



UNIVERSITY OF ICELAND

The University of Iceland Research Fund (project fund)

Statement on the evaluation of applications

Method for evaluating applications, criteria for categorisation and proposals for grant allocations.

The Science Committee have produced a proposal designed to reduce the work involved in evaluating applications and make the application process simpler and more transparent:

- Evaluation of publication output shall be standardised between schools as far as possible.
- Evaluation of research plans shall be simplified and carried out in three steps.

Project grading

All new applications shall be sent to external experts for evaluation, but follow-up projects shall be evaluated by a review panel – follow-up projects which were last evaluated by an external expert 5 or more years ago shall, however, be sent for re-evaluation. In accordance with the reviewers' evaluation, the project is then awarded a grade:

- Excellent application
- A. Good application
- B. Satisfactory application
- C. Poor application

In the old system, grading was more complicated and a small grade difference could have a profound effect on categorisation. This change is intended to simplify grading and reduce discrepancies in evaluation related to differing focuses amongst reviewers.

Project grades affect the categorisation of applicants in the following manner (review panels should note that it is possible to raise or lower applicants should they consider there to be grounds to do so (Final categorisation)):

- Excellent application – possible to raise grant
- A. Good application – grant unaltered
- B. Satisfactory application – grant lowered
- C. Poor application – the project shall not receive funding

Progress Division of Science and Innovation staff shall review progress and contact the review panel if it is unsatisfactory or if something is considered unclear.

Evaluation of publication output:

The review panel will not suggest grant amount, they will rate and categorize the applicants.

The review panel shall receive information on an applicant's advanced points and publication points. The definition of publication points for the Research Fund can be found in Table 1.

The conclusion from evaluation of publication output will be used as guide when deciding the grant amount for each applicant. However review panels are required to go over factors concerning publication output in order to determine whether there is cause to raise/lower the applicant's rank. **For further detail see Final categorisation.**

Table 1. Definition of publication points

Publications	Evaluation System	Publication Points > 1 author	Publication Points 1 author
Articles in ISI journals with 20% highest impact factor	20	2	3
Articles in A category journals on ERIH index	20	2	3
Book chapters published by most respected international publishers	20	2	3
Articles in ISI journals (remaining 80%)	15	1.5	2.25
Articles in B category journals on ERIH index	15	1.5	2.25
Articles in Icelandic journals placed in the highest category according to evaluation	15	1.5	2.25
Book chapters in second evaluation category	15	1.5	2.25
Articles in C category journals on ERIH index	10	1	1.5
Articles in Icelandic journals placed in the second highest category according to evaluation	10	1	1.5
Book chapters in third evaluation category	10	1	1.5
Books in the highest evaluation category		5	7.5
Books in the second highest evaluation category		3	4.5
Books in the third highest evaluation category		2	3
Articles published in distinguished conference publications	10	1	1.5

Final categorisation

The review panel shall have a certain amount of leeway to change the ranking. The review panels should determine if applicant's scientific contribution suggests they should receive a lower/higher ranking.

The following factors may affect categorisation:

1. New staff (those who have completed their doctorates in the last three years and begun an academic career in that time, or whose academic career, based on time of hiring (as a lecturer or research specialist), is no longer than 3 years) shall be ranked higher should they receive a low ranking due to publication output. This shall be based on hiring from the year 2013.
2. The quality of publications, publication conventions and other issues directly related to publication output. If the quality of publications is particularly high (publications have had a particularly high impact and so forth), the applicant's ranking may be raised by one or more category. In this way, consideration is taken of applicants who publish a great deal internationally and in high quality outlets. Indicators may be, e.g., the h-index, number of citations and other such criteria. In the same vein, a ranking may be lowered by one or more category if it is clear that the applicant has not made a significant contribution to article

writing, i.e. is not a leading (first or last) author on the majority of those articles reported.

Finally, an applicant's ranking may be raised if the publishing conventions in a certain academic field are very low with regards to volume compared to other academic fields.

3. Personal circumstances. Illness, parental leave, etc. may be taken into account. Information regarding these factors will be provided by the Division of Science and Innovation.
4. Work in the field. Rankings may be raised by one or more category for researchers who have used research specifically to enhance public services and work in the relevant field. The review panel must supply solid reasoning for such a decision.
5. If the applicant has not applied for a grant from another fund in the past five years, the review panel is authorised to lower the applicant's ranking by one category.

A clear rationale for **any changes** in ranking must be given by the review panels, should they choose to make use of the given leeway to change the ranking otherwise the changes will not be taken into consideration by the Science Committee.

Finally, a member of the review panel shall present applications to the Science Committee.

Applications shall be discussed at a meeting after a written evaluation has been issued. If there is any connection between a member of the review panel and the application, or if relations between a member and the applicant are too close (cf. the Science Committee's statement on ineligibility), said member shall not attend the meeting.