

Evaluation System for Public Universities

Evaluation Criteria

The Evaluation System for Public Universities forms the basis for job evaluation of academic staff, i.e., persons hired in accordance with standard procedure (assessment of qualification) who are members of the Icelandic Association of State University Professors or other collective bargaining organisations party to the Evaluation System (including the Union of University Teachers, Teachers' Association of the Iceland University of Education and Akureyri Union of University Teachers).

At the University of Iceland, publications and published materials not associated with the University of Iceland (Icel. *Háskóli Íslands*) are not evaluated. Evaluation covers research, teaching, administration and service work and other factors. Annual performance reporting takes the form of a report detailing activities during the previous year. At the University of Iceland, reporting also includes updating the teaching resume, an overview of collaboration with parties outside the University and an overview of work done outside the University. No points will be awarded before a satisfactory performance report has been submitted.

Research

Research evaluation is largely based on the publication outlet. Research appearing in a publication outlet that makes rigorous scholarly demands of its content is considered to have been already evaluated with regards to data solicitation, originality and contribution to advancement of knowledge. The peer-review process is a critical factor in publication. For peer review to be considered satisfactory, the material in question must be sent to a minimum of two reviewers. Peer review must be anonymous and professional. It must relate to content and be made by recognised experts in the field in question. Publication distribution, accessibility and impact are also evaluated.

Teaching

Teaching activity and quality are evaluated, including publication of teaching materials, innovation in teaching and supervision of graduate students. At the University of Iceland, points for teaching experience (B1) are not awarded unless the teaching resume has been updated (see above). This resume must be updated annually as part of the performance reporting process.

Administration, service, etc.

Administrative work is evaluated for points (cf. C), as is service work (cf. D). Points are given for specific administrative positions held within the university. Most positions evaluated under section C involve work under the aegis of the university as a whole or its various schools. Administrative work under the aegis of individual departments is not, in general, evaluated for points according to these rules. Public education work and services that build on an individual's expertise are evaluated under section D.

A. Research

a) Division of points for multi-author material

For multi-author books (A2), book chapters (A3), academic articles (A4), conference proceedings (A5), editorial work on academic publications (A7), reports, reviews and translations (A8), teaching materials (A9) and innovations (A10), division of points is calculated as follows:

Two authors: $1.5 \times \text{points} / 2$

Three authors: $1.8 \times \text{points} / 3$

Four or more authors: $2.0 \times \text{points} / \text{number of authors}$

Academic staff may receive additional points for up to two multi-author works annually as outlined below:

1. If a staff member publishes four or fewer multi-author works, (s)he receives additional points for one work – that for which the person in question will receive the most points *after* calculation – amounting to half of the difference between points awarded and points prior to division between authors.
2. If a staff member publishes more than four multi-author works, (s)he receives additional points for two works, amounting for each to half the difference between points awarded and points prior to division (see above).

A staff member thus receives additional points for one work if (s)he publishes four or fewer multi-author works in a year and additional points for two works if (s)he publishes more than four. The number of additional points received increases as the number of authors rises.

Example:

A publication receives 20 points. Points are divided between six authors, each of whom is awarded 6.67 points ($20/6=6.67$). The difference between points awarded (6.67) and points prior to division (20) is 13.33 points. As per the rules outlined above, authors receive half of this difference (6.67 points) or a total of 13.34 points each. Should any of these authors have published five or more works, they also receive additional points for that publication which gives them the second-highest number of points.

b) Special evaluation

Teachers and experts can request that materials falling under categories A.2-A5 and A7.2 be evaluated specially. The Evaluation Committee has the authority to deviate from the evaluation framework (maximum points) as it applies to a given publication. Should a teacher or expert wish for material to be awarded more points than the maximum stated here, supporting arguments must be specifically outlined. In requesting a special evaluation, (s)he must demonstrate that the work in question is exceptionally substantial or appears in an outlet that makes extraordinarily rigorous academic demands. The Evaluation Committee will seek the assistance of specialists in making a special

evaluation. The Committee may also take the initiative in seeking for materials to be evaluated specially.

c) Re-evaluation

At five-year intervals, teachers and experts may request that works that have enjoyed extraordinary attention or had an exceptionally great impact within their academic field be re-evaluated. The Evaluation Committee will seek the assistance of specialists in the academic field in question.

A1-A2

A1 Theses

A1.1 Candidatus or master's thesis (15 points)

A1.2 Doctoral thesis (30 points)

The name of the university at which the thesis was written must be stated, along with the length and title of the thesis. If an individual has two theses on the same level, both are evaluated for points. If articles, books or other materials based on a thesis are published, these additional publications are evaluated separately in the appropriate category.

A2 Books

A2.1. Peer-reviewed publications by the world's most respected academic publishers (up to 100 points)

Books published by the world's most respected academic publishers. The following publishers fall under this category:

Cambridge University Press

Elsevier

Harvard University Press

John Wiley & Sons (incl. Blackwell Publishing)

Kluwer/Springer

Oxford University Press

Taylor and Francis (incl. Routledge)

The above list is not comprehensive. An author whose work has been published by an academic publishing company of the same calibre (including, for example, the foremost publishers within a specific and narrow academic field) may request for this item to be evaluated in this category.

A2.2. International peer-reviewed publications and national peer-reviewed publications with an international dimension (up to 75 points)

Peer-reviewed publications from Iceland are considered to have an international dimension if they meet the following requirements:

- 1) They must satisfy requirements regarding knowledge creation in the international scientific debate of our time.
- 2) The publisher guarantees access to the work abroad (through commercial agents, for

example), so that it is possible to get them on international book purchasing lists.

3) In addition to peer-review, the publishing company attends to scholarly editing.

4) If material is in Icelandic, it shall be accompanied by a summary in English (or another widely spoken language).

A2.3. Peer-reviewed publications (Icelandic or foreign) primarily aimed at the domestic academic community (up to 50 points)

Materials falling under this category include peer-reviewed works published by recognised publishers but aimed primarily at the domestic academic community that do not satisfy all requirements stipulated for category two. Publications in this category must be based on independent research, but their worth may at the same time consist in their role in dissemination, i.e., they channel international scientific debate and theories into the domestic academic community.

A2.4. Other books (up to 25 points)

Peer-reviewed scientific works primarily aimed at the domestic academic community.

A2.5. Republications (up to 10 points) Republications must involve substantial change or addition to the previous edition to be evaluated for points.

A3. Book chapters

Book chapters fall into four evaluation categories, analogous to the book categories (A2.1-A2.4) listed here above.

A3.1. Peer-reviewed publications by the world's most respected academic publishers (up to 20 points)

A3.2. International peer-reviewed publications and national peer-reviewed publications with an international dimension (15 points)

A3.3. Peer-reviewed publications (Icelandic or foreign) primarily aimed at the domestic academic community (10 points)

A3.4. Chapters in other books (0-5 points)

A4 Academic articles

A4.1 Article published in ISI-journal with high impact factor or in an A category journal on the ERIH reference index (20 points).

ISI-journals are those international scientific journals documented in the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) databases under the auspices of Thomson Reuters. Articles in ISI-journals with an impact factor high enough to place them in the top 10% in their category receive 20 points. The European Research Index for Humanities (ERIH) is based on a system of peer assessment and is under the auspices of the European Science Foundation.

A4.2. Other articles in ISI journals, B category articles (ERIH) or articles in journals that receive a grade I rating in journal survey (15 points).

A4.3. C category articles (ERIH) and articles in journals that receive a grade II rating in journal survey (10 points).

A4.4 Articles published in journals that receive a grade III rating in journal survey (5 points).

The supplement (below) includes a list of the criteria that the survey is based on and details as to how a journal is rated on the basis of the results.

A5 Articles in conference proceedings

An international scientific conference must meet the following criteria:

1. Public programme.
2. Participants chosen on the basis of their expert knowledge.
3. A minimum of 15 speakers.
4. A minimum of 5 speakers work abroad.

Summaries and lengthened summaries are not evaluated for points.

A5.1 Article published in distinguished referenced conference proceedings (10 points)

Peer-reviewed articles in conference proceedings in a recognised publication form within the academic field in question.

Such conference proceedings must be accessible in international databases. Examples of such databases include:

IEEE Xplore: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org>

MSME digital store: <http://store.asme.org/>

SPIE: <http://spie.org>

ASCE: <http://www.asce.org>

ACM Digital Library: <http://portal.acm.org>

This list is not comprehensive. Evaluation Committees evaluate individual cases as they come up.

A5.2 Article in other conference proceedings (3-5)

Conference proceedings are to be peer-reviewed. When awarding points, procedures for peer-review are taken into account.

A6 Lectures and posters

A6.1 Plenary lecture or keynote address at international scientific conference (5 points).

A6.2 Public lecture by invitation at university abroad (3 points).

A6.3 Lecture at international conference (3 points).

A6.4 Lecture at domestic conference (2 points).

A6.5 Lectures at academic symposiums, seminars or meetings for professional groups (1 point).

A6.6 Poster at international conference (2 points).

A6.7 Poster at domestic conference (1 point).

The programme for a conference or meeting must be on hand. A letter of invitation must accompany the performance report in the case of a plenary lecture or keynote address (A6.1) or a public lecture by invitation at a university abroad (A6.2). A plenary lecture at a very large conference (more than 1,000 participants) may be evaluated for 10 points. Points for lectures and posters are given to the individuals presenting them.

Teachers and experts do, however, receive points if a lecture/poster is held/introduced by their student. Points are calculated according to rules for division of points (see above) as if there were two authors.

When a teacher or expert makes an unusually high number of contributions to the same conference or during a single year, the number of points may be capped should it be deemed that there are grounds to do so.

A7 Editorial work on academic publications

Scholarly editing of academic publications implies editorial work that builds on an editor's expert knowledge. Copy-editing thus does not fall under this category.

A7.1. Editor of an academic journal (3-6 points/issue)

Only scholarly editing of peer-reviewed journals is evaluated for points. Three points are awarded for editorial work that chiefly involves making decisions regarding publication of material. If scholarly editing also relates to the content and treatment of individual articles, criticism and scholarly commentary, three additional points are awarded. Should the same individual be responsible for both tasks, (s)he thus receives 6 points per issue.

For journals in categories A4.1 and A4.2, an individual receives points for a maximum of three issues per year. For journals in category A4.3, an individual receives points for a maximum of two issues per year and for one issue per year for those in category A4.4.

A7.2. Book editor (5-20 points)

Editing of peer-reviewed books only. The assumption is made that for such books, the editor both makes decisions regarding material published and attends to the editing of individual book chapters. Evaluation also takes into account the scope of the book and its categorisation as outlined in A2.

A request may be made for special evaluation for very extensive editorial work, for example when a large anthology with material by a number of scholars is at issue, for example in books re-examining wide-ranging fields within the sciences where the editor takes an active role in this mapping process, i.e., through the organisation of the publication, written introductions to individual book sections, and so on.

A8 Reports, reviews and translations

A8.1 Reports (0-3 points)

Evaluation is based on the scope of data solicitation, originality and contribution to new knowledge. Reports include published academic reports, working papers, university publication series with publication numbers and reports falling under legal deposit

legislation (for example having an ISBN number).

Reports can also be evaluated for service points (see D4). Reports that are the product of service research generally fall under category D. Evaluation of reports takes in general into account whether the material could, should there be reason to do so, be published in a platform that makes rigorous academic demands.

A8.2 Reviews (1-3 points)

Points are given for reviews in peer-reviewed journals where all published material undergoes a scholarly editing process. Reviews involve scholarly discussion and criticism: they are not short write-ups on the material content of individual books or other publications.

A8.3 Translations of academic articles, book chapters and other short writings (0-5 points)

A8.4 Translations of academic books (10-25 points)

Translations of material of high academic value that fall under the field of study of the individual in question.

Republications of works in other languages are valued at up to 10 points. These are translations of academic writings and scientific work published at an international level. Should such a publication bring with it significant academic acclaim, it may be awarded more points in accordance with the provision on special evaluation.

A9 Curriculum design for preschools, primary schools and secondary schools

A9.1 Curriculum design (0-10 points) Teaching materials for preschools, primary schools and secondary schools may be evaluated under this category should they meet with the following requirements:

1. The subject matter of these teaching materials falls within the author's area of research.
2. Teaching materials show clear signs of primary research having taken place.
3. Teaching materials are peer-reviewed by experts and published by respected publishers.
4. The goals, methods and process of curriculum design are stated in the associated materials, for example in teaching directions or in an accompanying statement by the author.
5. The teaching materials represent a considerable body of work.

Should these requirements not be met, teaching materials are evaluated for service points.

A10 Innovation and knowledge transfer

To receive points for innovation and knowledge transfer, there must be demonstrable connections to research, originality and knowledge innovation. Art creation in an

academic context also falls under this category. Innovation and knowledge transfer may also be evaluated for service points.

A10.1 Start-up company, design, innovation and knowledge transfer (0-20 points).

Evaluation is based on conventional evaluation criteria, cf. the introduction to these rules. Knowledge transfer is evaluated for points when the establishment of a company or negotiation of a contract involves the release of new knowledge or scientific innovation. The effects that company operations have had on university activities and its relationship with the university are also taken into account. In general, start-up companies are thus not evaluated during the first 5 years of operation. An explanatory report shall accompany the performance report.

A10.2 Software (0-20 points).

Software is only evaluated if it involves knowledge creation and/or new software design solutions. The release format is either software distributed as merchandise or open source software.

A10.3 Psychological tests (0-5 points).

To be evaluated, tests must be published and accessible and involve research work not appearing in any other form.

A10.4 Legislative bills (2 points as a general rule).

Only those bills that involve primary research and research work that has not appeared in any other form are evaluated. Work on a bill not meeting the above requirements may be evaluated for service points. Drafting a bill may in some instances involve considerable research work. In such cases, up to 10 points may be awarded for a bill. An author must specifically make a request for special evaluation, stating his/her reasoning.

Evaluation of bills takes in general into account whether the material could, should there be reason to do so, be published in a platform that makes rigorous academic demands. Where the author(s) of a bill are not identified in the bill itself, confirmation of authorship must accompany the performance report.

A10.5 Patents (10-15 points)

Only published patents are evaluated for points. Ten points are given for a published patent application and an additional 5 if the patent is granted. No points are given for republished patents or patent applications.

A10.6 Development work in schools and other institutions (0-10 points)

Development work in schools that builds on research by the scholar in question falls under this category. Development projects in this category involve the transfer of new knowledge within the domain of school operations and are evaluated upon their completion. A project description and implementation plan must be at hand. The connections between the development project and research by the scholar in question must be outlined. When evaluating a development project, the above factors are taken into account as well as how extensive the project is and whether evaluation by peers has

taken place. Should a development project not meet the requirements outlined above, it may be evaluated for service points.

Analogous knowledge transfer within other institutions may also be evaluated in this category, provided it satisfies requirements commensurable to those outlined above.

A10.7 Innovation in the arts (0-40 points)

To receive points for art creation, teachers must attend to regular instruction relating specifically to art creation and works of art (including literature). Teachers are not limited to individual art forms in this respect (a visual arts teacher can, for example, receive points for a theatre play or concert performance).

A10.7.1 Large solo exhibition at a recognised art gallery endorsed by an arts council (10-30 points)

Large solo exhibitions of visual and design pieces held at recognised art galleries endorsed by an arts council fall under this category. Such galleries include the National Art Gallery of Iceland, Reykjavík Art Museum, Kópavogur Art Museum, ASÍ Art Museum, Hafnarborg – the Hafnarfjörður Centre of Culture and Fine Art, Living Art Museum, Nordic House of Reykjavík and Akureyri Art Museum.

A10.7.2 Solo exhibition or participation in a group exhibition at a recognised art gallery or at an international arts and culture festival (0-15 points)

Solo exhibitions of pieces not previously shown fall under this category. Recognised art galleries are the same as described above.

A10.7.3 Extensive original musical composition or theatre play publicly performed by recognised artists (10-30 points)

Musical compositions falling under this category include operas and orchestra pieces performed in a public concert hall (the Icelandic Opera, the National Theatre of Iceland, Salurinn (Kópavogur Concert Hall) or the University Cinema). The composition should be of a length to fill an entire programme.

A10.7.4 Original musical composition or theatre play publicly performed by recognised artists (0-10 points)

Shorter compositions performed by recognised artist fall under this category. Points are not awarded more than once for a given composition.

A10.7.5 Musical performance/dramatisation at international arts and culture festivals, at public subscription concerts or at a recognised theatre (0-15 points)

International arts and culture festivals include the International Electronic and Computer Music Festival, Nordic Music Days and other festivals abroad. Public subscription concerts include the Icelandic Symphony Orchestra concert series and Tíbrá concert series in Salurinn, the Kópavogur Concert Hall.

A10.7.6 Concert or lengthy dramatisation (0-10 points)

Solo performances or artistic direction of orchestra, choir or chamber music ensemble for concert under the auspices of a respected concert holder or cultural institution.

Concerts held in connection with or under the auspices of international arts and culture festivals, respected concert holders or respected cultural institutions generally receive more points than concerts held independently by the individual in question. Concert premieres receive more points as a general rule.

Instrumentalists may also be awarded points for participation in a chamber music ensemble or important role in a musical performance held by recognised parties, such as the Icelandic Symphony Orchestra, even where a solo performance is not at issue, as they have been selected to perform on the basis of their artistic ability.

Such happenings are not, in general, evaluated for points unless they amount to more than two annually.

Respected concert holders and cultural institutions include: Icelandic Symphony Orchestra; Salurinn, the Kópavogur Concert Hall; Icelandic Opera; Skálholt Summer Concerts Festival; Reykjavík Arts Festival; Dark Music Days; Reykjavík Chamber Orchestra; Caput; Musica Antiqua; Gerðuberg; University Concerts; Association of Icelandic Musicians; and Music for All.

A10.7.7 Released recordings (0-10 points)

Recordings broadcast by recognised media or released by recognised record labels. Recording and broadcasting at the initiative of a respected medium, i.e., the Icelandic National Broadcasting Service. Recognised record labels include: Association of Icelandic Musicians, Ísdiskar, Iceland Music Information Centre, Jazzís, Klassís, Bad Taste, Skífan, Stöðin Inc., Thule Musik, Tónaflóð or known record labels abroad.

A10.7.8 Literary texts. (0-10 points)

Poems, short stories, short plays and other short literary texts.

A10.7.9 Books. (10-40 points)

Works of fiction, poetry anthologies, short story collections, lengthy plays and other literary works of artistic value. Previous publication of individual sections of a book is taken into consideration, as is whether the staging of the play has already been evaluated for points.

A10.7.10 Translations of book chapters and other short texts of artistic value (0-5)

A10.7.11 Translations of books of artistic value (10-25)

A10.7.12 Design, curating or directing work (0-10 points)

Organisation and management of exhibition or show for art gallery or theatre.

Design work here implies artistic design of work created for specific needs and contexts, where a number of factors come into play, such as environment, utility and beauty.

Individual visual and design pieces are not evaluated for points unless they are designed for specific contexts, where the expertise of the individual in question in designing the piece receives the acknowledgement of other parties such as an arts council or selection committee.

A11 Citations

Citations in the ISI databases (Science Citation Index, Social Science Citation Index and Arts and Humanities Citation Index) are evaluated as follows:

First 10 citations: 1 point/year

Next 20 citations 0.5 point/year

Citations exceeding 30: 0.1 point/year

Citations exceeding 2,000: 0.05 point/year

A request may be made for citations in peer-reviewed books and journals not listed in the ISI-databases to be evaluated. For such publications, the academic in question must provide confirmation that his or her work has been cited.

Points for citations are not paid out of productivity evaluation funds, such as the Writing and Research Fund.

A12 Grants from competitive funds (0-20 points/year)

Total value of grants from parties outside the university in question. Only those grants entered in the accounting system of the university in question or affiliated institutions are evaluated. The project manager or coordinator for a grant application also receives points unless agreed otherwise with grant recipient. Should the grant come from an international competitive fund, points double from what is listed below, but the maximum (20 points) remains unchanged.

Points:

1 point for 0.5-1.999 million ISK/year

2 points for 2-3.999 million ISK/year

3 points for 4-6.999 million ISK/year

4 points for 7-9.999 million ISK/year

One point is given for every additional 10 million ISK/year to a maximum of 20 points/year.

Points for grants are not paid out of productivity evaluation funds, such as the Writing and Research Fund.

Supplement on the categorisation of Icelandic journals

When evaluating an Icelandic journal (cf. A4.2 to A4.4), emphasis is placed on procedure at the journal being in keeping with accepted practices at an international level. To this aim, categorisation uses as a frame of reference those requirements used by *Thomson Reuters* in the database indexing of international scientific journals. These requirements cover factors such as peer review, whether articles are accompanied by English summary, publication frequency, distribution and submission rejection rate. These 19 requirements are divided into imperative and desirable requirements.

Three points categories of Icelandic journals:

Articles appearing in superior journals that meet the first 17 requirements listed below receive 15 points.

Articles appearing in journals that meet the first 15 requirements receive 10 points.

Articles appearing in journals that meet a minimum of the four imperative requirements listed at bottom receive 5 points.

Imperative requirements:

1. Publication of previously unpublished results.
2. Editor and editorial board have pursued higher education in the academic field.
3. Editor or scholarly editorial board review submissions and reject or accept them.
4. Peer review. Articles submitted are never published without anonymous peer review by two or more experts in the area in question.
5. Peer review relates to material content.
6. Peer-reviewed articles specifically marked as such where non-peer-reviewed material is also published.
7. Rejection rate of at least 15% of submissions (calculations based as a rule on the previous three years).
8. Regular, planned publication frequency (5 years taken into account as a rule).
9. Icelandic summary.
10. English summary.
11. Descriptive journal title.
12. Descriptive article titles.
13. Satisfactory bibliographical information for all citations.
14. Author addresses satisfactorily well indicated.
15. A minimum of 10% of authors with peer-reviewed articles from outside the university in question.

Desirable requirements:

16. Subscribers in Iceland.
17. Subscribers outside of Iceland or web access.
18. Journal indexed in international databases.

Imperative requirements:

1. Publication of previously unpublished results.
2. Editor and editorial board have pursued higher education in the academic field.
5. Comments from editor or editorial board relate to material content.
6. Peer-reviewed articles specifically marked as such where non-peer-reviewed material is also published.

B. Teaching

B1. Teaching experience

B1.1. Tenured instructor (senior lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor or professor), full time 10 points/year

B1.2. Non-tenured lecturer 2 points/year for each course taught, to a maximum of 6 points/year

B1.3. Teaching techniques course 0-2 points

Teaching in academic mobility programs is evaluated as sessional teaching (B1.2).

B2. Teaching materials

B2.1. Short booklets or teaching materials on the Internet 0-3 points

B2.2. Extensive teaching materials, textbooks 5-60 points

Preliminary versions of teaching materials may be evaluated under B2.1 but fall under B2.2 when published in final form.

B3. Supervision of students and thesis opposition

B3.1. Master's thesis 2-4 points

B3.2. Doctoral thesis 10 points

B3.3. Member of advisory committee 3 points

B3.4. Thesis opponent 3 points

Points are granted for supervision of graduate students upon completion of the thesis. Students' names and their thesis titles must be stated. The number of points for a master's thesis depends on its size. Individuals receive 2 points for supervision of a thesis for fewer than 50 ECTS credits, 3 points for a thesis for 50-70 ECTS credits and 4 points for a thesis for more than 70 ECTS credits.

4. Innovation in teaching 2-10 points

Innovation in teaching can be evaluated for points, such as organising and defining a new study programme, organising new courses or reorganising existing ones, defining new courses, developing teaching methods or designing a project database. A report detailing the nature of the work must accompany an application for evaluation of teaching innovation.

C. Administration

Points are awarded for administrative positions within the university as outlined below. The scope of the position (turnover, number of employees, students, etc.) determines the number of points awarded for C1, C4, and C5.

- C1. Department chair 5-10 points/year*
- C2. Chair of University Council works committee and standing evaluation committee of Academic School 10 points/year*
- C3. Chair of principal works committees of Academic Schools 5 points/year*
- C4. Director of research institute 5-15 points/year*
- C5. Dean/Head of faculty 25-50 points/year*
- C6. Dean of academic school 75 points/year*
- C7. Rector 100 points/year*
- C8. Assistant Rector 50 points/year*
- C9. Member of University Council 5 points/year*
- C10. Member of committee under the auspices of the University Council or the Rector 2 points/year*
- C11. Chair of committee under the auspices of the University Council or the Rector 3 points/year*
- C12. Member of evaluation committee for position at university 2 points*

Academic positions are evaluated for points only after the term is completed. Two points are awarded for every evaluation committee as per C12 to a maximum of 10 points/year.

D. Service

D1. Organisation of international scientific conference (2-10 points)

Chair/membership in conference committee.

D2. Evaluation work within public sector (0-2 points)

Membership in public evaluation committees, demarcated fixed-term projects.

D3. Committee or board membership (0-2 points)

Outside university in question.

D4. Advisory opinions and reports (0-5 points)

Reports published without formal peer review or unpublished reports and advisory opinions that are released for or under the auspices of parties outside the university in question. The Evaluation Committee must have access to a report for it to be evaluated for points.

D5. Software (0-10 points)

Software must involve applied software development and be distributed nationally or abroad either as merchandise or open source software.

D6. Educational materials for the public (0-20 points)

These must represent the composition and/or dissemination of material that the individual in question undertakes because of his/her academic expertise.

1. Books (general) 0-20 points

2. Translations (general) 0-10 points

3. Editing of non-scholarly books and journals 0-6 points

4. Article in non-scholarly journal 0-5 points

5. Review or critique in the media 1 point

(maximum: 10 points/year)

6. Newspaper article (0-3 points) or composition of item appearing in other media 0-10 points

(maximum: 10 points/year)

7. Speech at seminar or symposium aimed at the general public 1 point

8. Dissemination of information and advisory activity 0-10 points

(maximum: 10 points/year)

D7. Start-up company (0-50 points)

Start-up companies and license agreements with parties outside the university in question. After operations have been going on for some time (e.g., after 5-10 years), the company or agreement may be re-evaluated for up to 50 additional service points. In making the evaluation, employee and student participation, ownership and the visibility of the university in question in connection with the project are taken into consideration.

D8. Grants from competitive funds (0-20 points)

Total value of grants from parties outside the university in question. Only those grants that go through the accounting system of the university in question or affiliated institutions are evaluated. The project manager or coordinator for a grant application also receives one point unless agreed otherwise.

Points:

1 point for 0.5-1.999 million ISK/year

2 points for 2-3.999 million ISK/year

3 points for 4-6.999 million ISK/year

4 points for 7-9.999 million ISK/year

One point is given for every additional 10 million ISK/year to a maximum of 20 points/year.

E. Former employment (for initial evaluation)

Former employment in positions that fall outside these rules is evaluated if it is in the teacher's or specialist's field of expertise and relevant to the current appointment.

Work experience: 10 points/year

Work experience points are taken into consideration when making initial wage bracket placements for new appointments. Points for former employment in addition to points for teaching are not to exceed 10 points annually.

F. General

Specialists, academics and scientists with a 40% research requirement shall be awarded 10 points for work experience per year in accordance with the 10 points per year awarded to instructors with a 40% research requirement for teaching experience (see B1). Specialists, academics and scientists with a 60% research requirement shall receive 7 points per year, while specialists, academics and scientists with an 80% research requirement receive 3 points per year. These points in addition to points awarded for overtime instruction shall not, however, exceed a total of 10 points per year.

The Evaluation Committee has the authority to evaluate projects that do not fall within the scope of these rules for points should a well-founded request or recommendation be put forward, in particular for work inside or outside the university benefiting the scientific community in a broad sense and extensive promotion or education work aimed at the general public.

Exceptions may be made to these rules should there be special cause to do so.