

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ACADEMY OF FINLAND 1/17

ACADEMY PROGRAMME  
ON THE FUTURE OF LIVING AND HOUSING  
(ASU-LIVE), 2011–2015

EVALUATION REPORT

# ACADEMY OF FINLAND IN BRIEF

The Academy of Finland's mission is to fund high-quality scientific research, provide expertise in science and science policy, and strengthen the position of science and research. We are an agency within the administrative branch of the Finnish Ministry of Education, Science and Culture.

We work to contribute to the renewal, diversification and increasing internationalisation of Finnish research. Our activities cover the full spectrum of scientific disciplines.

We support and facilitate researcher training and research careers, internationalisation and the application

of research results. We are also keen to emphasise the importance of research impact and breakthrough research. We therefore encourage researchers to submit boundary-crossing applications that involve risks but also offer promise and potential for scientifically significant breakthroughs.

Our funding for research amounts to 428 million euros in 2016. Each year, our funding contributes to some 2,700 people's work (FTEs) at universities and research institutes in Finland.

For more information, go to our website at [www.aka.fi/eng](http://www.aka.fi/eng).

# CONTENTS

<b>1 Introduction</b> .....	6
1.1 Background .....	6
1.2 Goals and objectives .....	6
1.3 Preparation and organisation.....	7
1.4 Selection of projects.....	8
1.5 Final evaluation .....	9
1.6 Summary of evaluation results .....	10
<b>2 Evaluation</b> .....	11
2.1 Overall evaluation: success in achieving the goals and objectives of the programme .....	11
2.2 Programme implementation (coordination, role of steering group, participation of individual projects and researchers).....	12
2.3 Integration of results and synthesis at programme level .....	13
2.4 Evidence of scientific, societal and economic impacts.....	14
2.5 Contribution to researcher training.....	15
2.6 National and international collaboration and networking .....	16
2.7 Communication and media .....	17
<b>3 Summary of recommendations</b> .....	18
<b>Appendices</b>	
1. List of research projects and their funding .....	20
2. Assignment letter for the evaluation panel .....	22
3. Programme for evaluation panel meeting.....	24
4. Self-evaluation questionnaire .....	25
5. Communication and media visibility of the programme.....	29

## DESCRIPTION

Publisher	Academy of Finland	Date	3 January 2017
Author(s)	Evaluation panel		
Name of publication	Academy Programme on the Future of Living and Housing (ASU-LIVE), 2011–2015. Evaluation Report.		
Abstract	<p>In October 2008, the Board of the Academy of Finland decided to launch an Academy Programme with the title The Future of Living and Housing (ASU-LIVE). The programme approached living and housing as a substantive entity that comprises environmental issues from sustainable development to land use, logistics and services, and consumer issues from cultural needs through to health issues. The programme covered a wide range of recent housing trends and particularly various social, economic, technological and environmental issues related to housing. As well as producing high-level scientific results, the programme was designed to further deepen the dialogue between researchers and end-users of knowledge and to support and promote the application of new research results at an early stage.</p> <p>A working group consisting of members of the Academy’s research councils was appointed in January 2009 to prepare the programme. It convened five times, consulted several external experts and, in June 2009, organised an exploratory workshop that attracted more than 100 scientists and researchers to comment on the preparations of the programme and to develop its themes in three working groups. In November 2009, the Academy Board decided to open the first call of the ASU-LIVE programme in autumn 2010.</p> <p>Within the programme, the Academy granted 10 million euros in funding to five consortia and nine individual research projects. Moreover, a bilateral call was arranged for research funding proposals concerning the future of living and housing with the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS). As a result of the bilateral call, 958,830 euros was granted in funding to four Finnish-Japanese joint projects for a two-year funding period 2011–2012. The projects were fully integrated into the ASU-LIVE programme.</p> <p>This report presents an international expert panel’s assessment of the programme’s success in attaining the objectives set in the programme memorandum. The panel’s task was to assess the programme as a whole and to reflect particularly on the following: success in achieving the programme’s goals and objectives; programme implementation; integration of results and synthesis at programme level; evidence of the scientific, societal and economic impacts pursued; contribution to researcher training, national and international collaboration and networking; and communications and media. The panel was also asked to provide recommendations for the further development of Academy programme activities. The scientific quality of the programme was not assessed.</p>		
Keywords	housing, living, society, life spans, spaces, resident		
Name and number of series	Publications of the Academy of Finland 1/17		
ISSN	0358-9153		
ISBN	Print	PDF	978-951-715-891-6
Number of pages	31		
Distributed by	Academy of Finland, POB 131, FI-00531 Helsinki, viestinta@aka.fi		
Published by	Academy of Finland		
Place and date of printing			
Other information	<a href="http://www.aka.fi/publications">www.aka.fi/publications</a>		

## KUVAILULEHTI

Julkaisija	Suomen Akatemia		Päivämäärä	3.1.2017
Tekijä(t)	Arviointipaneeli			
Julkaisun nimi	Academy programme on the future of living and housing (ASU-LIVE), 2011-2015. Evaluation report.			
Tiivistelmä	<p>Lokakuussa 2008 Suomen Akatemian hallitus päätti käynnistää akatemiaohjelman ”Asumisen tulevaisuus (ASU-LIVE)”. Ohjelmassa asumista tarkasteltiin kokonaisuutena, johon sisältyivät ympäristökysymykset kestävästä kehityksestä maankäyttöön, logistiikkaan ja palveluihin, samoin kuluttajakysymykset kulttuurisista tarpeista aina terveysnäkökulmiin asti. Ohjelman viitekehys ja aihealueet valittiin siten, että ohjelma kattoi asumisen sosiaalisia, taloudellisia, teknologisia ja ympäristöön liittyviä kysymyksiä. Korkeatasoisen tieteellisen tutkimuksen lisäksi ohjelman avulla syvennettiin vuoropuhelua tutkijoiden ja tiedon käyttäjien välillä ja pyrittiin nostamaan keskusteluun perustutkimuksen tuloksia aikaisessa vaiheessa.</p> <p>Tammikuussa 2009 ohjelmalle nimitettiin Akatemian tieteellisten toimikuntien jäsenistä koostuva valmisteluryhmä. Ryhmä kokoontui viisi kertaa ja konsultoi ulkopuolisia asiantuntijoita erityisessä kutsutilaisuudessa. Kesäkuussa 2009 sen työskentelyn tueksi ja ohjelman lopullisten teemojen hahmottelemiseksi järjestettiin avoin niin sanottu tutkiva työpaja, johon osallistui yli sata asumisen tutkimuksesta kiinnostunutta tutkijaa ja muuta alan asiantuntijaa. Marraskuussa 2009 Akatemian hallitus päätti avata ASU-LIVE-ohjelman ensimmäisen tutkimusrahoitushaun syksyllä 2010.</p> <p>ASU-LIVE-ohjelmassa Akatemia myönsi rahoitusta yhteensä kymmenen miljoonaa euroa viidelle hankekonsortiolle ja yhdeksälle yksittäiselle tutkimushankkeelle. Lisäksi japanilaisen tutkimusrahoittajan Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) kanssa järjestettiin kahdenvälinen asumistutkimukseen kohdennettu tutkimusrahoitushaku, jonka seurauksena yhteensä 958 830 euroa myönnettiin neljälle suomalais-japanilaiselle hankkeelle kaksivuotiskaudelle 2011–2012. Nämä hankkeet integroitiin osaksi ASU-LIVE- ohjelmaa.</p> <p>Ohjelman päätyttyä kansainvälinen arviointipaneeli arvioi ohjelman onnistumisen ohjelmamuistioon kirjattujen tavoitteiden saavuttamisessa. Paneelin tehtävänä oli arvioida ohjelma kokonaisuudessaan ja kiinnittää erityistä huomiota seuraaviin seikkoihin: onnistuminen ohjelmalle asetettujen tavoitteiden saavuttamisessa, ohjelman toimeenpano, tulosten integraatio ohjelman tasolla, ohjelman tieteellinen, yhteiskunnallinen ja taloudellinen vaikuttavuus, panos tutkijakoulutukseen, kansallinen ja kansainvälinen yhteistyö ja verkostoituminen sekä ohjelman viestintä ja näkyvyys medioissa. Lisäksi paneelilta pyydettiin suosituksia Akatemian tutkimus-ohjelmatoiminnan kehittämiseksi. Ohjelman tieteellistä laatua ei arvioitu.</p>			
Asiasanat	asuminen, yhteiskunta, tilat, elinkaari, asukas			
Julkaisusarjan nimi ja numero	Suomen Akatemian julkaisuja 1/17			
ISSN	0358-9153			
ISBN	Painetulle kirjalle annettu tunnus	Pdf-versiolle annettu tunnus 978-951-715-891-6		
Sivumäärä	31			
Julkaisun jakaja	Suomen Akatemia, PL 131, 00531 Helsinki			
Julkaisun kustantaja	Suomen Akatemia			
Painopaikka ja -aika				
Muut tiedot	www.aka.fi/julkaisut			

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background

Launched in response to an initiative from the research community, the subject matter of the Academy Programme on the future of living and housing was rooted in pressing interests and concerns. Changes in family and age structures, in lifestyles and the workplace, as well as energy issues and the challenges of sustainable development, had been found to put a whole new focus on questions of living and housing. Correspondingly, the research concerns ranged from social and physical spaces to virtual environments. Requirements of accessibility, sustainability and variability had gained increasing prominence in relation to living and housing. Despite their prominence and importance, housing issues had received only modest basic research attention in Finland when compared to many other European countries. Moreover, the research field of housing was found to be widely dispersed in Finland.

The people behind the initiative came from different disciplines and universities, providing from the outset a multidisciplinary background for the programme. The programme was designed to cut across the fields of biosciences and environmental research, natural sciences and engineering, health research, as well as cultural and social research.

The main focus of the programme was on basic research and it approached the housing issue by concentrating on the individual resident. The programme was expected to have diverse and varied impacts and, importantly, to work closely with end-users of the knowledge produced and applications developers. It was

expected that by identifying common research themes and promoting user-driven research, the programme would help foster greater synergy between the various research partners in the field of living and housing.

## 1.2 Goals and objectives

The framework for the research programme was selected with a view to covering a wide range of housing trends and particularly various social, economic, technological and environmental issues related to housing. Projects funded under the programme were expected to espouse a multidisciplinary approach and to produce research results with wide-ranging applicability.

In addition to producing high-level scientific results, the programme was expected to promote the dialogue between researchers and end-users of knowledge, to raise debate about the results of basic research, and to support the immediate application of new research results. The programme was designed also to support doctoral training and research careers, to promote international networking, and to advance national multidisciplinary cooperation.

The scientific goals of the programme were as follows:

- examine future living and housing as a whole, from the resident's perspective, including a range of related topics from environmental and consumer issues to cultural factors and factors influencing residents' health

- emphasise the connections of basic research with housing practices
- produce internationally significant research evidence on living and housing
- strengthen multidisciplinary competencies and research environments in areas that will promote the development of housing research in Finland.

The research policy objectives of the programme were as follows:

- create new national and international research networks
- increase the mobility of doctoral students and researchers
- promote coordination and cooperation with other national and international partners
- raise public debate on the future of housing and facilitate informed decision-making.

The programme approached the future of living and housing as a substantive entity that comprises environmental issues from sustainable development to land use, logistics and services, and consumer issues from cultural needs through to health issues. Current forms of housing and housing needs were found to have been influenced among other things by changes in family structures and in the workplace, the growth of teleworking, the development of housing prices, urbanisation, population ageing, immigration and multiculturalism, as well as the increasing number of holiday residences and second homes. Also, the goals of ecologically and socially sustainable development had changed housing and perceptions of good living. Along with these changes, housing planning had become an integral part of environmental planning. On the reverse side of the coin, the instability in the

housing markets, social differences, poverty, and even homelessness had been increasing.

The emphasis on user-centred housing, aesthetic values and accessibility had raised target standards for housing. At the same time, internationalisation and migration were generating new flows of cultural influences in Finland. Hence, housing was perceived to be increasingly impacted by social and cultural factors. Changing housing needs were placing significant challenges most particularly on urban and regional planning, environmental engineering, architecture, housing production, and the development of the residents' position as consumers.

### 1.3 Preparation and organisation

In February 2007, the research community submitted to the Academy of Finland an initiative for the launch of an Academy Programme on living and housing. The Research Council for Culture and Society took the initiative to the Academy Board in autumn 2007 and in autumn 2008. At its meeting in October 2008, where it reviewed the Academy's 2010–2013 action plan and budget, the Board decided to grant budget authority for the preparation of the Academy Programme *The Future of Living and Housing*.

A working group charged with preparing the programme and consisting of members of the Academy's research councils was appointed in January 2009. The working group was chaired by Research Director Päivi Hovi-Wasastjerna (Research Council for Culture and Society), and its other members were Professor Jouni Häkli (Vice Chair, Research Council for Biosciences and Environment), Professor Kirsti Husgafvel-Pursiainen (Research Council

for Health), and Professor Hannu Hänninen (Research Council for Natural Sciences and Engineering). The Academy's Administration Office was represented by Science Adviser Tiina Forsman (Culture and Society Research Unit); Mikael Fogelholm, Director of the Health Research Unit; Pirjo Hiidenmaa, Director of the Culture and Society Research Unit; Science Adviser Maaria Lehtinen (Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Unit); Science Adviser Kyösti Lempa (Biosciences and Environment Research Unit); and Senior Science Adviser Jaana Roos (Programme Unit).

The working group consulted external experts at a round table meeting in March 2009. These experts were Professor Sirkka Heinonen (Finland Futures Research Centre), Research Professor Anneli Junnto (University of Kuopio), Research Professor Markus Laine (City of Helsinki), Programme Manager Mika Lautanala (Tekes – the Finnish Funding Agency for Innovation); Senior Architect Aila Korpivaara (Ministry of the Environment), Coordinator Kimmo Kurunmäki (University of Helsinki); Director Jukka Pekkanen (Confederation of Finnish Construction Industries), and Professor Kauko Viitanen (Aalto University).

The working group convened five times and in June 2009 organised an exploratory workshop, which attracted an attendance of 117 scientists and researchers. They were invited to comment on the ongoing preparations of the programme and develop its themes in three working groups.

On 3 November 2009, the Board of the Academy decided to open the first call for the new Academy Programme in the autumn of 2010.

## 1.4 Selection of projects

For the selection of projects to be funded, a programme subcommittee was appointed. It included Professors Jouni Häkli (Research Council for Biosciences and Environment, Chair of the committee), Pauline von Bonsdorff (Research Council for Culture and Society), Kirsti Husgafvel-Pursiainen (Research Council for Health), and Erno Keskinen (Research Council for Natural Sciences and Engineering).

The programme's original Steering Committee, as of January 2010, included all members of the subcommittee, as well as the following experts: Professor Bo Bengtsson (University of Uppsala), Research Director Päivi Hovi-Wasastjerna (Aalto University), Senior Adviser Sampsa Nissinen (Tekes), Research Director Anssi Salonen (RYM Ltd., Built Environment Innovations), Senior Architect Aulis Tynkkynen (Ministry of the Environment).

The tasks of the Steering Committee were to prepare the programme and submit to the programme subcommittee a proposal on projects to be funded; to manage the programme and answer for the follow-up; to be responsible for the final evaluation; and to supervise the coordination of the programme.

The application process was divided into two stages. At the first stage, in connection with the Academy of Finland's October 2010 call, applicants were invited to submit brief plans of intent of no more than four pages. Altogether 69 plans were submitted. The Steering Committee recommended that the Programme Steering subcommittee invite full applications from 37 initial applicants. The deadline for full applications, complete with research plans, was 31 January 2011. These applications



were reviewed by an international panel of experts. The Steering Committee submitted its proposal for a shortlist of projects to be selected, based on the scientific evaluation and the objectives set in the programme memorandum.

The international expert panel that carried out the scientific review of full proposals consisted of the following members: Professor Andre Thomsen (Delft University of Technology, Chair of the panel), Dr Magnus Bång (Linköping University), Professor David Clapham (Cardiff University), Professor Simin Davoudi (Newcastle University), Professor Dorly Deeg (VU University of Medical Center), Professor Maria Kaika (University of Manchester), and Professor Eva Sandstedt (Uppsala University).

On the basis of ratings provided by the review panel, the programme subcommittee granted, on 13 June 2011, altogether 10 million euros to five consortia and nine individual research projects.

As a part of the preparations for the programme, the Academy of Finland arranged, in 2010, a bilateral call for research funding proposals concerning the future of living and housing with the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS). On 17 June 2010, altogether 958,830 euros was granted to four Finnish-Japanese joint projects for the two-year funding period 2011–2012. These projects were fully integrated into the ASU-LIVE programme.

Since 2010, the Academy of Finland has participated in the European Joint Programme Initiative (JPI) Urban Europe through the ASU-LIVE programme. As a part of the ASU-LIVE exit plan, the Academy currently participates in the ERA-NET Cofund Smart Urban Futures

(ENSUF) joint call organised by JPI Urban Europe. The funding decisions on this call are due in December 2016.

The programme has led to a series of projects (5 consortia, 9 individuals and 4 with Japan) covering various aspects of future living and housing and addressing the programme's focus on accessibility, variability and to a lesser extent sustainability. The funded research projects include topics such as demographic change, the future of housing types, housing tenure, housing market restructuring and community-built housing, homelessness and second homes, local environmental qualities and health. The impact of technological developments on future housing and living has been addressed in a couple of joint projects with Japan. A complete overview of all funded projects can be found in Appendix 1.

## 1.5 Final evaluation

After its completion, the ASU-LIVE programme was evaluated by an international panel of experts. The panel was chaired by Professor Marja Elsinga (Delft University of Technology). Its other members were Professor Roger Andersson (Uppsala University) and Professor Simin Davoudi (Newcastle University). Dr Joris Hoekstra (Delft University of Technology) acted as the scientific secretary of the panel. The panel was asked to assess the programme as a whole, not the individual projects, and to reflect especially on the following issues:

1. Success in achieving the goals and objectives of the programme
2. Implementation of the programme (coordination, role of steering group, participation of individual projects and researchers)

3. Results and impact, integration of results and synthesis at programme level
4. Evidence of the scientific, societal and economic impacts pursued by the programme
5. Contribution to researcher training
6. National and international collaboration and networking
7. Communications and media

The basis of the evaluation was formed by the final reports of the funded projects, the researcher’s self-evaluations and other materials directly related to the activities of the programme, such as a media analysis prepared by the Academy of Finland Communications Unit. Moreover, in its meeting in Helsinki on 2016, the panel interviewed a number of the programme’s key persons (see Appendix 1).

The final evaluation procedure was designed by the programme’s final Steering Committee, which included the following members: Professor Pauline von Bonsdorff (Research Council for Culture and Society, Chair of the committee), Professor Erno Keskinen (Research Council for Natural Sciences and Engineering), Professor Sarianna Sipilä, Research Council for Health), and Professor Alfred Colpaert (Research Council for Biosciences and Environment), as well as the following experts: Research Director Päivi Hovi-Wasastjerna (Aalto University),

Professor Jouni Häkli (University of Tampere), Senior Adviser Sampsa Nissinen (Tekes), Research Director Anssi Salonen (RYM Ltd., Built Environment Innovations), Senior Architect Aulis Tynkkynen (Ministry of the Environment).

### Rating scale

In its assessment of the different elements of the programme, the panel used a rating scale from 1 to 6:

- 6 = outstanding
- 5 = excellent
- 4 = very good
- 3 = good
- 2 = fair
- 1 = poor

## 1.6 Summary of evaluation results

Evaluation topic	Rating (1–6)
Overall evaluation	5-
Implementation	4
Integration and synthesis	3
Scientific, societal and economic impacts	4
Contribution to researcher training	2.5
Collaboration and networking	4.5
Communication and media	6

## 2 EVALUATION

This section gives an overview of the results of the evaluation. It deals with each of the seven evaluation topics that were formulated in section 1.3. These seven topics are also included in the assignment letter for the evaluation panel (see Appendix 2).

### 2.1 Overall evaluation: success in achieving the goals and objectives of the programme

It should be stressed that our grading of the overall success should not be seen as a mean value of the other six evaluation topics but rather as a judgement of whether the programme achieved its key goals and objectives. The panel's overall evaluation of the ASU-LIVE programme is very positive. The programme has raised awareness of housing research and housing issues in Finland, both among professionals and the general public. People have become more conscious of the fact that housing is important for the health and wellbeing of residents. The programme has resulted in a number of relevant and interesting research projects that would not have been possible without the programme's funding. Connections and collaborations between Finish housing researchers have been strengthened and the Finnish housing research community has become less fragmented. The topic of the programme was very timely and relevant and the research attracted a large amount of media attention. These are all important achievements that really made a difference. In sum, the panel concludes that the overall objectives of the programme were met. For a more detailed evaluation of the various

subgoals of the programme, we refer to sections 2.2 to 2.7.

By focusing on the future of housing and living from the perspective of the resident, the initial scope of the programme was rather broad. The panel thinks it was a sensible choice to focus on the individual resident. This made the programme interesting and relevant to society and filtered out more technical and engineering-oriented housing research. Despite this, there still was a significant degree of heterogeneity in the research projects that were finally funded. The self-evaluation survey among the researchers indicates a high degree of multidisciplinary working and some degree of interdisciplinary learning although some researchers mention the risk of fragmentation. It is suggested that some projects were not about housing at all and hence the common ground for building cooperation was reduced. As far as the scope of a research programme is concerned, it is a challenge for the Academy of Finland to strike a good balance between attracting a large amount of good and innovative research proposals on the one hand (this requires a broad scope), and the wish of integration at programme level (this requires a narrower scope) on the other hand. The panel thinks that the initial scope of the ASU-LIVE Academy Programme was good. However, now that the housing research landscape in Finland has been scanned and mapped, a possible follow-up programme on housing could have a narrower focus. This would allow for a better integration of the various individual research projects that are part of such a programme.

The ASU-LIVE Academy Programme was connected with a bilateral call for research funding proposals concerning the future of living and housing with the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS). Although the panel understands the financial and political considerations behind this bilateral call, we doubt whether the research projects that have been funded through it really fit within the ASU-LIVE programme. Both in terms of content and duration (the projects with Japan lasted two years whereas the other research projects lasted four years), the joint Japanese-Finnish projects seem a bit isolated from the rest of the research programme. We advise the Academy of Finland to make future joint research calls more content-driven. What is the common ground between the countries in the joint call? What can they learn from each other's research?

Every research programme has the ambition to have a lasting impact on the future, both in scientific and societal terms. At this moment, the scientific follow-up of the ASU-LIVE programme is unclear. The programme established important collaborations and connections between Finnish housing researchers, as well as with housing researchers from abroad. The future will show whether these networks will sustain and be able to attract sufficient research funding. Obviously, this is primarily the responsibility of the researchers themselves. Nevertheless, the Academy of Finland can have a facilitating role here. The Academy could, for example, consider organising thematic meetings where researchers that were active in the ASU-LIVE programme could present their plans for the future and assess whether there is a common ground for joint proposals. In such meetings, the Academy could advise the participating researchers on how to apply for funding.

Also, the follow-up of the research could be mentioned as one of the evaluation criteria in the call for proposals so that researchers are stimulated to already consider this when writing their proposals.

## 2.2 Programme implementation (coordination, role of steering group, participation of individual projects and researchers)

The panel thinks that the programme was implemented in a very good manner. The participating researchers were satisfied with the programme coordination. During the interviews, various stakeholders stated that both the Programme Manager and the Communications Unit of the Academy of Finland did an excellent job. Once a year, the Academy organised a seminar of 1.5 days that was compulsory for the researchers that participated in the research programme. These seminars were highly appreciated by the researchers and seen as useful in learning about other projects, networking and collaborating with other research groups. Some researchers stated that the overall integration of the research programme would have been bigger if the annual seminars had had a more innovative and interactive design. It was also suggested to organise thematic sessions for researchers that are working on more or less the same topic in order to increase the chances of mutual cooperation.

Initially, the idea was to have separate meetings for the principal investigators (PIs) of the various research projects. However, this idea did not materialise. The panel sees this as unfortunate. We think that a yearly PI meeting, possibly tied to the annual seminars, would possibly have increased the overall integration of the programme. At such a meeting, the PIs could discuss both thematic and practical

issues and learn from each other's experiences.

The panel is positive about the role of the Steering Committee. It consisted of well-respected academics from various disciplines. The Committee met some four times a year and also participated in the annual seminars. Although the Committee remained in the background, it played an important coordinating role in all phases of the ASU-LIVE programme.

### **Transparency and accountability**

The Academy of Finland uses a so-called *ex ante review* to assess the quality of research proposals. The idea is that at the start of a research programme, research proposals are thoroughly evaluated by means of a peer review procedure. After the completion of this procedure, the money is granted to the best proposals. During the term of the research programme, there is no further review of the progress and the research results. After their research projects have ended, the principal investigators are requested to submit a so-called final report in which the main achievements of the research project are listed. However, there is no formal research evaluation in which the quality of the research is assessed. The panel appreciates the freedom and trust that the Academy grants to the individual researchers. Nevertheless, there seems to be some room for improvement in the procedure, both in terms of transparency (from the side of the Academy) and accountability (from the side of the researchers).

As far as *transparency* is concerned, the panel advises the Academy to clearly phrase the goals of the research programme in the call text. This would allow the

applicants to tailor their research proposal to these goals and increase the chances that the programme's objectives are actually met.

In terms of *accountability*, the panel suggests that the Academy organise a mid-term review, for example, after 2.5 years. In this review, the progress of each research project, particularly with regard to the main objectives of the research programme, should be monitored and evaluated. If the mid-term review shows that some projects really lag behind, the Academy should have the option to stop the funding (this option thus requires that the funding is paid in terms). At the end of the research programme, a peer review of the scientific results of the various research projects may be considered. In setting up these procedures, it is up to the Academy to find a good balance between accountability and control on the one hand, and cost-efficiency, trust and flexibility on the other hand. In the current situation, this balance seems a bit skewed in favour of the latter three aspects.

### **2.3 Integration of results and synthesis at programme level**

The self-evaluation documents and the summaries of the various research projects do not show evidence of a significant programme-level synthesis. This is probably due to the fact the programme dealt with quite different topics and disciplines. In 2015, a joint book (in Finnish, not available as 'open access') was published in which some important results of the research programme were presented in a popular way. Furthermore, a few of the research projects within the ASU-LIVE programme collaborated with each other which resulted in some joint publications. The panel acknowledges

these efforts but observes that, overall, there has been little cooperation between the different research projects. This is also mentioned as a weak point of the research programme in the self-evaluation by the researchers. In order to come to a somewhat better integration of programme results, the panel suggests that the Academy of Finland (in cooperation with the PIs) publish a brochure or flyer (open access) in which the main results of the ASU-LIVE programme are presented in an accessible way and connected to each other where possible.

### Towards an academic programme director?

The panel had some discussion on whether the overall integration of the ASU-LIVE Academy. Programme would have benefited from the appointment of an academic programme director. This could have been a part-time function for a respected academic in the field of housing and living. The pros and cons of such a programme director are listed in the table below. In the end, the panel thinks that the desirability of appointing an academic programme director depends on the following factors:

- The size of the research programme: the more extensive (in terms of funding) the research programme, the bigger the need for an academic programme director. Moreover, the costs of a programme director will be comparatively less if the research programme is more extensive.
- The desirability of integration of the various research projects that are formulated within the framework of the programme (this obviously also depends on the theme of the programme). The higher this desirability, the bigger the need for an academic programme director.

- The profile of the programme manager of the Academy of Finland. The programme manager and the academic director work in close cooperation and therefore it is important that they are complementary to each other. Depending on his/her profile, the programme manager might also fulfil some of the tasks of the academic programme director, thus making the latter less necessary.
- The availability of suitable candidates: it might be difficult to find well-respected academics that are willing to take up a part-time job as a programme director with many managerial responsibilities.

Pros	Cons
Academic leadership: preparing meetings and joint publications of the programme	Expensive
Can assure coherent outcomes and integration of the research results	Risk of more bureaucracy/ time-consuming coordination (between programme manager and program director)
Ambassador of the programme and focal point for media and policy-makers	Might be difficult to find suitable candidates

## 2.4 Evidence of scientific, societal and economic impacts

The scientific significance and originality of the research outcomes varies between projects. Some have produced internationally important outcomes while others have covered well-travelled grounds. The self-evaluation by the researchers that participated in the programme shows a high degree of satisfaction in relation to the impact of the programme on consolidating a fragmented field of research and enhancing its

visibility. In this respect, it should be noted that a detailed review of the scientific quality of the output of the programme is beyond the scope of this evaluation report (see also Appendix 2). In order to get more insight into this issue, the Academy of Finland might consider appointing a separate evaluation panel.

In terms of societal impact, some projects have already been taken up in public debate and policy discussions. However, it generally takes time for research projects to have visible and measurable impacts. In any case, the panel observes that the visibility of the research was high (see also section 2.7). A high visibility is usually a necessary condition, although not a sufficient one, for realising societal and economic impacts. In future programmes similar to ASU-LIVE, the Academy of Finland could possibly increase the societal impact of the research by translating the research results into policy recommendations (the principal investigators and the steering committee could also have a role in this). These policy recommendations could be presented at annual seminars. The Academy might also consider explicitly inviting relevant policy-makers to these seminars and ask them to respond to the policy recommendations. It is important to be innovative in this respect because policy-makers will generally only go to meetings with a programme that fits their agendas and tastes.

In terms of connections with practice, some projects have linked to practice more directly than others. The business sector (economic impacts) was less present in the group of stakeholders despite the significant role of the housing developers, builders, funders and investors in housing futures. This is related to the fact that the Academy of Finland primarily funds basic research. For the funding of more applied

research projects, there is a separate funding agency (Tekes).

## 2.5 Contribution to researcher training

The panel thinks that the contribution to researcher training is the weakest point of the ASU-LIVE Academy Programme. According to the available statistics, the programme resulted in eleven PhD degrees and three master's theses. Even though these figures might not be completely up-to-date and accurate (one of the projects has not yet reported its final results and some PhD projects are still ongoing), this production is quite limited given the size of the programme and the amount of funding available. Part of the explanation for this can be found in the organisation of the Finnish research funding system. The Academy of Finland primarily funds research projects of researchers that already have a PhD degree, whereas PhD candidates are directly funded by the Finnish universities (who receive funding for this from the Finnish Government). Consequently, the ASU-LIVE programme did not have dedicated funding for PhD projects. Nevertheless, it was possible to give university-funded PhD candidates a role in the programme by connecting their PhD projects to one of the funded research projects. Given the broad scope of the programme and the theoretical and policy relevance of the research topic, there were ample possibilities for this. The panel regrets that the participating universities did not make better use of these possibilities. PhD students are the housing researchers of the future and therefore are very important for securing the long-term scientific impact of the programme.

The ASU-LIVE Academy Programme did not organise specific PhD training for the PhD candidates that were active in the

programme. These PhD candidates mainly relied on the regular training that was offered by their universities. The self-evaluation survey shows that they were generally satisfied with this training. For future programmes, the panel would advise the Academy of Finland to aim for a higher number of PhD candidates, for example, by setting clear goals with regard to this topic in the call text, and by indicating that this will be one of the review criteria. Applicants should be requested to indicate how they will involve PhD students in their research projects. If a research programme indeed succeeds in accommodating a significant number of PhD candidates, it is advisable to organise separate workshops or training events for this group. This would not only improve researcher training but might also increase the overall integration of the research programme.

What has been said above about PhD projects, both in terms of analysis and recommendations, also applies to master's projects. The panel observes that several Finnish universities that participated in the ASU-LIVE Academy Programme offer master's programmes that fit within the scope of the programme. In some cases, the ASU-LIVE programme resulted in the addition of new courses (e.g. about housing economics) to these master's programmes. Master's students sometimes also assisted with the collection of research data. However, the number of students that actually wrote their master's thesis within the framework of the ASU-LIVE programme is very low (3). This is regrettable, because the graduation of master's students can have a lasting impact on future housing research and practice. After all, students that graduate on the topic of housing are quite likely to also take up a future job within the housing field.

The ASU-LIVE programme did clearly have a positive impact on the careers of the participating researchers that already had a PhD degree. As a result of the research carried out within the programme, several of these researchers were promoted to a higher academic rank and/or managed to secure funding for future research projects.

## 2.6 National and international collaboration and networking

The ASU-LIVE Academy Programme has provoked a lot of cooperation and networking, both nationally and internationally. First of all, the programme allowed Finnish researchers to meet each other, take note of each other's research and collaborate. During the term of the programme, some research groups and researchers have really 'found each other' (both within research consortia and between research projects), which has resulted in several joint publications. This made a big difference compared to the situation before the research programme started, when housing research in Finland was very scattered and fragmented. The programme did not result in domestic mobility: there were no researchers that temporarily moved from one Finnish university to another. During the interviews, the panel learned that given the small size of the housing research community in Finland, domestic mobility is not really needed to collaborate with other researchers and learn from each other's research. Once the contacts are established, Finnish housing researchers tend to find each other rather easily. Furthermore, there are also administrative barriers that make temporary moves from one Finnish university to another less easy than it seems.



The programme was also expected to lead to international research networks and international mobility of researchers. In terms of international research networks, there were strong connections with several European countries such as the UK and Sweden, as well as with the US, New Zealand and Japan. In terms of international researcher mobility, the whole programme resulted in 84.5 international mobility months, which can be seen as a good achievement. Nevertheless, these months were unevenly distributed over the various research projects, with some projects having no international mobility at all. Personal reasons, as well as teaching and administrative responsibilities at the 'home university', often play a role here. For researchers with families, temporarily moving to another country is not a decision that is lightly taken.

The management of the ASU-LIVE programme did not steer strongly to stimulate researcher mobility. There was money available for this, but principal investigators had the freedom to spend this money in other ways as well. The panel feels that if the mobility of researchers is really an important goal, the steering should be stronger and smarter. First of all, just as in the case of PhD and master's degrees, the call for applications should state clearly that international mobility is important and that the research proposals will also be reviewed on this aspect. The applications should indicate what type of international mobility is envisaged, and how that fits within the proposed research. Second, it is advisable to ring-fence part of the research funding for the purpose of researcher mobility only. As far as this is concerned, it is important to strike a good balance between the importance of researcher mobility on the one hand, and flexibility for PIs on the other.

## 2.7 Communication and media

The communication and media visibility was one of the strongest elements of the ASU-LIVE programme. Although it differs between individual research projects, the media analysis of the Communications Unit of the Academy of Finland (see Appendix 5) shows that the programme as a whole attracted an impressive amount of media coverage. The topic of housing and living turned out to be a very timely and relevant one. The programme management and the Communications Unit of the Academy played an excellent role in enhancing and facilitating media coverage, for example, by submitting press releases and inviting representatives of the media to events. In relation to this, the panel thinks that the large media coverage (the programme was consistently in the news) not only had a positive impact on the programme as a whole but also on the individual research projects (a research project that is part of a research programme that gets so much media coverage must be interesting...).

As a possible way to further improve the media coverage of future research programmes, the panel suggests to work with so-called 'embedded' journalists. These are journalists that (as part of their training or because they receive some funding from the research programme) follow the research of the programme from the beginning to the end and frequently report on new developments. Finally, appearance in print media and on TV has been higher than in social media; a point that can be taken into account in the future.

### 3 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on its evaluation of the ASU-LIVE Academy Programme (see section 2), the panel has the following recommendations for the Academy of Finland. The Academy may take these recommendations into account when setting up a research programme that is similar to the ASU-LIVE programme.

- Give future calls for applications in the field of housing research a somewhat narrower focus to allow for a better integration of the various research projects that form part of the programme.
- Make future joint research calls (involving funding agencies of two or more countries) more content-driven: identify the common ground between the countries in the call and indicate how they can learn from each other's research.
- Give the annual seminars a more interactive and innovative character and consider the organisation of thematic meetings.
- Organise an annual meeting for principal investigators, possibly tied to the annual seminars, in which both thematic and practical aspects can be discussed.
- Organise thematic meetings at the end of the programme. In such meetings, researchers that work on more or less similar topics could explore whether there is a common ground for developing joint proposals, and the Academy could advise the participating researchers on how to apply for funding.
- Mention the follow-up of the research as one review criterion in the call text. This will stimulate researchers to already think about follow-up when they are writing their proposals.
- Improve the transparency of the programme by clearly phrasing its goals in the call text. This would allow applicants to tailor their research proposals to these goals, which would increase the chance that the goals are actually met.
- Improve the *accountability* of researchers by organising a mid-term review, for example, after 2.5 years, in which the progress on the main objectives of the programme is monitored and evaluated. If the mid-term review shows that some projects really lag behind, the Academy of Finland should have the option to stop the funding (this option thus requires that the funding is paid in terms). At the end of the programme, a peer review of its scientific results could be considered. In setting up these arrangements, it is up to the Academy to find a good balance between accountability and control on the one hand, and cost-efficiency, trust and flexibility on the other hand.
- Produce a brochure or flyer for the general public in which the main results of the programme are presented in an accessible way and connected to each other where possible.

- Consider the appointment of an academic programme director in order to increase the overall integration of the programme, also depending on the theme and size of the programme, the profile of the programme manager and the availability of suitable candidates.
  - Translate the research results into recommendations for policy-makers that can be presented at the annual seminars, and to which the policy-makers can respond in an interactive session.
  - Increase the number of PhD degrees and master's degrees produced by the programme by setting clear and ambitious goals with regard to this topic in the call text. Ask the applicants to clearly indicate how they will incorporate PhD students and master's students in the proposed research.
- 
- Organise separate workshops and training events for PhD candidates (and possibly also master's students) within the framework of the programme (on the condition that the programme accommodates a sufficient number of PhD candidates and master's students).
  - Increase international researcher mobility by setting clear and ambitious goals with regard to this topic in the call text.
  - Ring-fence some of the programme funding for international researcher mobility only.
  - Consider further enhancing the media coverage of the programme by working with so-called 'embedded journalists' and paying more attention to social media.

## Appendix 1. List of research projects and their funding

### Academy Programme The Future of Living and Housing (ASU-LIVE), 2011-2015

#### Consortia

**Hall, Colin Michael**, Itä-Suomen yliopisto

Furman, Eeva, SYKE

Tuulentie, Seija, METLA

*Homes beyond Homes: Multiple dwelling and everyday living in leisure spaces*, 1 148 153 €

**Muilu, Toivo**, Oulun yliopisto

Mäntysalo, Raine, Aalto-yliopisto

Vihinen, Hilikka, MTT

*Balancing local politics, housing preferences and sustainability in the new detached housing areas in the rural-urban interaction zones*, 880 734 €

**Ruonavaara, Hannu**, Turun yliopisto

Bengs, Christer, Aalto-yliopisto

Haila, Anne, Helsingin yliopisto

*The Finnish Housing Regime in Transition*, 973 031 €

**Tyrväinen, Liisa**, METLA

Lanki, Timo, THL

Korpela, Kalevi, Tampereen yliopisto

*Green Infrastructures for Health in the Future Living Environments*, 594 601 €

**Viitanen, Kauko**, Aalto-yliopisto

Tiilikainen, Aimo, VTT

*Research on resident-driven infill development possibilities – case study in urban areas in Finland*, 1 031 976 €

#### Individual projects

**Juhila, Kirsi**, Tampereen yliopisto

*Long-term homelessness and Finnish adaptations of the ‘Housing First’ model*, 696 824 €

**Karppi, Ilari**, Tampereen yliopisto

*Creating meaningful continuities between urban dwellers, technologies and environments in planning (CONTURB)*, 646 075 €

**Kortteinen, Matti**, Helsingin yliopisto

*New urban poverty and the renovation of prefabricated high-rise suburbs in Finland (PREFARE)*, 657 741 €

**Kröger, Teppo**, Jyväskylän yliopisto

*Moving in Old Age: Transitions in Housing and Care (MOVAGE)*, 631 908 €

**Martikainen, Pekka**, Helsingin yliopisto

*The implications of changing family structures and population ageing on long-term housing trajectories, housing wealth and health, and nursing home residence*, 520 283 €

**Määttä, Tapio**, Itä-Suomen yliopisto

*Neighbour disputes and housing in Finland*, 525 254 €

**Rantanen, Taina**, Jyväskylän yliopisto

*Life-Space Mobility in Old Age (LISPE)*, 652 350 €

**Tani, Sirpa**, Helsingin yliopisto

*Dwelling with the city: children and young people as participating residents*, 657 133 €

**Terviö, Marko**, Aalto-yliopisto

*Modeling housing market frictions - tools for policy analysis*, 383 937 €

### **Joint projects. Academy of Finland and Japan Society for the Promotion of Science**

**Katsuyuki Haneda**, Aalto University

*Improving the quality of medical treatment and daily healthcare: an approach from wireless communications and networks*, 240 000 €

**Marketta Kyttä**, Aalto University

*Inhabitants in Contexts, Place-based comparative research on ecosocially sustainable environments in Finland and Japan*, 238 820 €

**Juha Röning**, University of Oulu

*Interactive Context-aware System for Persuasion of Energy Efficient Living*, 240 000 €

**Liisa Tyrväinen**, Finnish Forest Research Institute

*Stress-reducing qualities of urban green areas*, 240 000 €

## Appendix 2. Assignment letter for the evaluation panel

### Academy Programme The Future of Living and Housing (ASU-LIVE), 2011-2015

#### EVALUATION PANEL MEMBERS

1. Prof. Marja Elsinga (Delft University of Technology)
2. Prof. Roger Andersson (Uppsala University)
3. Prof. Simin Davoudi (Newcastle University)

#### RATIONALE

The aim of the process is not a scientific evaluation of the programme. Rather, it is the aim of the panel to assess how the programme succeeded in producing added value to current research on the housing and living, whether there is evidence of scientific, societal and economic impacts of the programme, how it was received in the media, and how the researchers experienced their participation in the programme.

#### TASK

The panel shall read and analyze the reports of the ASU-projects, the researchers' self-reflections (online-questionnaire), media analysis, as well as other materials directly related to the programme. In its two-day meeting in Helsinki, the panel will conduct interviews with various relevant people, e.g., the Programme Manager, the Chair of the programme Steering Group, Director of the Academy of Finland Programme Unit, two principle investigators of ASU-research projects, and two other researchers.

The panel is expected to assess the programme as a *whole*, not the individual projects, and to discuss especially the following issues:

1. Success in achieving the goals and objectives of the programme
2. Implementation of the programme (coordination, role of the steering group, participation of individual projects and researchers)
3. Results and impact, integration of results and synthesis at programme level
4. Evidence of the scientific, societal and economic impacts pursued by the programme
5. Contribution to researcher training
6. National and international collaboration and networking
7. Communications & media

#### REPORT

The evaluation report will be written by the panel in English. The report should be a short and explicit strategic tool for the development of various programme activities in the Academy of

Finland (for the benefit of the Academy Programme Unit, the Research Councils, and the Board of the Academy).

#### SCHEDULE

- June: collection of reports from individual ASU-projects
- Summer: on-line self-evaluation questionnaire to the ASU-projects
- September: all relevant evaluation materials sent to the members of the panel
- November: panel meeting in Helsinki (interviews and preparation of the report)
- December: publication of the report

#### PRACTICAL MATTERS

Each panel member will receive an honorarium (EUR 1700, tax will be deducted). The Chair of the panel receives an honorarium of EUR 2000, tax will be deducted. Also the panel secretary receives an honorarium. All travelling expenses (economy class) and accommodation will be reimbursed.



Arja Kallio, Director  
Academy Programme Unit  
Academy of Finland

## Appendix 3. Programme for evaluation panel meeting

### **EVALUATION PANEL OF THE ACADEMY OF FINLAND RESEARCH PROGRAMME THE FUTURE OF LIVING AND HOUSING (ASU-LIVE)**

#### **Panel Programme**

**Academy of Finland, Hakaniemenranta 6, Helsinki**

**16–17 November 2016**

#### **Tuesday 15 Nov.**

19:00 Get-together dinner

#### **Wednesday 16 Nov.**

10:00–10:15 General information and guidelines

10:15–11:00 Opening discussion

11:00–12:00 Interview with researchers:

– Dr. Essi Eerola, VATT Institute for Economic Research, Public Economics

– Dr. Outi Jolanki, Univ. of Tampere, Social Gerontology

12:00–12:30 Discussion

12:30–13:15 Lunch

13:15–14:15 Interview with Principle Investigators

– Prof. Hannu Ruonavaara, Univ. of Turku, Social Research/Sociology

– Prof. Ilari Karppi, Univ. of Tampere, Regional Studies

14:15–14:45 Discussion

14:45–15:15 Interview with the Director of the Academy of Finland Programme Unit,  
Dr. Arja Kallio

15:15–15:45 Interview with the Chair of the Steering Committee, Prof. Jouni Häkli

15:45–16:15 Interview with the Programme Manager of ASU-LIVE, Dr. Risto Vilkkö

16:15–17:00 Discussion

#### **Thursday 17 Nov.**

9:00–10:00 Conclusions

10:00–12:00 Discussion

12:00–13:00 Lunch

13:00–15:00 Final discussion



## Appendix 4. Self-evaluation questionnaire

### Introduction

Academy of Finland research programmes are evaluated by a dedicated international group of experts after the end of the programme funding period. For this purpose, participants of the ASU-LIVE programme are asked to fill in the following self-evaluation questionnaire, which will provide important information for the evaluators. This self-evaluation is an official and integral part of the evaluation, and therefore, filling in the questionnaire is mandatory. **Please answer in English.**

Replies can be given anonymously. However, personal information may be included in the end of the questionnaire. Sections A–C are directed to all researchers, whereas the section D is meant only for the principle investigators.

**The deadline for submitted replies is XX July 2016**

Let it be noted, that the principle investigators are expected to submit their final reports to the Academy of Finland online services by 15 June 2016.

The questionnaire includes two kinds of questions:

1. Multiple choice questions with numerical scale 1-5:  
5 = strongly agree; 4 = agree; 3 = neutral; 2 = disagree; 1 = strongly disagree
2. Written comments and answers (free text)

Thank you for your help for the success of the ASU-LIVE evaluation process!

### Questions A: General issues

To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

- a. The objectives of ASU-LIVE programme were overall relevant. (1-5)
- b. The objectives of ASU-LIVE programme were overall achievable with the available funding. (1-5)
- c. ASU-LIVE programme succeeded in promoting multi- and/or interdisciplinarity in our research area. (1-5)  
If possible, give an example. (Open space for an answer)
- d. ASU-LIVE programme promoted the development of our research area. (1-5)  
If possible, give an example. (Open space for an answer)

Open comments on general issues: (Open space for an answer)

## **Questions B: Coordination and collaboration within the programme**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

- a. The coordination of the programme significantly helped our project to achieve its objectives. (1-5)
- b. The coordination efficiently contributed to the overall integration of the programme. (1-5)

Please describe how your project interacted and collaborated with other ASU-LIVE projects? (Open space for an answer)

Open comments on coordination and collaboration: (Open space for an answer)

## **Questions C: Personal research and career related experiences**

Please estimate to what extent you were able to promote your personal:

- Scientific goals (1-5)
- Networking (1-5)
- Training (1-5)

Please briefly describe your personal main objectives with respect to the programme? (Open space for an answer)

**Please estimate how much the following factors supported your personal research?**

- Institutional/university support (1-5)
- National collaboration and networks (1-5)
- International collaboration and networks (1-5)
- Availability of qualified research personnel (1-5)
- Other sources of funding (1-5)

**Did the programme generate on the national level such research cooperation that you would not have had without this funding? (Yes/No)**

**Did the programme generate such international research cooperation that you would not have had without this funding? (Yes/No)**

If yes, please name the country/countries

Open comments on personal experiences: (Open space for an answer)

## **Questions D: To be answered by the Principle Investigators of the projects**

To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

- a. ASU-LIVE funding was essential to our research. (1-5)
- b. In our project, ASU-LIVE funding significantly promoted research careers. (1-5)
- c. ASU-LIVE funding was sufficient for the execution of our original research plan. (1-5)
- d. Our project greatly benefited from being a part of the ASU-LIVE programme in relation to:
  - Scientific results (1-5)
  - National collaboration (1-5)
  - International collaboration (1-5)

- Researcher training (1-5)
  - Researcher mobility (1-5)
  - Visibility in media (1-5)
- e. We succeeded in completely achieving our original goals during the project funding period. (1-5)
- f. The results of our work could not have been achieved without being part of the ASU-LIVE programme. (1-5)

**Please list all your ASU-LIVE related activities in the public media. (Newspaper articles, TV and radio interviews etc.) You may provide links to publications and activities.**  
(Open space for an answer)

**Have you made use of social media to promote your ASU-LIVE related research results, or to engage in public discussion (e.g. Twitter, LinkedIn, blogs, etc.).**  
(Open space for an answer)

**From the research point of view, how do you see the main opportunities and challenges in dealing with the media and wider public?** (Open space for an answer)

**Please give an estimate: The practical applicability of our research is very high**

- In the short term (up to 5 years) (1-5)
- In the long term (more than 5 years) (1-5)

**Please give examples of how your research results could lead to practical applications.**  
(Open space for an answer)

**Please give examples of how your research results have already led to practical applications.** (Open space for an answer)

**Please indicate the extent of involvement of the following stakeholders in your project. Our project closely collaborated with:**

- Research partners (as listed in the grant application) (1-5)
- Other researchers and academic stakeholders (1-5)
- Policy makers (1-5)
- Government experts and officials (1-5)
- NGOs (1-5)
- Business organizations (1-5)
- Public organizations (local authorities, cities, municipalities, etc.) (1-5)
- The media (1-5)
- Civil society at large (1-5)

**What do you consider to be the main result or greatest highlight of your ASU-LIVE project**

- a) **From the scientific point of view.** (Open space for an answer)
- b) **For the private or public organizations.** (Open space for an answer)
- c) **For the public media and wider society.** (Open space for an answer)

### **General Evaluation of the ASU-LIVE Programme (free text)**

- What were the strengths of the ASU-LIVE programme?  
(Open space for an answer)
- What were the weaknesses of the ASU-LIVE programme?  
(Open space for an answer)
- How could the ASU-LIVE programme have been improved?  
(Open space for an answer)
- Do you have recommendations for the development of the Academy of Finland programme activities? (Open space for an answer)

### **Voluntary information:**

- Name of the respondent: (Open space for an answer)
- Title of the ASU-LIVE project: (Open space for an answer)
- Organization: (Open space for an answer)
- Department: (Open space for an answer)
- E-mail: (Open space for an answer)

## Appendix 5. Communication and media visibility of the programme

Media analysis  
Communications Unit  
Leena Vähäkylä

Sep 12 2016

### **Research Programme on The Future of Living and Housing (ASU-LIVE): Programme communication 2011–2015**

#### **A summary of measures taken and media visibility in the programme**

##### *1. Communication about Academy of Finland research programmes*

Communication about the Academy's research programmes called Academy Programmes is based on the communications strategy of the Academy of Finland. According to this strategy, the Academy disseminates information to its stakeholders and the general public on its activities, Academy-funded research, research careers, and the significance of scientific research to society at large.

Communication about Academy Programmes is a target-oriented effort carried throughout the duration of the programme in question. For this purpose, the Academy uses different media channels and communication methods in a creative way. In its international communications, the Academy publishes press releases via the European science news service AlphaGalileo and via the global science news service EurekAlert (operated by AAAS).

Besides press releases, the Academy also presents research programmes, programme objectives and the results of programme projects in its own media (e.g. website and publications). The Academy also arranges seminars and public events (fairs, science events and science cafés) with a view to disseminating information about its research programmes.

##### *2. Background*

When the ASU-LIVE programme was launched, communication was considered one of the main tasks of the programme coordinator. One of the programme's research policy objectives was to raise public debate on the future of housing and facilitate informed decision-making. The programme had a significant public role because of its highly topical theme.

##### *3. Press conferences and press communications*

The first press release was published about research funding decisions on 20 Sep 2011. Yleisradio, the Finnish Broadcasting Company (later YLE) featured the topic on the internet news in Finnish. The main point in the news was Finnish-Japanese co-operation.

The opening seminar was held on 21-22 Nov 2011. Press invitations were sent in Finnish only. The seminar did not interest the media. Some universities published the invitation and programme on their websites.

The first press release to attract great media exposure was a release about neighbour disputes (27 Aug 2012). The project 'Neighbour disputes and housing in Finland', headed by Professor Tapio Määttä, organized an open workshop on the subject and the press release was published by the University of Eastern Finland to coincide with the workshop. The news story was published in 31 newspapers (Finnish only) and it was also picked up in television newscasts on two Finnish TV channels, MTV3 and YLE. Four editorial articles were published: in *Pirkanmaan Sanomat* (local newspaper), *Ilkka*, *Itä-Savo* and *Länsi-Savo* (provincial newspapers).

The programme organised a larger media and stakeholders event (7 Jun 2013) together with the SKIDI-KIDS programme. Five media picked up the story, of how leaving home early affects young people. The media in question were *Nuotta* (young people's magazine), *Plusmedia* (*Nuotta*'s Estonian edition), *Helsingin Sanomat* (the biggest newspaper in Finland), *Keskisuomalainen* (provincial newspaper) and the webmagazines *Verkkouutiset* and *Uusi Suomi*. Later (11 Feb, 2015), *Uusi Rovaniemi* (local newspaper) interviewed psychologist Raisa Cacciatore, who also referred to the programme's results.

The Communication Unit of the Academy of Finland organized a 'science breakfast' (one of the Academy's press conference formats) for journalists about the difficulty of taking up permanent residence in one's second home (6 May 2014). The results reported came from the project 'Homes beyond Homes: Multiple dwelling and everyday living in leisure spaces'. This item interested media widely too. 29 newspapers wrote about it and it was featured on MTV3 news and YLE news. The latest articles on this subject were written as late as October 2014.

The Academy of Finland produced a video with Deski (an idea site for journalists) about the way young people spend their time (6 Aug 2014). Deski also made a press release on the subject. Five print media (*Aamulehti*, *Ilkka*, *Kansan Uutiset*, *Pohjalainen* and *Vantaan Sanomat*) and MTV3 news made stories.

Homelessness was one of the themes of the ASU-LIVE programme. YLE news and *Aikalainen* (the magazine of the University of Tampere) interviewed researcher Riitta Granfelt from the University of Tampere (17 Oct 2013). Granfelt was also interviewed by Fun Tampere, a local radio station, after the University of Tampere's article about Granfelt's research (17 Feb 2015).

Postdoctoral researcher Erja Portegijs was interviewed for YLE news on the topic of elderly people's living space (9 Apr 2014). There was a comment on the subject in the letters to the editor of the newspaper *Ilkka* a few days later. Portegijs was a researcher in the project 'Life-Space Mobility in Old Age' at the University of Jyväskylä.

Programme Manager Risto Vilkkö was interviewed for six newspapers or magazines: *Lempäälän-Vesilahden Sanomat* (local newspaper, 15 Mar 2012), *Rakennuslehti* (magazine on building and construction, 19 Apr 2012), *Karjalainen* (provincial newspaper, 28 Jan 2015), *Viva* (women's magazine, 3 Nov 2015), *Me naiset* (women's magazine, 19 Nov 2015) and *3H+K* (magazine on housing, 5 Feb 2016).

The ASU-LIVE programme's researchers wrote a popular book, a compilation of articles on the themes of the programme. It was published as part of the Academy of Finland's series *Tutkitusti*, in co-operation with publisher Gaudeamus, and edited by Jouni Häkli, Risto Vilkkö and Leena Vähäkylä. The book was published at the Helsinki Book Fair 2015. Two websites featured news about the publication. Local newspaper *Vaasan ikkuna* wrote a short piece about the book. 365 copies have been sold.

#### *4. Social media*

A Twitter search of the programme name ASU-LIVE gives no hits, and there are no hits on Facebook, either. The programme did not have its own Facebook page or Twitter account. When the programme began, Twitter was not as popular as it is today. Some of the programme's projects used Twitter, as they mention in the Webropol survey, but without mentioning the name of the actual programme.

#### *5. Summary*

The ASU-LIVE programme was quite well covered in print media and television. When press releases were published or press conferences organised they always attracted great publicity. One or two 'science breakfasts' for journalists are normally organised for each research programme. The Academy of Finland also invites journalists to opening and ending seminars. However, it is very unusual in Finland that journalists take part in seminars. Some of the projects within the programme were active and organised their own press conferences or wrote press releases. All press releases and invitations to the press were made in Finnish only.

In summary, the programme can be said to have featured topics of current interest and many of the projects dealt with topics that interested the general public, with neighbour disputes and second homes as good examples. This explains why the programme got so much publicity.