the (natural) environment
- ✓ Other qualitative proofs of impact on society