RC-Specific Evaluation of CECH – Contemporary European Church History

Seppo Saari & Antti Moilanen (Eds.)
RC-Specific Evaluation of CECH – Contemporary European Church History

Seppo Saari & Antti Moilanen (Eds.)
Summary:
Researcher Community (RC) was a new concept of the participating unit in the evaluation. Participation in the evaluation was voluntary and the RCs had to choose one of the five characteristic categories to participate.

Evaluation of the Researcher Community was based on the answers to the evaluation questions. In addition a list of publications and other activities were provided by the TUHAT system. The CWTS/Leiden University conducted analyses for 80 RCs and the Helsinki University Library for 66 RCs.

Panellists, 49 and two special experts in five panels evaluated all the evaluation material as a whole and discussed the feedback for RC-specific reports in the panel meetings in Helsinki. The main part of this report is consisted of the feedback which is published as such in the report.

Chapters in the report:
1. Background for the evaluation
2. Evaluation feedback for the Researcher Community
3. List of publications
4. List of activities
5. Bibliometric analyses

The level of the RCs’ success can be concluded from the written feedback together with the numeric evaluation of four evaluation questions and the category fitness. More conclusions of the success can be drawn based on the University-level report.

RC-specific information:

Main scientific field of research: Humanities
Participation category:
2. Research of the participating community is of high quality, but the community in its present composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition or a clear breakthrough

RC’s responsible person:
Lauha, Aila

RC-specific keywords:
Religion and politics  Religion and national identity  Religion and culture  Churches and the Cold War  Ecumenical movement  Religious minorities, controversies, and crises  Religion in Finland and its neighboring areas  European studies

Keywords:
Research Evaluation, Meta-evaluation, Doctoral Training, Bibliometric Analyses, Researcher Community

Series title and number:
University of Helsinki, Administrative Publications 80/85, Evaluations

ISSN: 1795-5513 (Online)  ISBN: 978-952-10-7505-6 (PDF)

Total number of pages: 85  Language: English

Additional information:
Cover graphics: Päivi Talonpoika-Ukkonen
Enquiries: seppo.o.saari@helsinki.fi

Internet address:
Foreword

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Johanna Björkroth
Vice-Rector
Chair of the Steering Group of the Evaluation

Steering Group of the evaluation
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1 Introduction to the Evaluation

1.1 RC-specific evaluation reports

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

It is essential to emphasize that the evaluation combines both meta-evaluation 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.
- 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.

---

3 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.

4 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\(^5\) compilations on publications and other scientific activities\(^6\)
4. External evaluation
5. Public reporting

### 1.4 Implementation of the external evaluation

**Five Evaluation Panels**

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

\(^6\) Supervision of thesis, prizes and awards, editorial work and peer reviews, participation in committees, boards and networks and public appearances.
1.5 Evaluation material

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

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

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

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

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

Evaluation material

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

Background material

University of Helsinki

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

The Finnish Universities/Research Institutes

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)
4. **International and national (incl. intersectoral) research collaboration and researcher mobility**
   - Description of
     - the RC’s research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities
     - how the RC has promoted researcher mobility
     - Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.
   A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, national and international collaboration
     - Strengths
     - Areas of development
     - Other remarks
     - Recommendations

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

5. **Operational conditions**
   - Description of the operational conditions in the RC’s research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).
   - Identification of the RC’s strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.
   A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practices related to leadership and management
     - Strengths
     - Areas of development
     - Other remarks
     - Recommendations

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

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

   Competitive funding reported in the text is also to be considered when evaluating this point.
   A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness, future significance
     - Strengths
     - Areas of development
     - Other remarks
     - Recommendations

8. **The RC’s strategic action plan for 2011-2013**
   - RC’s description of their future perspectives in relation to research and doctoral training.
   A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, processes and good practices related to leadership and management, national and international collaboration, innovativeness, future significance
     - Strengths
     - Areas of development
9. Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

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

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

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

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

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

13. RC-specific conclusions

1.7 Evaluation criteria

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

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

Description of criteria levels

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

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

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

In cases where the research is of a national character and, in the judgement of the evaluators, should remain so, the concepts of “international attention” or “international impact” etc. in the grading criteria above may be replaced by “international comparability”.
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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)**

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.

---

7 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
   - University level public report March–April 2012
   - RC specific reports

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

1.9 Evaluation feedback – consensus of the entire panel

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

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

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

2.1 Focus and quality of the RC’s research

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

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

The RC “Contemporary European Church History” (CECH) goes far beyond the realm of church history and theology insofar as its key research questions are very closely related to major cultural and social problems of contemporary societies and their ongoing religious and secular transformations. The research of historical topics such as religions and nationalisms or religions and politics in different European contexts of the 20th century is done in a comparative and interdisciplinary perspective.

The diversity of the research topics is quite impressive. The different projects represented in this RC such as religious minorities, oecumenical movements, churches in the cold war and its aftermath, international cooperation of churches are analyzed in their long lasting evolution to better understand their actual relevance.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

2.2 Practises and quality of doctoral training

- Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC’s principles for:
  - recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates
  - supervision of doctoral candidates
  - collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes
  - good 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 great variety of dissertation topics is impressive. The interdisciplinary and comparative methods and approaches which these topics necessitate reflect the large realms of the RC’s scholarly interests and activities. All senior researchers are actively involved into the training of PhD students.

The panel is convinced that the association of the RC’s PhD students with the Finnish Doctoral School of History will be of great academic interest and value.

To judge after the self-evaluation of the doctoral training and the supervision of candidates, the selective process of doctoral students is very serious and once admitted, doctoral students are very well taken care of by supervisors as well as by postgraduate seminars.

Numeric evaluation: 5 (Outstanding)
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’s national and societal impact is very active, extensive and dynamic in the Finish and also in the Scandinavian context. Members of the RC hold important positions in ecumenical and ecclesiastical organizations.

The RC’s doctoral training is focused on an intense interaction between research and societal problems which is certainly on the strong-points of this RC and assures good career prospects for the doctoral candidates or new doctors both in academic and non-academic fields.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

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

ASPECTS: Scientific quality, national and international collaboration

The international cooperation of the RC involves both senior scholars and doctoral students which can be considered the strength of its scientific policy. The RC is anchored in quite a few long term international collaboration projects with Scandinavian, British, German, Italian, and also US-American academic institutions and individual researchers. Since all these countries have very different religious backgrounds and traditions, the research contacts and the researchers’ mobilities are broadening the intellectual perspectives and are strengthening the comparative approaches of the topics and methods.

The expertise of the RC of Baltic countries and through them also of Russia is quite unique.

Senior scholars of the RC are closely connected to international institutions and publications and anchor Finnish research to an important degree into the international arena.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

After the self-evaluation, a satisfactory balance between research and teaching has been achieved. Some teaching tasks are also carried out by post-docs and even by doctoral students.

A problem is the incorporation of administrative duties into research and teaching which is very time consuming. On the other hand the fact that one PI is a Dean of the faculty and a member of the Academy
of Finland and all PIs are actively involved in scholarly organisations in Finland and abroad, is also very beneficial for the academic and international acknowledgement of the RC.

The challenge of the RC is now to seek an optimal balance between the administration of research and research itself which will certainly take some efforts.

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

As far as I can judge from the self-evaluation of the RC, the leadership and management of the researcher community has profited from the fact that since 2010 the Faculty of Theology is functioning as a single financial and administrative unit which enables greater cooperation and joint planning of teaching and even in some cases of research.

The Faculty has a Joint Committee for Teaching, but detailed planning of the teaching takes place within the Faculty’s department – which seems to me quite a healthy solution. The Faculty has also a Joint Research Committee which coordinates the recruitment and training of doctoral students.

This looks to me quite satisfactory.

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

The RC “Contemporary European Church History” has received extensive domestic and also international funding coming from the European Union and the European Research Council.

Seen from the perspective of an outsider it is nearly impossible to evaluate the importance of this funding since it should be put into a comparative perspective with other RCs.
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 objectives of the RC relate to developing already existing research poles and reinforcing its international profile while maintaining its strong national profile.

It is recommended that the scholars of the RC try to publish more in international language in keeping of course their Finnish stronghold active.

The future perspectives of research and doctoral training are promising insofar that the projects take the changing European religious landscape into account. Also the Finnish perspective will be modified given the transformation of the society and the intensification of international networks and collaborations.

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

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

The RC is without any doubt capable to produce highly interesting and relevant academic research. Therefore it should be intellectually, organizationally, and financially recognized and supported.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

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

-

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

Focus area 8: Language and culture

The University of Helsinki’s priorities such as the relation between culture and society presents a major focus in the RC’s research agenda.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

Concerning the international dimension of the various RC projects and the large international contacts of its faculty, we would like to suggest to develop also contacts with a country like France and it’s century long tradition of secularism. It could be interesting to compare the experiences of national churches with the societal implications of the French model. This perspective would also enlarge the European dimension of the RC.
2.13 RC-specific conclusions

The Contemporary European Church History group represents innovative research topics which necessitate interdisciplinary and comparative research methods. This broadens its academic and international horizon very favourably. Quite a few members of the group are active in editorial boards and international associations. Their publication list is mostly in Finnish and it would be recommendable that they publish more in other accessible European languages. The fact that the research group is very much integrated in international projects might be very helpful for the future careers of the PhD students.

We regret however, that the presentation of the working materials was rather descriptive than self-evaluative. A more methodological focused and analytical presentation of the individual research projects, their respective approaches and their integration into the general topic of the study group would have considerably contributed to the academic value of the presentation.
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RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW

NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Contemporary European Church History (CECH)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:
Professor Aila Lauha, Faculty of Theology

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)
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RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 RESPONSIBLE PERSON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name: Lauha, Aila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: +358 9 1912 3037 or +358 50 3310612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation: Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street address: Aleksanterinkatu 7, 5th floor, Helsinki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Contemporary European Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): CECH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the operational basis in 2005-2010 (eg. research collaboration, joint doctoral training activities) on which the RC was formed (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The RC takes part in the evaluation as it forms an intrinsic and functional research community. This RC has a common multiform research area, ‘Contemporary European Church History’. The members of the RC have already collaborated in different projects and line-ups for many years. The research topics have a wide variation and each researcher will attain her own special expertise. Regardless of this diversity, the members are interested in each other’s topics and work together in a productive manner. Mutual willingness to receive and give feedback is a distinctive feature of this RC. Multidisciplinary collaboration of the RC with research units and networks both in the UH and other Finnish universities is active. The central attributes of the RC are: 1) research projects financed by external funding, 2) an active and productive doctoral training and 3) a lively international interaction. The RC has already attained international recognition and is ascending to the pinnacle of its field of research on the European level. The RC identifies itself with the category 2. An important motivation for taking part in this evaluation is the aspiration for further development. Furthermore, the RC is keen to receive competent external feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 SCIENTIFIC FIELDS OF THE RC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main scientific field of the RC’s research: humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC’s scientific subfield 1: Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC’s scientific subfield 2: History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC’s scientific subfield 3: Humanities, Multidisciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC’s scientific subfield 4: --Select--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, if not in the list:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

4 RC’S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

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

Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The research work done within the RC is very successful measured by the number of high level dissertations, for instance. When compared to the size of the field of research, the amount of external research funding based on academic evaluation is considerable. Individual scholars and doctoral students have received several grants. In addition, the researchers of the department have been awarded prizes in recognition of high quality research. The remarkably active international cooperation of the RC involves both senior scholars and doctoral students. The RC aims to reach the international top of its field of research by publishing a greater number of studies in international languages. This remains a challenge for the community. Another challenge is related to resources. The PIs of the RC have an extensive teaching responsibility to bear ranging from basic studies to advanced special studies. Within the research areas of the RC, approximately 20–25 Master’s theses are completed every year. Teaching responsibilities take time from active research work. In addition, one of the PIs has been the Dean of the Faculty throughout the whole period of time under evaluation. From the point of view of this RC, it would be of utmost importance that the UH would develop a sabbatical system. For the above mentioned reasons, the RC does not for the time being consider it possible to identify itself with the participation category 1. The RC has strong motivation to develop and looks forward for feedback from the evaluation process.

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 conducted within the RC consists of four categories:

1. Religion, Politics and Nationalism in Europe in the 20th century:
   Research on the religion in the Baltic States and Russia has for a long time been one of the main research focus areas of the CECH community. It has been the main actor in creating the International Network of Baltic Church Historians, which gathers a wide range of international scholars. Characteristic features of this field of research are active publishing by especially the established researchers, workshops, and researcher exchange. A rather new research focus is the Roman Catholic Church. The opening of new collections in the Vatican Secret Archives has given the impulse to study the political role of the Catholic Church.

2. Churches and Ecumenical Movement during the Cold War:
   The CECH community is already internationally known as a center of research on Churches and the Cold War. Several dissertations and articles have been published on the topic. External funding during the last ten years has been significant (including an EU-funded project). In 2010 a new project ‘The Ecumenical Movement and the Cold War Politics’, funded by the Academy of Finland was started.
3. Minorities, Controversies, and Crises in the Context of Religion:

The third focus area discusses certain critical aspects in the field of religion. This research addresses questions concerning religious minorities in Finland, such as anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism. The legal status of different religious communities in Finland is a special point of interest. Encountering other religions and cultures as a part of missionary work and in the integration process of Finnish immigrants also belongs to this research area.

4. Finnish and Nordic Religious Landscape in Transition:

Research on the changing Finnish religious landscape is an elementary part of this RC, and the topic is often discussed in a wider Nordic context. There are several publications on this field of research with varied themes, ranging from women and religion to church and state relations, from religious education to war hero burials etc.

**Significance of the RC’s research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces):** The research of the RC corresponds to the research areas of both the UH and the Faculty of Theology. The UH has defined ‘Culture and Society’ as one of its focus areas. All the research done within this RC is essentially related to this priority. The Faculty of Theology has defined three specialty areas and three emerging areas for its research. The research of this RC is in line particularly with the specialty areas ‘The evolution and contents of the Christian history of ideas’ and ‘Religion in Finland and its neighbouring areas’. In addition, the research profile of the RC fits extremely well to the emerging research areas ‘Religion in cultural structures’ and ‘Religion in Europe’. In the Faculty of Theology doctoral training consists of doctoral seminars in respective subjects, research projects, Centers of Excellence, Faculty provided special seminars and the Finnish Graduate School of Theology programme. The Faculty is a founding member of the Global Network of Research Centers in Theology. The doctoral training of this RC follows the general guidelines of the Faculty of Theology including active participation of the PIs and doctoral students within the ‘Global Network’. Two post-graduate seminars lead by professors of this RC function actively and meet on a regular basis. All the senior researchers give active input to the doctoral training. Representatives from different academic fields (e.g. history, sociology, and literature) - both domestic and international – are invited to act as opponents, supervisors, and evaluators. Many researchers and doctoral students have been trained in university pedagogy, and new methods of higher education are implemented in teaching and supervision. A part of the doctoral training are joint courses for post-graduate students of all history departments in the UH. Integral features of the training are international interaction, gaining teaching experience, and transferable skills. Within this RC a pilot project has been carried out aiming to support the doctoral students in planning and performing their studies with the help of individual study plans.

**Keywords:** Religion and politics

Religion and national identity

Religion and culture

Churches and the Cold War
Ecumenical movement
Religious minorities, controversies, and crises
Religion in Finland and its neighboring areas
European studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6 QUALITY OF RC’S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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): Indications of high quality research and doctoral training:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) The RC has received extensive domestic and international funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The members publish actively and a growing number of the publications are in international languages. However, this is not done at the expense of national publications as historical study is closely connected also with domestic topics (especially category 4 of the RC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The PIs hold significant positions of trust in various academic institutions and organizations such as the Academy of Finland and CIHEC (Commission internationale d'Histoire et d'Etudes du Christianisme). They are well represented also in several scholarly societies as well as on editorial boards of academic journals. For further information, consult the UH databases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The Faculty of Theology has paid increasing attention to the doctoral training by means of increased supervision and external evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Funding for doctoral training has been extensive, both as a part of research projects and individual grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) The doctoral degree and training give valuable qualifications and opportunities for the students. This is attested by the successful employment of newly graduated doctors of theology, both in academic and non-academic fields.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on how the RC’s scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): To do justice to the research area of this RC, following aspects need to be taken into consideration:
High level research needs to be published not only in English, but also in Finnish, Swedish, German and other languages (e.g. Latvian). Publishing in domestic languages derives from the special responsibility of the unit to concentrate on Finnish religious history. This includes the responsibility to maintain and develop the academic terminology of the research field as well as the popularization of the research results. For this reason, the evaluation cannot be based only on English-dominated science-based citation indexes, which do not reflect the work of the RC adequately.

Historical study favours monographs. Although article publishing has increased to some extent, this scientific tradition should be taken positively into consideration.

Concerning doctoral training it is advisable to complement the picture given by the TUHAT database and other indicators by becoming acquainted with the procedures in the UH, for instance through interviews with supervisors, doctoral students and the external examiners.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>PI-status</th>
<th>Title of research and teaching personnel</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lauha</td>
<td>Aila</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Talonen</td>
<td>Jouko</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tiensuu</td>
<td>Kyllikki</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Professor, acting</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ketola</td>
<td>Mikko</td>
<td></td>
<td>University Lecturer</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Antila</td>
<td>Jaakko</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate, Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Antikainen</td>
<td>Marjo-Riitta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Aro-Heinilä</td>
<td>Irja</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate, Dissertation in 2005</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Jalovaara</td>
<td>Ville</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate - Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Krapu</td>
<td>Jenni</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate - Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Latvala</td>
<td>Pia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate, Dissertation in 2008</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nokelainen</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate, Dissertation in 2010</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lavery</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lund</td>
<td>Pekka</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate - Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Meriläinen</td>
<td>Juha</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate, Senior Researcher - University Lecturer</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pajunen</td>
<td>Mika</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate, Senior Researcher</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Poteri</td>
<td>Juha</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate, Dissertation in 2010</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sorsa</td>
<td>Leena</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate, Dissertation in 2010</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ahonen</td>
<td>Paavo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Bergström</td>
<td>Milla</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Isotalo</td>
<td>Eeva-Leena</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Ketola</td>
<td>Hanna-Maija</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Koskelainen</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Kyrö</td>
<td>Suvi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Laine</td>
<td>Antti</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Laitinen</td>
<td>Aappo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Peiponen</td>
<td>Matti</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Törmänen</td>
<td>Tuomo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Vuori</td>
<td>Tiimo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Kyrölähti</td>
<td>Jarmo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral Candidate</td>
<td>Faculty of Theology, Church History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name of the RC’s responsible person: Lauha, Aila

E-mail of the RC’s responsible person:

Name and acronym of the participating RC: Contemporary European Church History, CECH

The RC’s research represents the following key focus area of UH: 8. Kieli ja kulttuuri – Language and culture

Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area: Key focus area 8 consists of “research on identities, cultures, legal cultures and religions as well as research on Finnish culture and the changes taking place under the pressure of multiculturalism”. The key objectives (identities, multi-culturalism, and Finnish culture) are covered by CECH under the following principal research areas:

1. Religion, Politics and Nationalism
2. The Churches and the Ecumenical Movement during the Cold War,
3. Minorities, Controversies, and Crises in the Context of Religion, and

In addition, the research profile of CECH corresponds to key focus area 9, Social Justice, as its key objectives ‘Nordic welfare state and ethnicity’ are closely related to research within CECH.

There is also a clear connection to key focus area 10 ‘Globalisation and social change’, which includes European studies; European culture and societies have been shaped by religious beliefs and practices and this theme runs through all the research areas of CECH.

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):

CECH consists of church historians and historians undertaking research into 20th Century European Church History in the Faculty of Theology. This is a key period because the 20th Century in Europe saw great political and social changes which had a fundamental impact on religious life; there were rapid developments in ideology, in science and in the study of religion; defining the concept of freedom of religion and the increased secularization were some of the leading trends of the period. Thorough study into all these changes is important not only to reveal the long-term historical developments, but also to provide insights into the more recent past; this is vital for understanding the contemporary ideological and religious situation in Europe.

Contemporary Church History is a broad research area. The World Wars, together with the conflicts between the churches and totalitarian political ideologies and/or nationalistic ideas frequently emerge as central events in the research. The fundamental questions which arise are how the political and intellectual tumult affected the churches and religious life, and how the churches influenced political opinion. Linked to this is the study of the internal and institutional development of the European churches and their increasing international cooperation following the beginning of the Ecumenical Movement. Despite extensive international study of these themes, there are still many areas which remain unexplored, and which require fresh perspectives alongside new comparative and analytical methodologies. CECH has identified the following categories as the principal areas for its research:
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1. Religion, Politics and Nationalism

CECH maintains and enhances the highly renowned work of the Department of Church History in the study of Religion, Politics and Nationalism in Finland. Church and politics, particularly Party politics, in Finland has been analyzed in the dissertations of Antila (2010) and Vuori (2011); H.-M. Ketola, Kyrönlahti and Törnänen will finish their dissertations in near future.

The Department’s research into religion in the Baltic States and Russia has been extremely prominent since the 1990s; the opening of archives in Eastern Europe having greatly enhanced research opportunities. PIs Talonen and M. Ketola have made significant contributions to the creation of the International Network of Baltic Church Historians, which facilitates collaboration between international scholars from the Baltic states, Sweden, Finland, and Germany. The Network organizes international symposia and is proactive in publishing its work. International collaboration is evidenced by the exchange of researchers between faculties – two post-graduate students from Latvia work in close cooperation with CECH. Two PIs have contributed to a book (2010) on churches and religion in Eastern Europe from World War II up to the present.

A new research focus of CECH is the study of the political role of the Roman Catholic Church up to the present. The controversial Catholic organisation Opus Dei and its political influence has been analyzed by M. Ketola (2006). In the future, Laitinen and Bergström will reflect on the Catholic Church during the inter-war years in their theses.

2. The Churches and the Ecumenical Movement during the Cold War

The CECH community is internationally renowned as a research center into the Churches and the Cold War. In 2001–2004 many CECH members were involved in the EU funded project “Churches and European Integration” (CEI), which was led by PI Lauha and brought together researchers from five European countries. The book North European Churches From the Cold War to Globalisation (2006) presented the results of CEI to a wider audience. As a result of the CEI project, there have been also other considerable outcomes in publishing, conferences and international collaboration in the period 2005 to 2010. Doctoral theses have been completed by Jalovaara (2007), Latvala (2008), Pajunen (2008), Krapu (2009), as well that of Meriläinen (2009) which won two awards. Kyrö completed her licentiate thesis (2008). It is anticipated that at least 1 or 2 new cold war related dissertations will be produced annually (Laine, Peiponen etc). Articles have been published and conference papers given by CECH members and they have been particularly successful in gaining external funding. New international networks have been fostered, as well as active participation in conferences in Europe and the USA. In 2010, a new project “The Ecumenical Movement and Cold War Politics” was begun, led by PI Lauha and funded by the Academy of Finland. A Hungarian post-doctoral scholar joined the project in 2010 for a three-year period.

3. Minorities, Controversies, and Crises in the Context of Religion

This focus area embraces critical aspects in the field of religion such as the position of religious minorities, anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism. The discussion of anti-Semitism in Finnish academic life has only recently received attention and a deeper look at Finnish Christian anti-Semitism has been pursued by Ahonen. The study of Finnish anti-Catholicism has been planned within the framework of an international network of scholars, started in 2010. The legal status of different religious communities in Finland is a special point of interest, see Nokelainen’s dissertation (2010).

Encountering other religions and cultures as a part of missionary work abroad and in the integration of Finnish immigrants also belongs to this research area. P. Lund, for example, who in his award-winning dissertation (2006) and other publications has analysed the problematic political and psychological situation of Finnish missionaries during the National Revolution in China in the 1920s.
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4. Finnish and Nordic Religious Landscape in Transition

Researching the changing religious circumstances in the Nordic countries, and Finland in particular, is the express remit of this RC. Publications in this field are wide-ranging: women and religion; church-state relations; religious education; war hero burials, etc. The significant research outcomes are shown by the dissertations of Aro-Heinilä (2005), Poteri (2009), and Sorsa (2010), by the books and articles of Antikainen, Lauha, Lavery and Tiensuu, as well as the forthcoming theses of Isotalo and Koskelainen. All members of the CECH contribute actively to this focus area.

The research profile of CECH corresponds with the research agendas of both the UH and the Faculty of Theology. In the context of the faculty, the research correlates to our identified specialism - “The Evolution and Contents of the Christian History of Ideas” and “Religion in Finland and its Neighboring Areas”. It also fits the Faculty's emerging research areas of “Religion in Cultural Structures” and “Religion in Europe”.

Our strong international profile is one of our strengths with publishing, conference participation and collaboration greatly increasing between 2005 and 2010. External recognition is demonstrated by the success rate of funding applications for the research work of CECH.

A particularly important strength is that this active and high level research community enhances the teaching of Church History for Master’s students and the majority of pro gradu theses (annually 25-35) are in contemporary Church History. Currently there are more than 20 doctoral students actively engaged in the field. Those who have graduated as doctors from CECH have been highly successful in finding employment in a variety of different fields, e.g., in publishing, in the churches, or in teaching and teacher education, as well as within universities.

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

Within the context of our focus areas of research, we will extend our expertise in the study of the 1960s and provide an authoritative Finnish perspective to the ongoing international discussion of the period. In addition, we will give increased attention to the ‘transition period’, from the end of the Cold War to the present. The rapid ongoing changes in European religious landscape, including Finland, naturally influence our scientific profile. Therefore, we will develop our expertise in multiculturalism and in the history of the different European minorities.

The quality of our research is verified by our strong international profile. In order to strengthen it even further and, consequently, to improve the quality of our research, we will pay specific attention to our publication policy, e.g. by way of publishing in high ranking journals and monograph series. Additionally, we aim to develop new research methods and augment interdisciplinary collaboration, both in Finland and internationally.
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2 PRACTISES AND QUALITY OF DOCTORAL TRAINING (MAX. 8800 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

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

The Recruitment and Selection of Doctoral Candidates

The Faculty of Theology has a rigorous selection process for entrance to doctoral training. Prospective students must hold an appropriate Master's level degree, ideally with the minimum grade requirement of magna cum laude approbatur. In addition, the applicants must submit a 15-page research proposal and a study plan which are evaluated first by professors in the applicant's respective field, and then by the Faculty's Research Committee.

The Supervision of Doctoral Candidates

Two supervisors are appointed to each doctoral of CECH student by the faculty. The faculty encourages students and supervisors to complete a Supervision Agreement, detailing the rights and responsibilities of both parties.

Within CECH, two postgraduate seminars lead by professors Lauha and Talonen function actively and meet on a regular basis. While professors are responsible for supervision, experienced docents (mid-career researchers) also act as supervisors and additionally, all senior researchers provide doctoral training.

In 2007–2009, following a successful pilot project within CECH, aiming to support doctoral students in planning and carrying out their studies, individual study plans have been adopted in the field of contemporary church history. Students are asked to formulate their plans and discuss them with their supervisor during three stages in their studentship. Topics such as study progress, supervision, integration to the research community, scientific networking, international contacts, and possible career perspectives are covered in the study plans. This system significantly enhances the quality of our doctoral training. Given its demonstrable benefits, we hope that the system will be embraced by the faculty as a whole.

Supervision at the individual level takes place between the supervisor and the student during appointments available to every doctoral student. This allows the supervisor to take the specific needs of each individual student into consideration. In addition, students receive instruction as a group in monthly postgraduate seminars, in the meetings of the research projects within CECH, and in various training sessions and symposiums arranged by both the faculty and the Finnish Graduate School of Theology (FGST). Through international contacts, students have been able to benefit from international supervision. Representatives – both domestic and international – from different academic fields such as history, sociology, and literature, are invited to act as supervisors, examiners, opponents and evaluators. One focal aspect of the regular meetings of the postgraduate seminars is the peer support between the students.
Collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes

An essential part of the doctoral training in Church History are joint courses for post-graduate students of all history departments in the University of Helsinki (UH) as well as courses and conferences for doctoral students organised by the Finnish Doctoral School of History of which several doctoral students of CECH are members. Cooperation between Nordic and Baltic departments of church history (e.g., Lund, Uppsala, Aarhus, Oslo and Tartu) is an integral element of our doctoral training. The significance of the long-term Nordic liaison was recently underlined by the decision of the University of Lund to grant a doctoral degree honoris causa for one of the PI’s of CECH.

CECH has cooperated very closely with the FGST: one PI is a member of the Board and eight of our doctoral students have been members of the FGST. The admission to the FGST rests on the academic quality and the progress of doctoral studies. The annual symposiums arranged by the FGST are open to all doctoral candidates of theology in the organising university, and a high number of our doctoral students have participated in them. In the symposiums, the doctoral students follow lectures by international scholars and present their own papers in English in order to acquaint themselves with international conference procedures and research environment. The international Advisory Board of the FGST acts as an external evaluator of and advisor on the doctoral training given in the FGST.

Our faculty is a founding member of the Global Network of Research Centers in Theology. CECH is represented in the network by one of our PIs. This low-cost international network enables doctoral students and post-docs to pursue their research in participating schools for one or two terms without heavy bureaucracy and provides international training and supervision.

Many doctoral students and senior researchers participate in an inter-disciplinary discussion group on contemporary ecumenism coordinated by the Department of Systematic Theology. Similar cooperation exists also with the Department of Practical Theology. Recognizing the value of networking, doctoral students at the faculty have also spontaneously launched an informal monthly gathering for sharing hints, concerns and good practices related to doctoral studies. In addition, at the Department of Church History the doctoral students have formed a committee to plan future prospects.

Good practise and quality assurance in doctoral training

The transparency of established practises in our doctoral training is a clear indication of quality.

In the faculty, doctoral training consists of postgraduate seminars, research projects, faculty provided special seminars and the Finnish Graduate School of Theology programme. Doctoral training within CEHC follows the strategic plans of the faculty, the FGST and the UH.

In order to further develop the quality of our doctoral training, CECH has recently invested in university pedagogical training. Several members of CECH from PIs to doctoral students have completed pedagogy courses arranged by the UH and new methods of higher education are implemented in teaching and supervision. For instance, self and peer assessments are an elementary part of seminar work of CECH.

Assuring good career prospects for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates

A doctoral degree from the faculty gives valuable qualifications and opportunities for the students. This is attested by the successful employment of newly graduated doctors of theology, both in academic and non-academic fields. Besides scholarly work, doctoral students are qualified for roles in society where high-level expertise in theology and religion is needed.

Apart from research work, the duties of doctoral students employed by the UH include teaching assignments and administrative tasks. Their primary responsibility, however, is to complete the doctoral
degree; other duties serve to develop their qualifications and thus help ensure good career prospects in the future.

Our doctoral students have gained valuable teaching experience assisting in seminars, tutoring undergraduate students, instructing essay groups and methodology exercise groups at the Master’s level, and teaching on topics related to their own research. Participation in research projects has provided them with first-hand experience of project work as well as international application and evaluation practices. Doctoral students are encouraged to make use of the international networks and complete a part of their doctoral studies outside Finland. For many of the students, the most essential libraries and archives related to their research are abroad. (See chapter 5.) Students are also commended to take courses, like Academic Writing in English, arranged by the UH and geared to doctoral students.

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

A major strength of CECH is the high level of both students and supervision. The faculty attracts a variety of young students among whom we can select and train the best. CECH has enhanced its doctoral training through increased supervision and external evaluation.

CECH is strongly committed to the global research community and international cooperation among the leading faculties of theology and religious studies, especially within LERU (League of European Research Universities). One example is the collaboration in doctoral training with the University of Heidelberg. Many doctoral students and one PI have participated in the international and multidisciplinary seminars organized jointly by the UH and the University of Heidelberg.

However, one of our challenges is how to better attract international students. Financial restraints and time limited funding pose considerable difficulties for doctoral students. In addition, the low number of post-doc positions remains a challenge. (See chapter 5). CEHC aims to improve external funding and advance its international appeal.

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 principal research themes of CECH have received extensive public interest because understanding the recent past is considered of great importance, especially by the media; examples of key issues being Cold War operations and Finlandizierung. Most doctoral theses, too, pay careful attention to the general political context, which extends their relevance to a wider audience beyond church historians, consequently these and other scholarly publications of CECH have received favourable coverage in newspapers and other media. Cold War topics have been a special object of media interest (e.g. Jalovaara 2007, Latvala 2008, and Meriläinen 2009).

The PIs of CECH have often been invited to appear in the media to comment on topical political and religious issues: PI Lauha has been especially sought out in this regard and has been interviewed on the Finns’ struggle to come to terms with their war-time past; PI Talonen has often been asked to comment on ecclesiastical developments. When Pope John Paul II died in 2005, PI M.Ketola gave interviews to several media outlets on the significance of the deceased pontiff and the challenges of his successor; his book on Opus Dei has also received considerable media attention.
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Two post-doctoral researchers of CECH (Jalovaara, Meriläinen) are web bloggers of Kotimaa, the leading ecclesiastical paper in Finland. Meriläinen is a regular guest on a radio discussion program that focuses on current religious phenomena.

The readiness to appear in the media can partly be seen as a result of the line taken by the Finnish Graduate School of Theology which encourages and trains doctoral students to popularize their research. The FGST also expects the doctoral students to develop other so called practical and transferable skills useful to them in a wide range of tasks in the society. The faculty’s annual doctoral courses have also provided tools and ideas for making research known to a wider audience.

An important forum for disseminating new research results to the general public has been the Finnish Society of Church History of which PI Ketola is the present chairman and PI Tiensuu was the former; Meriläinen is the secretary. During the academic year, the Society holds monthly lecture events open to the public at which many of the doctoral students have presented their research. Occasionally the Society arranges larger seminars and symposia; in 2008, for instance, the Society arranged a very popular seminar on the Finnish Civil War of 1918 at which members of CECH gave keynote lectures. Also, since 1990’s, Lavery has held a popular annual summer university lecture course on Finnish history and published a general history of Finland in English (2006).

The members of CECH hold positions in important ecumenical and ecclesiastical organisations. PI Lauha is a member of the Church and Society Commission of the Conference of the European Churches, and is a member of the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church’s EU Advisory Board which also includes many leading Finnish politicians. PI Ketola was a member of the Finnish Evangelical Lutheran Church’s Commission on the Church and the Jews in 2005–2010. Some members of CECH are also active in politics.

Ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC’s research and doctoral training.

The societal impact of CECH is already extensive and versatile. The members of CECH will be even more effective in presenting scholarly viewpoints on different aspects of religion to wider society through a variety of other forums. They will write Op-Eds and other expert opinion articles for newspapers and magazines, and give interviews.

The societal impact of CECH could be strengthened by a more pro-active policy of contributing to topical discussions and participation in the work of organizations and societies of wider scientific, political and ecumenical significance.

CECH will in the future also make even better use of the teologia.fi website maintained by three Finnish universities (the University of Helsinki, Åbo Akademi University and the University of Eastern Finland) with the aim of disseminating Finnish theological research to a popular audience. A series of articles on a wide range of theological topics is published three times per year. PI Lauha is its chief editor.

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

The international networks of CECH are numerous. The PIs hold significant positions of trust in various academic institutions and organizations, home and abroad, such as the Academy of Finland and CIHEC (Commission Internationale d'Histoire Ecclesiastique Comparée), where one PI is the official Finnish representative and another PI the secretary. PIs have evaluated research and teaching in countries like
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Finland, Sweden, Norway, Estonia, Lithuania, and Ireland, and are well represented in several scholarly societies and on editorial boards of academic journals, including Kirchliche Zeitgeschichte and Studia Theologica. Researchers and doctoral students have participated international conferences and done archive research both in Europe and North America.

The strongest geographic areas of expertise and the most important directions of collaboration of CECH are Nordic and Baltic countries, Central Europe, Italy, and United States. The members of the League of European Research Universities (LERU), such as the universities of Heidelberg and Lund, have been important partners of research and doctoral training (see chapter 2). The same can be said about the universities of Aarhus, Uppsala, Oslo and Münster. Among American universities the Finlandia University, and the universities of Oklahoma, Chicago, and Minnesota have been the most important partners.

One PI is a member of one of the Steering Committees of the American Academy of Religion, and one researcher received an award from the Immigration History Research Center (University of Minnesota). Two PIs have been among the forming members of the International Network of Baltic Church Historians. The opening of the archives of Pope Pius XI in the Vatican Secret Archives in 2006 led to the formation of an international network of Pius XI scholars. This has involved one of the PIs and two doctoral students. CECH has also been represented in the international research network Anti-Catholicism in Comparative and Transnational Perspective. A traditional American organization, the Society for the Advancement of the Scandinavian Study, chose a researcher from the RC as its President in 2009. Other international committees and networks with the RC members include for example the Society of Historians of Scandinavia, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Joint Committee of the Nordic Research Councils for the Humanities. Also the cooperation, which started before this evaluation period through the EU project on Churches and European Integration, has continued during this period in different forms.

Several members of CECH have had important positions in different national institutions, such as the Finnish Historical Society, the Luther-Agricola Society, and the Finnish Literature Society. The most important forum for collaboration is the Finnish Society of Church History (FSCN), whose main officers have long come from CECH. The majority of publications in the field of church history are published by the FSCN, who also arranges public lectures and seminars, and is active in international cooperation with societies like CINEC and journals such as Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique. About the national networking concerning doctoral training, see chapter 2

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

International collaboration has long been one of the strengths of CECH. A major challenge lies in tempting more international scholars to visit and work in Finland. Some improvement has already been achieved, when an American professor and a Hungarian researcher joined CECH recently. Despite of that, ongoing projects and active networks can and will be used more effectively for recruiting international scholars. The great diversity of language skills (Swedish, English, German, Italian, Spanish, French, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, and Latin) among the group has been of use in the international research and networking. The same skills enable CECH to publish more in international periodicals and journals. So far the majority of publications have been published in Finnish, even though the proportion of English has increased significantly during the last years. The fact, that the majority of sources are located in foreign archives, is another challenge. Work arrangements as well as financial solutions are needed to enable researchers to spend lengthy periods of research abroad.
5 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).

The core infrastructure for research in the University of Helsinki and the facilities of the Faculty of Theology provide a solid foundation for research and teaching. After dismantling its departments at the beginning of 2010, the faculty now functions as a coherent unit, and this has helped implement transparency into the process of resource allocation to all researchers and lecturers irrespective of their research specialisms, to the benefit of the faculty as a whole as well as CECH specifically. This administrative re-organisation has facilitated a harmonisation of the rights and responsibilities applicable to each individual scholar and teacher, and the more equitable allocation of travel and conference expenses, for instance. The faculty and CECH have also worked actively to promote equality in the work community.

Despite the fact that travel and related research expenses are now distributed more evenly, this does pose particular problems for CECH given that the nature of historical research requires work to be carried out both in Finnish and foreign archives. Lengthy periods abroad are often required, which obviously increases the costs of the research. We expect that the increased accessibility of 20th century historical sources (e.g. the opening of archives in Eastern Europe, the ongoing digitization of source material in various archives around the world etc.) will facilitate our work to some extent in the future; the National Digital Library project, aiming to improve the accessibility and long-term preservation of electronic materials, is a good example of progress being made. Another positive development is the building of a new university library in Helsinki, due to be completed in 2012. By assembling the collections of various small faculty libraries into a single unit, the university library will undoubtedly provide a boost for historical research, among others. The improved operational infrastructure will also enhance the expansion of digital collections and online databases accessible through the NELLI portal.

A satisfactory balance between research and teaching has been achieved. In addition to the tenured staff, some teaching tasks are carried by post-docs and doctoral students. In church history, doctoral students have been successfully introduced to academic teaching and they are frequently provided with more teaching opportunities than the minimum expected by the faculty. A greater challenge is the incorporation of administrative duties into research and teaching; this is especially demanding for the PIs. One PI is Dean of the faculty and a member of the Board of the Academy of Finland, and other PIs occupy a range of positions in the university. All the PIs are actively involved in scholarly organizations at home and abroad (see chapter 4). These extensive administrative duties inevitably mean less time for research and teaching. One specific and positive response to this challenge has been the incorporation of young scholars and doctoral students into all three aspects of academic work which has enabled some lightening of the work load for tenured staff. Naturally, this has been beneficial in supporting the training of doctoral students for an academic career.

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

One of our most important operational strenghts is the open and positive atmosphere in the work community. The ratio of men to women in CECH is close to optimal, and the PIs have emphatically supported and encouraged women to develop their academic careers. On the whole, the high level of both academic and administrative expertise is a major asset for CECH. Operational conditions can be enhanced through external funding and a major strength of CECH is experience in coordinating large scale research projects (e.g. funded by the EU).
The challenge now is to seek an optimal balance between the administration of research and the research itself. The development of a sabbatical system would provide a welcome opportunity for tenured staff to focus solely on research work at regular intervals. We will also continue to incorporate the younger members of our community into teaching and administrative duties. CECH contributes to the development of the research environment and works towards a more functional distribution of research, teaching, and administrative tasks.

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

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

Since 2010, the Faculty of Theology has functioned as a single financial and administrative unit which has enabled greater cooperation and joint planning of teaching and, to some extent, research. The general structure of the degrees and the guidelines for organizing teaching are planned by the Faculty’s Joint Committee for Teaching, but detailed planning and the actual teaching takes place within the Faculty’s departments and is led by a senior academic (currently, Prof. K. Arffman has this role for Church History). All academics within the Faculty’s eleven specialist subjects contribute to Master’s teaching. The Faculty also has a Joint Research Committee whose remit includes coordinating the recruitment of doctoral students and planning the general framework for doctoral training (see chapter 2).

Research is planned and carried out by specialist units based on the principal theological disciplines; thus CECH is situated within the Department of Church History. The Department’s tenured staff is composed of three professors and four university lecturers; of these two professors and three lecturers belong to CECH. Every professor is responsible for high level academic research work and its supervision and there are between 10–15 researchers and doctoral students at work in the department annually. PIs Lauha and Talonen both supervise their own postgraduate seminars, and arrange combined sessions of both seminars.

The role of the Departmental Amanuensis is crucial in coordinating the activity of the department. His duties include arranging meetings, advising students, updating the web pages and intranet, and ensuring the flow of information within the academic community. He also initiated in 2007 an innovative future-oriented committee of young researchers in the department which envisions the shape of future of church historical research and teaching in the faculty.

Researchers and teachers meet regularly in different forums to discuss topical issues; these might be related to the organization of Master’s level education, or to research and doctoral training. For example, the professors meet twice a year to discuss applications from prospective doctoral students of Church History with formal decisions being made by the Faculty’s Research Committee, where CECH is represented by Meriläinen. The frequent informal discussions about research in church history are very important and productive: an afternoon coffee session is organized monthly, and it has proved useful for sharing information about new or planned projects, publications etc. Additionally, docents not currently employed by the university are invited to docent meetings once a year.

As the Dean, PI Lauha has attended an extensive leadership training programme in 2009–2010. As a result new ideas on academic leadership have been reflected within CECH.
Project management is the responsibility of the respective PIs who are supported by the Faculty which arranges the re-allocations of teaching and other responsibilities of researchers working on externally funded projects. In applying for project funding, members of the CECH work together and even many of the younger scholars have contributed to funding applications, e.g. by compiling and writing the necessary documentation.

- **RC’s strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes.**
  
  A major strength is the supportive and sociable atmosphere of CECH, which contributes to positive feedback and a desire to co-operate. This is an important factor in providing an environment where innovative and exciting projects and ideas can be cultivated.

  All the PIs have demonstrable success in applying for funding and leading research projects, some of which have been very extensive large scale projects. Many members of CECH also have experience of participating in multidisciplinary projects, which is an obvious asset for us.

  To ensure that we have talented researchers in the future, we are constantly looking for promising young students with an interest in contemporary church history. They are encouraged to apply for doctoral training and advised on how to apply for researchers grants etc. Many of these students are recruited to the research projects of CECH.

### 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: **1040000**

- **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: -

- **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: -

- **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: **Aino ja Kaarlo Tiisalan rahasto**
  - **Alkoholitutkimussäätiö**
  - **Alfred Kordelinin säätiö**
  - **Eila ja Georg Ehrnroothin säätiö**
  - **Emil Aaltosen säätiö**
  - **Helsingin yliopiston rahastot**
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- Jenny ja antti Wihurin säätiö
- Kirkon tutkimuskeskus ja Kirkkohallitus
- Koneen Säätiö
- Suomen kulttuurirahasto
- total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: 840000

• 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:
  - 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: Doctoral programme positions financed by Ministry of Education and Culture, and University of Helsinki, total 182 months
  - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 500000

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

The strategic objectives of CECH relate to developing existing research strengths in the focus areas, increasing the international profile of our work while maintaining our strong national profile through the dissemination of research outcomes, and progressive improvements in the development of new researchers (doctoral and post-doc).

Specific developments within the focus areas. In area 2, we will extend our expertise in the study of the 1960s and provide an authoritative Finnish perspective to the ongoing international discussion of the period, collaborating with renowned scholars such as Hugh McLeod (Birmingham) and with research institutes, e.g. the University of Lund. Additionally, the ‘transition period’, from the end of the Cold War to the present, will receive increased attention. Within area 4, we aim to develop new research methods and interdisciplinary collaboration (e.g. with scholars in literature and art history), while maintaining the lively cooperation between Finnish and Nordic historians. The European religious landscape, including that of Finland, is rapidly changing and, naturally, this influences our scientific profile; consequently we will develop our expertise in multiculturalism and the different European minorities.

The scientific quality of CECH relies on our strong international profile in publishing, conference participation, and collaboration. We will pay specific attention to publishing in high ranking journals and monograph series and to encouraging scholars at all levels to participate in international academic discussion. Conferences like the AAR Annual Meetings are valuable for establishing contacts with publishers.

Our scientific quality is also measured by high level doctoral theses and the constant development of doctoral education and supervision is of utmost importance. New pedagogical methods, such as self and peer assessments, are promoted while an encouraging atmosphere for research is constantly nurtured. Furthermore, ongoing co-operation with other universities and institutions will be...
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augmented, both nationally and internationally, e.g., the faculty recently reached an agreement for closer co-operation with Emory University in Atlanta.

A major challenge lies in tempting more international scholars to visit and work in Finland. We participate in exchange programs such as Erasmus and DAAD, as well as small-scale visiting programs (e.g, with Erlangen, Mainz). We aim to provide more teaching in English, while encouraging students to constantly improve their language skills. In 2011–2013, we will host international workshops, for instance on the Ecumenical Movement and the Cold War.

The societal impact of CECH will be strengthened by an even more active contribution to the work of organizations of wider scientific, political and ecumenical significance. The teologia.fi service will be used to popularize our research, and we strongly support the endeavours to start an English version of this service. Under the auspices of the Finnish Society of Church History, public events and seminars on topical themes will continue to be organized.

External funding will be sought in cooperation with other disciplines of the faculty, as well as with researchers of neighboring disciplines from other faculties and universities, and the opportunities for large scale international research projects (EU, ESF) will be explored. To improve the quality of our leadership and management, we will focus on leadership training, including encouraging young scholars to develop these skills in the early stages of their academic careers. There will be a concentration on pedagogical training for both tenured staff and doctoral students. In accordance with the principle of “research based teaching”, all researchers of CECH contribute to Master’s education in the faculty.

Concerning the future significance of CECH, it is clear that high level research in contemporary church history is urgently needed. During the previous decades, religion and religious themes have become extremely topical, creating an acute demand for well-researched, academic studies of religion. We confidently expect that the significance of our work will only increase in the coming years.

The stage 2 materials of CECH have been compiled by the PIs Lauha, Talonen, Ketola, and Tiensuu; post-doctoral researcher Meriläinen and doctoral students Laine and Laitinen. The amanuensis of the Department of Church History collected the information concerning external funding in section 7. This working group was formed initially in November 2010 to prepare the stage 1 materials and it met twice before the turn of the year and three times in 2011. Between the meetings, each member of the group gathered information and drafted the section of the report assigned to her/him, and finally, the whole group revised the texts. Before including CECH’s doctoral students in the evaluation process, their permission was obtained and they were additionally asked to supply information concerning the funding of their doctoral studies.
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CECH/Lauha

1 Analysis of publications

- Associated person is one of Aila Lauha, Jouko Talonen, Kyllikki Tiensuu, Mikko Ketola, Jaakko Antila, Jenn Kreso, Mika Pettersson, Ville Jalovaara, Jenni Krapu, Mika Nokelainen, Jason Lavery, Juho Meriläinen, Tuomo Törmänen, Jarmo Kyrönlahti.

<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>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Article in conference publication (refereed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Unrefereed journal article</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Published scientific monograph</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceedings or special issue of journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Article in professional journal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Article in professional hand or guide book or in a professional database system, or text book material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular article, newspaper article</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Popular monograph</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005

2006

2007

2008

2009

A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)

2005
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B1 Unrefereed journal article

2005


2006


CECH/Lauha
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2007

2008

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

2005

2006
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2008


2009


2010
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CECH/Lauha


C1 Published scientific monograph

2005


2006


2007


2008


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

2005


2006


McLeod, H, Saarinen, R, Lauha, A 2006, North European churches from the Cold War to Globalisation, Publication / Church Research Institute, no. 56, Church Research Institute, [Tampere].
CECH/Lauha

2007

2008

2009

2010

Martikainen, T, Jalovaara, V 2010, Religionens återkomst: brytningspunkter i kyrkan, religionen och kulturen = Uskonnon ylösnousemus : kirkon, uskonnan ja kulttuurin muros, Magma-studie, Finlands svenska tankesmedja Magma, [Helsingfors].

D1 Article in professional journal

2007

2010


D2 Article in professional hand or guide book or in a professional data system, or text book material

2007
Ketola, M 2007, 'Mikä Opus Deissä oikein kiinnostaa?', Teologia.fi.

2010

Pajunen, M 2010, 'Ekumenia Suomessa', in A Laine, M Torppa (eds), Ekumeenisen kasvatuksen kirja , Suomen lähetysseura, Helsinki.

D5 Text book or professional handbook or guidebook or dictionary

2005

2007

2010
E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2005
Ketola, M 2005, 'Periaatteen miehiäkö?', Helsingin Sanomat.

2006
Ketola, M 2007, 'Mennesysysteemistä ei voi vapautua muistomerkkejä poistamalla', Helsingin Sanomat.

2007
Tiensuu, K 2006, ‘Kirkkouskovainen Nurmes’, Sana..

2008

Ketola, M 2008, 'Evanneen avulla meni lapsenpitäjänsä päähä', Helsingin Sanomat.

2009

Ketola, M 2009, 'Vierailleko paavi vihdoin Venäjällä?', Helsingin Sanomat.
Ketola, M 2009, 'Working towards the pope', Teologia.fi.
Ketola, M 2009, 'Juutalaiset ongelma katoliselle kirkolle', Kaleva.
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E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2005
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2006


2010


E2 Popular monograph

2005

Foltz, A, Foltz, R, Talonen, J, Yliniemi, E, Yliniemi, M 2005, A godly heritage: historical view of the Laestadian revival and development of the Apostolic Lutheran Church in America, [Editors], Frazee, MN.


2009

## Analysis of activities 2005-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and awards</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of research journal</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of manuscripts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of communication journal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of candidates for academic posts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in review committee</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in research network</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in interview for written media</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in radio programme</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in TV programme</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis
Aila Lauha,
Novakainen, Mika, Aila Lauha, 1998 → 2010, Finland
Aro-Heiskanen, Asa, Aila Lauha, 2002 → 2005, Finland
Jalavaara, Ville, Aila Lauha, 2002 → 2007, Finland
Koekkoek, Laura, Aila Lauha, 2002 → ..., Finland
Kyrö, Suvi, Aila Lauha, 2002 → ..., American Samoa
Vijanen-Pihkala, Aino-Majja, Aila Lauha, 2002 → ..., Finland
Isotalo, Eeva-Leena, Aila Lauha, 2004 → ..., Finland
Krapu, Jenni, Aila Lauha, 2004 → 2009, Finland
Lahtinen, Aapo, Aila Lauha, 2004 → ..., Finland
Lavola, Pia, Aila Lauha, 2004 → 2008
Mellinen, Juha, Aila Lauha, 2004 → 2009, Finland
Norvo, Nina, Aila Lauha, 2004 → ..., Finland
Pajunen, Mike K.T., Aila Lauha, 2004 → 2008, Finland
Peltonen, Matti, Aila Lauha, 2004 → ..., Finland
Virkkunen, Elsa, Aila Lauha, 2004 → ..., Finland
Laine, Antti, Aila Lauha, 2005 → ..., Finland
Bergström, Milla, Aila Lauha, 2006 → ..., Finland
Ahonen-Paavo, Aila Lauha, 2009 → ...
Ketola, Hanna-Majja, Aila Lauha, 2009 → ..., Finland
Kantala, Pirjo, Aila Lauha, 2010 → ..., Finland
Kotilainen, Tatu, Aila Lauha, 2010 → ..., Finland

Jouko Talonen,
väitöskirjan ohjaus, Carl E. Aarnio, Jouko Talonen, 2000 → ..., Sweden
jakso-opintojen ja väitöskirjan ohjaus, Jouko Talonen, 2005 → 2010
väitöskirjan ohjaus, Ah Kuiba, Jouko Talonen, 2005 → ...
väitöskirjan ohjaus, Juha Vainio-Läppä, Jouko Talonen, 2005 → ...
väitöskirjan ohjaus, Jyrki Kivelä, Jouko Talonen, 2005 → 2010, Finland
väitöskirjan ohjaus, Keijo Karvenen, Jouko Talonen, 2005 → ...
väitöskirjan ohjaus, Petri Haapakoski, Jouko Talonen, 2005 → ...
väitöskirjan ohjaus, Päivi Rohkiminen, Jouko Talonen, 2005 → ...
väitöskirjan ohjaus, Tuomas Pakkala, Jouko Talonen, 2005 → ...
ilmestäistutkimuksen ohjaus, Kerttu Kokkonen, Jouko Talonen, 2006 → 2011
väitöskirjan ohjaus, Ari Auranen, Jouko Talonen, 2006 → ...
väitöskirjan ohjaus, Jouko Talonen, 2006 → 2010
väitöskirjan ohjaus, Ilmari Rubenis, Jouko Talonen, 2006 → ...
väitöskirjan ohjaus, Timo Vuoh, Jouko Talonen, 2006 → 2011
CECH/Lauha

Prizes and awards
Kyllikki Tiensuu, Mikael Agricolan risti, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 30.03.2010, Finland
Juha Meriläinen, Doctoral Thesis Award 2010, Juha Meriläinen, 25.03.2010, Finland
Michael J. Karni Scholarship Winner 2010, Juha Meriläinen, 30.03.2010, United States

Editor of research journal
Aila Lauha, Kirchliche Zeitschrift (Scientific Periodical, Germany), Aila Lauha, 2001 → ..., Germany
Studia Theologica (Nordic/International Theological Journal), Aila Lauha, 2003 → 2010, Norway
Editor in chief of the Teologia.fi website, The aim of the, Aila Lauha, 2009 → ..., Finland
Kyllikki Tiensuu, KIRKKO-TAIDE - Vuosilta, Markku Halldorin juhlistaja, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2005 → 09.06.2005, Finland
Kirkkonen k kaleteri 2006, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Kirkkonen k kaleteri 2007, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Kirkkonen k kaleteri 2008, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Kirkkonen k kaleteri 2009, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Mikko Ketola, Suomen kirkohistoriallisten seuran vuosikirjan toimitaja, Mikko Ketola, 2003 → 2010, Finland
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Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran vuosikirja, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Kirchliche Zeitgeschichte, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Germany
Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran vuosikirja, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Communio Viatorum, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Czech Republic
Journal of Baltic Studies, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom
Kirchliche Zeitgeschichte, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Germany
Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran vuosikirja, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Jaakko Antila,
Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran vuosikirja, Jaakko Antila, 05.03.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Suomen kirkkohistoriallisen seuran vuosikirja, Jaakko Antila, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Peer review of manuscripts
Kyllikki Tiensuu,
Kirkon kalenteri 2011, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2001 → ..., Finland

Editor of communication journal
Mikko Ketola,
Vartija-lehteen päätömittaus, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Assessment of candidates for academic posts
Aila Lauha,
Assessment, Candidates for Professorship at the University of Oslo, Aila Lauha, 2009, Norway

Membership or other role in review committee
Aila Lauha,
Evaluation of study programs in Theology, Estonian universities, Member of the Evaluation panel, Aila Lauha, 02.05.2005 → 09.05.2005, Estonia
Evaluation of Research, Member of the Evaluation Panel, Uppsala University, Aila Lauha, 23.03.2007 → 27.03.2007, Sweden
Evaluation of study programs in Theology, Estonian universities, Member of the Evaluation panel, Aila Lauha, 30.09.2008 → 05.10.2008, Estonia

Membership or other role in research network
Aila Lauha,
Planning seminar of the EU-project "Embracing Eastern Europe", Nijmegen, Netherlands, Aila Lauha, 18.01.2007 → 20.01.2007, Netherlands
Network planning the EU-project Religious Tolerance and Interfaith Responsibility (for the 7. Frame-work programme), Aila Lauha, 04.12.2008 → 07.12.2008, Germany

Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board
Aila Lauha,
The Finnish Historical Society, research fellow, Aila Lauha, 1993 → ..., Finland
Board of the Department of Church History, Member, Aila Lauha, 01.01.1998 → 31.12.2009, Finland
Senate of University, Vice member, Aila Lauha, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2009, Finland
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CECH/Lauha

Teologisen tiedekunnan tiedekuntaneuvostoa, Jouko Talonen, 01.01.2008 – 31.12.2008, Finland
Kirjallihistorian professorin tehtävän täyttöön valmistautumisesta, Jouko Talonen, 04.02.2010 – 17.05.2010, Finland
Kirjallihistorian (vanhempi aika ja reformaatio) professorin tehtävän täyttämisen valmistautumisesta, Jouko Talonen, 04.02.2010 – 31.05.2010, Finland
Toimituskuunnan jäsen, Jouko Talonen, 2010, Estonia

Kyllikki Tiensuu ,
Suomalaisen Teologisen Kirjallisuusseuran johtokunta, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.1991 – ... , Finland
Suomen Historiallisten Seuran tutkijajärjestelmä, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.1993 – ... , Finland
Luitprandlisen Kulttuurin Säätiön valtakunnanjohtaja, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2000 – ... , Finland
Valtakunnallisen teologian tutkijakoulun johtoryhmä, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2000 – ... , Finland
Tieteilijän seuran valtakunnallisen tutkijakoulun hallitus, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2004 – 31.12.2010, Finland
Kirkon tutkimuskeskus, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2005 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Suomalaisen Teologisen Kirjallisuusseuran Suomen Toimituskuunnan jäsen, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Suomen Historiallisten Seuran Suomen Toimituskuunnan jäsen, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland

Mikko Ketola ,
Suomen Kirjallisuusseuran seura, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2007 – 31.12.2007, Finland
Suomen Kirjallisuusseuran seuran puheenjohtaja, Mikko Ketola, 19.01.2007 – ... , Finland
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CECH/Lauha

Katariina-instituutin johtokunta, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Suomen Kirkkohistoriallinen seura, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Suomen kirkkohistoriallinen seuran vuosikirjan toimitusneuvosto, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Suomen kirkkohistoriallinen seuran puheenjohtaja, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2009, Finland

C.HEC:n sihteeri, Mikko Ketola, 27.08.2010 → ...
Kirchliche Zeitgeschichte -akademikerin toimitusneuvosto, Mikko Ketola, 2010 → ..., Germany
Scandinavia and the Baltic in Transnational and International Challenges -julkaisusarjan toimitusneuvoston jäsen, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, United Kingdom
Suomen kirkkohistoriallinen seuran julkaisuneuvosto, Mikko Ketola, 2010 → ..., Finland
Suomen kirkkohistoriallinen seuran puheenjohtaja, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Finland

Vuonna tapetutavais kirkon Teologisena instituutin toimituskomitean jäsen, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2010 → 31.12.2010, Estonia

Jaakko Antila

Suomen kirkkohistoriallinen seura, Jaakko Antila, 05.02.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Suomen kirkkohistoriallinen seura, Jaakko Antila, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Juha Meriläinen

Helsingin yliopiston teologisen tiedekunnan jatkotutkimusauditorium, Juha Meriläinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Kirkkohistorian laitoksen jatkotutkimusauditorium, Juha Meriläinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Member of the Faculty Council, Faculty of Theology, University of Helsinki, Juha Meriläinen, 2007 → 2009, Finland
Member of the Research Committee of the Faculty of Theology, University of Helsinki, Juha Meriläinen, 2007 → ..., Finland
Teologisen tiedekunnan tiedekuntaneuvosto, Juha Meriläinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Teologisen tiedekunnan tutkimusvaliokunta, Juha Meriläinen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland
Vision Committee Member, Juha Meriläinen, 2007 → 2009, Finland
Steering Board Member, teologia.fi - web page, Juha Meriläinen, 01.01.2009 → 30.06.2009, Finland
Secretary and Treasurer of The Finnish Society of Church History, Juha Meriläinen, 01.09.2009 → ..., Finland
Secretary of the Finnish National Committee of the C.HEC, Juha Meriläinen, 01.08.2010 → ..., Finland

Mika Pajunen

Kirkolliskokouksen yleisvaliokunnan sihteeri, Mika Pajunen, 01.02.2010 → 30.04.2010

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization

Alia Lauha

The National Matriculation board - Assisting Member (Evaluator) 1993-, Alia Lauha, 1993 → ..., Finland
The Finnish Union of University Professors, Board of the Chapter of the University of Helsinki, Alia Lauha, 01.01.1999 → 31.12.2009, Finland
The Finland Institute in Germany, member of the board of commissioners of the Foundation, Alia Lauha, 2000 → ..., Finland
The Foundation of the Finnish Institute in Germany, Executive Committee Member, Alia Lauha, 2000 → ..., Finland
The Council of the The Finnish Union of University Professors, Member, Alia Lauha, 01.01.2001 → 31.12.2010, Finland
Council of the Helsinki University Science Foundation, Alia Lauha, 2005 → ..., Finland
Member of the Follow up committee in personnel affairs, Alia Lauha, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2008, Finland
The National Library, Vice Member of the Board, Alia Lauha, 01.08.2007 → ..., Finland
Member of the Advisory Committee of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland Church Committee for Responsible Investment, Alia Lauha, 2008 → ..., Finland
INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE
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The Board of the Research Center of Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, Aila Lauha, 2008
The Academy of Finland, Board of the Academy, Aila Lauha, 2010
The Academy of Finland, The Research Council for Culture and Society, Chair, Aila Lauha, 2010

Jouko Talonen,  
Teologisten tiedekuntien ja DIAK-ammattiomakohtaisen opintojen vertailussa työryhmä, Jouko Talonen, 01.05.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland  
Suomen teologinen instituuti (STI), hallituksen jäsen, 1. vpj, Jouko Talonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland  
Suomen teologinen instituuti (STI), hallituksen jäsen, Jouko Talonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland  
Lähetyshiljaisuus, Jouko Talonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland  
Perusta-lehtien neuvottelukunta, Jouko Talonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland  
Suomen teologinen instituuti (STI), Jouko Talonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Kyllikki Tiensuu,  
Yleisradio Oy:n harkausohjelmien valvontakunta, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2003 → ..., Finland  
Kirkon kulttuuripalkintotyöryhmä, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland  
Yleisradio Oy:n harkausohjelmien valvontakunta, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland  
Kirkon kulttuuripalkintotyöryhmä, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland  
Yleisradio Oy:n harkausohjelmien valvontakunta, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland  
Kirkon kulttuuripalkintotyöryhmä, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland  
Yleisradio Oy:n harkausohjelmien valvontakunta, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Finland  
Yleisradio Oy:n harkausohjelmien valvontakunta, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Mikko Ketola,  
Kirkohallitus, Kirkko ja juutalaisuus -työryhmä, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2005 → ..., Finland

Ville Jalovaara,  
Helsingin yliopiston yliopistounvalvoituskunta, Ville Jalovaara, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland  
Helsingin yliopiston yliopistounvalvoituskunta, Ville Jalovaara, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland  
Teologisen tiedekunnan tutkimustabletitus, Ville Jalovaara, 22.03.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

Aila Lauha,  
Teologian yliopillaiden tiedekuntaryhmä (The Student Corporation of the Students of Theology), Aila Lauha, 2000 → ..., Finland

Jouko Talonen,  
Lähetyshiljaisuus, Jouko Talonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Kyllikki Tiensuu,  
Kotialan liiton hallinnan toimikunta, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2001 → ..., Finland  
Nurmeksen evankelisien opiston ystävät ry:n hallitus, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2001 → ..., Finland

Sakunan Kehrä hallitus, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2002 → ..., Finland

Emi Cedernolz'in säätiö, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Hevringen evankelisien opiston hallintoelavoisto, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Hevringen evankelisien opiston hallintoelavoisto, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Kotialan liiton hallinnan toimikunta, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Luterilaisen Kulttuurin Säätiö, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Nurmeksen evankelisien opiston ystävät ry, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
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Satakuntalaisen Osakunta (Inspektorit), Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2005 – 31.12.2005, Finland
Suomen Luterilainen Evankeliumiyhdistys, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2005 – 02.07.2005, Finland
Emil Cedercreutzin säätiö, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Helsingin evankelisten opiston hallintoneuvosto, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Karjalan Liton hengellinen toimikunta, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Luterilaisen Kulttuurin Säätiö, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Nurmeksen evankelisen opiston ydittävä ry, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Satakunnan Kita, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Satakuntalaisen Osakunta (Inspektorit), Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Satakunnan Säätiö, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland
Emil Cedercreutzin säätiö, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2007 – 31.12.2007, Finland
Helsingin evankelisten opiston hallintoneuvosto, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2007 – 31.12.2007, Finland
Karjalan Liton hengellinen toimikunta, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2007 – 31.12.2007, Finland
Luterilaisen Kulttuurin Säätiö, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2007 – 31.12.2007, Finland
Nurmeksen evankelisen opiston ydittävä ry, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2007 – 31.12.2007, Finland
Satakunnan Kita, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2007 – 31.12.2007, Finland
Satakuntalaisen Osakunta (Inspektorit), Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2007 – 31.12.2007, Finland
Satakunnan Säätiö, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2007 – 31.12.2007, Finland
Nurmeksen evankelisen opiston ydittävä ry, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2008 – 31.12.2008, Finland
Satakuntalaisen Osakunta (Inspektorit), Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2008 – 31.10.2008, Finland
Satakunnan Säätiö, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 01.01.2008 – 31.10.2008, Finland
Jaakko Antila ,
Opiskelijoiden tietystilto, Jaakko Antila, 01.01.2006 – 31.12.2006, Finland

Participation in interview for written media

Jouko Talonen ,
Baltic Church History – meeting, Jouko Talonen, 25.06.2000 – 31.12.2011, Finland
Esthelin Pihlcan seurahankin kokouksissa, Jouko Talonen, 12.03.2000 – 31.12.2011, Finland
Luonto Allan seurakunnan tilaisuudessa, Jouko Talonen, 01.06.2000 – 31.12.2011, Finland
Muonion juhannusseurat, Jouko Talonen, 25.06.2000 – 31.12.2011, Finland
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Porjatan Sanomat 7, Jouko Talonen, 09.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Teologiset opintoraportit, SRO Kauhajoen, Jouko Talonen, 10.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Väen tie 1, Jouko Talonen, 07.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Fakultasföreläsningar i Teologiska fakultet i Upsala Universitet, Jouko Talonen, 10.12.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lahden koulutus 6, Jouko Talonen, 02.06.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Muninniemi seurakunta, Jouko Talonen, 26.08.2001 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Isalmis Sanomat, Jouko Talonen, 30.06.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Itälahti, Jouko Talonen, 27.02.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Liesma-lehti, Jouko Talonen, 07.05.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Vantaan Lauri-seurakuntalehti, Jouko Talonen, 13.06.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Rozentalis seuran vuosikirja 2002 (Forssas 2003), Jouko Talonen, 01.01.2003 → 31.12.2011, Latvia
Helsingin Kirjallinen opinen, Jouko Talonen, 02.11.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kirkkolakokouksen jälkevihkoon kunnan II osasto, Jouko Talonen, 01.02.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Liputan tirk-talo (Laajennetut seurakunta, Lahti), Jouko Talonen, 21.03.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Teologiset opintoraportit, Jouko Talonen, 10.01.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Tiili-seura (STJ), Jouko Talonen, 07.03.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Estettilä Etelä-Suomen Rahuan Sanan (Fidschiffreningen i Södra Finland) Avointen ovien päivässä Helsingin Leistatisaaren lehtrystyöttömin nukkehunneen, Jouko Talonen, 02.12.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Estettilä Oulun Historia-seuran toimialalla (Oulu), Jouko Talonen, 12.04.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Estettilä Rukolaisten herättysliikkeen 250-vuotimistov turbineassa (Kuusankoski), Jouko Talonen, 02.04.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Estettilä Tiilipu-senuraissa 2-10. 2006 (Helsinki), Jouko Talonen, 02.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Estettilä Helsingin OPKO:n opiskelijallaista, Jouko Talonen, 28.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Juhlapuhe inkoottosten kestsijuhlassa (Hyvinkää), Jouko Talonen, 09.07.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Keskoste eurooppalaisessa ja suomalaisessa ajattelussa-seminarissa. Järjestäjänä Tasavaltta-Seura ja Kristillisissä Solidariten Keskusta-Clubi, Jouko Talonen, 06.05.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Oulun yliopiston ikäihmisten yleislaitoksen kuntaliiton Pudasjärven kansansopistossa, Jouko Talonen, 23.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Yritysliitto Rauhan kiinnostossa kansansopistossa (Rajan), Jouko Talonen, 24.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Horinaien seuratavun listakirje, Jouko Talonen, 13.11.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Historian Ystävän Liiton XXIII historiaesiminaaria Lahden kansansopistossa, Jouko Talonen, 13.06.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Raatamatt- ja moominsopiväli (Tampere), Jouko Talonen, 30.03.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Seminarii: Tulevansuoden näkyvää (Rauhan Sanan sujuhdistelait), Jouko Talonen, 13.01.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
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Teologinen keskivinkkipiiri (Helsingin varsinaisen teologian tohtoripiiri), Jouko Talonen, 28.11.2007 – 31.12.2011, Finland
Yleisduonto Sairioon seurakunnassa, Jouko Talonen, 18.03.2007 – 31.12.2011, Finland
Kyllikki Tiensuu ,
YLE1, Horisontti-ohjelman kirkkohistorialliset henkilökuvat, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 28.11.1999 – 31.12.2011, Finland
Naisteologiyhdistyksen 70-vuotisjuhlaseminaari, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 18.03.2004 – 31.12.2011, Finland
Härnön Seurakunnan seurakunnan näitelauri, Kyllikki Tiensuu, 06.04.2006 – 31.12.2011, Finland
Mikko Ketola ,
YLE 1, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2001 – 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE 1, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2001 – 31.12.2011, Finland
YLE 1, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2001 – 31.12.2011, Finland
Aarnuketis (haastattelu), Mikko Ketola, 10.04.2005, Finland
Esitelmä Keskuutan eduskuntaryhmän järjestämässä esitelmiöitä ja esintöitä suureen Erkki Korpman kansalaissinissa, Mikko Ketola, 20.10.2005, Finland
HS Nyhiltse, Mikko Ketola, 08.04.2005, Finland
Haastattelevana Helsingin yliopiston dosenti Mikko Ketola Helsingin tuomiokirkon kryptan Exodus – Juutalaisen kansan historiaa näytelyssä, verkkokirjekirja, Mikko Ketola, 10.02.2005, Finland
KD (Kristillisdemokraattinen vikkipäivä, haastattelu), Mikko Ketola, 09.06.2005, Finland
Kotimaa (haastattelu), Mikko Ketola, 27.05.2005, Finland
Launtiarekkia, YLE 1, Mikko Ketola, 19.04.2005, Finland
Suomen Kuvalehti (haastattelu), Mikko Ketola, 26.08.2005, Finland
Suomen tietoturvaristo, Mikko Ketola, 01.01.2005 – 31.12.2011, Finland
Vantaan Lauri (haastattelu), Mikko Ketola, 20.04.2005, Finland
"Adolf Hitler luomi Saksan kansan mutta tuhoi vakavanun", Mikko Ketola, 09.08.2005, Finland
Dosenti Ketolan koodi, Mikko Ketola, 14.04.2006, Finland
Etu tauttaa, Mikko Ketola, 15.04.2006, Finland
Kirkonmiehen pohjalainen Da Vinci –mystear, Mikko Ketola, 20.03.2006, Finland
Plapa Henrik pääsi paloon, Mikko Ketola, 2006, Finland
Salalatik, teorissä, Mikko Ketola, 26.02.2006, Finland
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Suomalainen Da Vinci -mysteeri ratkaistaan lumisella Pohjanmaalla, Mikko Ketola, 17.02.2006, Finland
Ville Jalovaara,
LERU seminar on Research-Based Teaching, University of Helsinki, Ville Jalovaara, 23.03.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
What is Theology within the different theological fields?, Symposium arranged by the Finnish Graduate School of Theology, Turku, Ville Jalovaara, 23.09.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Hämeen Sanomat, Ville Jalovaara, 08.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Pohjoisen Sanomat, Ville Jalovaara, 30.11.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Suomenmaa, Ville Jalovaara, 07.11.2005 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kyrkpressen 1.3.2007 (haast. Stig Kammeren), Ville Jalovaara, 01.03.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Vantaa Lahti (haast. Paul Juusela), Ville Jalovaara, 22.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Helsingin Sanomat kuukausihetille haastattelu, Ville Jalovaara, 01.01.2009 → 31.12.2011, Norway

Participation in radio programme
Mikko Ketola,
Radio Dai, Mikko Ketola, 18.04.2005, Finland
YLE, Radio X (suora lähetys), Mikko Ketola, 04.04.2005, Finland
YLE, radion ulkomaantoinitus, Mikko Ketola, 04.04.2005, Finland
Haastattelu sarjassa Saksaaineitä, Mikko Ketola, 20.11.2005, Finland
Kultakuume-ohjelma, Mikko Ketola, 01.03.2006, Finland
Radio Dai, Mikko Ketola, 18.05.2006, Finland
Radio Dai, Mikko Ketola, 01.03.2006, Finland
Ville Jalovaara,
Hirsoon, Yle Radio 1, Ville Jalovaara, 11.11.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Hirsoon, Yle Radio 1, Ville Jalovaara, 04.11.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Participation in TV programme
Aila Lauha,
Reflections on the war-time past, Aila Lauha, 05.12.2005, Finland
Mikko Ketola,
Nelosen tv-uutiset, Mikko Ketola, 19.04.2005, Finland
Nelosen tv-uutiset (puhelinhaastattelu suorassa lähetysessä), Mikko Ketola, 19.04.2005, Finland
TV7 (haastattelu), Mikko Ketola, 06.06.2005, Finland
YLE Aamu-tv, Mikko Ketola, 20.04.2005, Finland
YLE Aamu-tv (haastattelu), Mikko Ketola, 04.04.2005, Finland
YLE En tv-uutiset, Mikko Ketola, 05.04.2005, Finland
Arto Nyberg, Mikko Ketola, 26.02.2006, Finland
Haastattelu K-Rappu-ohjelmassa, Mikko Ketola, 23.05.2006
Ville Jalovaara,
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Tv-uutiset, YLE 2 18.00 &amp; 21.50, Välisäätsö, 17.02.2007 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Appendix B.b.

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

**The bibliometric analyses by Helsinki University Library (HULib)**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Humanities
Aejmelaeus, Anneli – CSTT
Anttonen, Pertti – CMVG
Dunderberg, Ismo – FC
Havu, Eva – CoCoLoC
Heikkilä, Markku – RCSP
Heinämaa, Sara – SHC
Henriksson, Markku – CITA
Janhunen, Juha – LDHFTA
Kajava Mika, – AMNE
Klippi, Anu – Interaction
Knuutila, 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
Pulikkinen, Tuja – Gender Studies
Pyrhönen, Heta – ART
Ruokanen, Miikka – RELDIAL
Saarinen, Risto – RELSOC
Sandu, Gabriel – LMPS
Tarasti, Eero – MusSin
Vehmas-Lehto, Inkeri – TraST
Östman, Jan-Ola – LMS

Social Sciences
Airaksinen, Timo – PPH
Engeström, Yrjö – CRADLE
Granberg, Leo – TRANSRURBAN
Haila, Anne – Sociopolis
Hautamäki, Jarkko – CEA
Heinonen, Visa – KUMU
Helén, Ilpo – STS
Hukkinen, Janne – GENU
Jallinoja, Riitta – SBII
Kaartinen, Timo – SCA
Kettunen, Pauli – NordSoc
Kivinen, Markku – FCREES
Koponen, Juhani – DEVERELE
Koskenniemi, Martti – ECI
Kultti, Klaus – EAT
Lahelma, Elina – KUFE
Lanne, Markku – TSEM
Lavonen, Jari – RCMSER
Lehtonen, Risto – SocStats
Lindblom-Yläne, 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 – PosPu
Sumelius, John – AG ECON
Vaattovaara, Mari – STRUTSI
Vainio, Martti – SigMe

The next appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.
Contemporary European Church History (CECH)/Aila Lauha

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

Number of authors in publications/year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of authors</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</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>Grand total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Grand total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de_DE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>en_GB</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fi_FI</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lv_LV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sv_SE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>und</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language of publications 2005-2010

- FI 82.8%
- EN 10.9%
- DE 1.1%
- SV 2.2%
- LV 2.2%
- Other 0.7%
## Journal / Year / Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Grand total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teologinen Aikakauskirja</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kirkkohistorialisen Seuran Vuosikirja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vantaan Lauri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsingin Sanomat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaleva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotimaa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historiallinen Aikakauskirja</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teologia.fi</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perusta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchliche Zeitschrifteteilnehmer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvijas Luterānis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahava</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rauhan sana</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanansaataja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synvyus Suomen uskonnonopettajain liiton jäsenni</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annuntiatio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A propos [Elektroninen aineisto] : Suomen Akatemian lehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turun Sanomat</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristl perspektiv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkko ja kausunki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kuvaalehti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museo Suomen museoliiton julkaisu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lähde Historiallisen aikakauskirja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaube in der 2. Welt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kykykin Kirkon diakonia ja yhteiskuntatyön tiedotuslehti</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkerin kirkko</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomenmaa : Keskustapuolueen pää-läänenkannattaja</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uusi tie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkistoviesti</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialog (St Paul)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elämään</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pohjanlan joulu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vartiha : Ihminen, uskonto, yhteiskunta.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communio viatorum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reseptio : Kirkon ulkomaanasiain keskuksen teologisten asiain jaiston tiedotuslehti.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Journal ranking (Norway, Australia, ERIH)

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

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

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

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

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

ERIH ranking 2007-2008
Purpose of The European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH) is to develop and to maintain an impact assessment tool for European research journals. Journal classification processes are conducted by discipline-specific expert panels. In the ERIH 2007 Initial List there are three categories:

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

B = international publications, both European and non-European, with significant visibility and influence in the various research domains in different countries.

C = European publications with a recognized scholarly significance among researchers in the respective research domains in a particular readership group in Europe; occasionally cited outside the publishing country, though the main target group is the domestic academic community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teologinen Aikakauskirja</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historiallinen Aikakauskirja</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirchliche Zeitgeschichte</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanava</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Kirkkohistoriallisen Seuran Vuosikirja</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communio viatorum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialog (St Paul)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vartija : ihminen, uskonto, yhteiskunta.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norway</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Journal articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Publisher ranking (based on Norwegian ranking list)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>C1 Published scientific monograph</th>
<th>C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceedings or special issue of journal</th>
<th>D5 Textbook or professional handbook or guidebook or</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
<th>Publisher Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen kirkkohistoriallinen seura</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Finnish Society of Church History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomalainen teologinen kirjallisuusseura</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pohjola-Suomen historiallinen yhdistys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomalainen Kirjallisuuden Seura</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleksanteri institu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Research Institute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eerdmans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suomen Lähetysseura</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finlands svenska tankesmedja Magma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otava</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher ranking</th>
<th>Number of publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>