

# Evaluation System for Public Higher Education Institutions

## Evaluation criteria

The Evaluation System for Public Universities forms the basis for evaluation of the work of academic staff, i.e. persons hired in accordance with a qualifications assessment who are members of the State University Professors' Union or another union party to the Evaluation System (for example, the Union of University Teachers or the Association of University Teachers in Akureyri). At the University of Iceland, publications and published materials not marked with the name of the University of Iceland are not evaluated. Evaluation covers research, teaching, administration, service and other work. Annual performance evaluation involves a performance report detailing work done over the last year. At the University of Iceland, this also involves updating the teaching portfolio, an overview of collaboration with parties outside the University and an overview of work done outside the University. No points will be awarded, for research, teaching or anything else, before a satisfactory performance report has been submitted.

### *Research*

Evaluation of research 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 the data acquisition, originality and contribution to the advancement of knowledge. The publisher's peer-review process is of utmost significance. For peer review to be considered satisfactory, the material in question must be sent to at least two reviewers. Peer review must be anonymous, professional, substantive and carried out by recognised specialists in the field in question. Publication distribution, accessibility and impact are also evaluated.

It is increasingly common for a journal to publish articles first online and subsequently in print. To remove all ambiguity, the year of publication for an article is considered to be that year in which it appears in print. It is nevertheless permissible to report a journal article in that year in which it is first published online. However, the article will not be evaluated before that year in which it appears in print. If an article is only published online, it shall be evaluated in that year.

### *Teaching*

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

### *Administration, service and other*

Administrative work is evaluated for points (cf. Section C), as is service work (cf. Section D). Points are awarded for specific administrative positions, in particular under the auspices of the University as a whole, or its schools. Administrative work under the auspices of faculties is, as a rule, not evaluated for points in accordance with these rules. Lifelong learning and public services and engagement performed by University staff in their capacity as specialists are evaluated under Section D.

## Section A. Research

### a) Division of points for jointly authored material

This applies to books (A2), book chapters (A3), journal articles (A4), conference publications (A5), academic editorial work (A7), reports, reviews and translations (A8), teaching materials (A9) and innovations (A10). When these have more than one author, points are calculated as follows:

Two authors	1.5 x points / 2
Three authors	1.8 x points / 3
Four or more authors	2.0 x points / number of authors

Academic staff may receive additional points for up to two jointly authored works annually, in accordance with the following:

1. Staff members publishing four or fewer jointly authored works shall receive additional points for one work, amounting to half of the difference between points awarded and points prior to division between authors. The work selected is always the one which is most advantageous for the staff member in question, i.e. that which gives the most points *after* calculation.
2. Staff members publishing five or more jointly authored works shall receive additional points for two works, amounting to half of the difference between points awarded and points prior to division between authors for both works.

In accordance with the above, staff members publishing four or fewer jointly authored works in a year shall receive additional points for one work. Staff members publishing five or more jointly authored works in a year shall receive additional points for two such works.

Example:

A publication receives 20 points. Points are divided between six authors, each of whom is awarded 6.67 points ( $20/6=6.67$ ). Then (in accordance with item 1 above), there is also the difference between points awarded (6.67) and points prior to division (20), which is 13.33 points. In accordance with the rule, each author also receives half of this difference, or 6.67 points. The work therefore earns an author 13.34 points. If the author in question has published five or more jointly authored works, the rule is repeated. The work which gives the author the next highest number of additional points is then selected.

For further clarification, it is worth mentioning that the more authors a work has, the greater the number of additional points in accordance with this rule.

### b) Special evaluation

Teaching and research staff may request that materials falling under categories A.2-A.5, A7.2 and

A8.1 be evaluated specially; a productivity evaluation committee is authorised to deviate from the evaluation framework (maximum points) as it applies to a given publication. Should a member of teaching or research staff request that material be awarded more points than the

maximum stated here, supporting arguments must be specifically outlined. It must be demonstrated that the work in question is exceptionally significant or has been published in an outlet that makes particularly rigorous academic demands. The assistance of specialists shall be sought in making a special evaluation. Productivity evaluation committees and the Office of Research Affairs may also take the initiative in specially evaluating works published in outlets which make extraordinarily rigorous academic demands.

### *c) Re-evaluation*

At five-year intervals, teaching and research staff may request that works that have received exceptional acclaim, or had an particularly significant impact within their academic field be re-evaluated. The assistance of specialists in the relevant field shall be sought in making the evaluation.

## **Evaluation categories A1-A12**

### **A1 Theses**

*A1.1 Candidate's or Master's thesis (15 points)*

*A1.2 Doctoral theses (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 reports two theses at the same level, points are awarded for both. If articles, books or other material based on a thesis are published in a recognised academic outlet, these publications shall be evaluated separately in the appropriate category.

### **A2 and A3. Books and book chapters**

Books are organised into four categories (see below). A special committee of three specialists, appointed by the Science Committee for Public Higher Education Institutions, shall carry out the evaluation and categorisation of books and book chapters. The committee shall, as appropriate, seek the assistance of other specialists in evaluating individual books and book chapters. In this evaluation, it shall be considered whether the work meets international standards concerning editorial format and academic contribution, regardless of the language in which it is written. The process for evaluating journal articles is also taken into consideration (cf. categorisation in A4). The Science Committee for Public Higher Education Institutions is authorised to issue more detailed guidelines for the evaluation and categorisation of books.

### **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. Authors of works published by an academic publisher of the same calibre (including, for example, the foremost publishers within a certain narrow academic field) may request that these works be evaluated within this category.

*A2.2. International peer-reviewed publications and Icelandic peer-reviewed publications with international significance (up to 75 points)*

Icelandic peer-reviewed publications are considered to have international significance if they meet the following requirements:

- 1) They satisfy demands concerning the creation of knowledge within current academic discourse.
- 2) The publisher guarantees that works are accessible abroad (through commercial agents, for example), such that it is possible to obtain them through international book purchasing lists.
- 3) In addition to peer review, the publisher actively conducts academic editorial work.
- 4) If the work is in Icelandic, it must be accompanied by an abstract in English (or another widely spoken language).

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

Materials falling under this category include peer-reviewed works published by recognised publishers, which are aimed primarily at the domestic academic community and do not satisfy all requirements stipulated for category A2.2. Publications in this category must be based on independent research, but their value may also lie in their communicative role, i.e. their role in disseminating international academic discourse and theories to the domestic academic community.

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

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

*A2.5. Republications (up to 10 points)*

Republications must involve substantial changes.

### **A3. Book chapters**

Book chapters fall into four evaluation categories, corresponding with the above categories for books (A2.1-A2.4).

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

*A3.2. International peer-reviewed publications and Icelandic peer-reviewed publications with international significance (15 points)* *A3.3. Peer-reviewed publications (Icelandic or otherwise) primarily aimed at the domestic academic community (10 points)*

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

### *A3.5 Chapters in handbooks and encyclopaedias*

Chapters in handbooks and encyclopaedias are evaluated in category A3.5, since these contain summaries of information rather than discussion of the author's research results. Extensive chapters in handbooks and encyclopaedias with a bibliography, published by the most respected academic publishers in the world, are evaluated for up to 10 points, while other chapters in handbooks and encyclopaedias which do not meet the aforementioned requirements are evaluated for 0-5 points.

### **A4 Journal articles**

*A4.1 Article published in ISI journal with a high impact factor (20 points).*

ISI journals are those international scientific journals documented in the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) databases under the auspices of *Clarivate*. Articles in ISI journals with an impact factor high enough to place them in the top 20% in their category shall receive 20 points.

*A4.2. Other articles in ISI journals, articles in Scopus journals, articles in journals included in the top levels of the Finnish, Norwegian and Danish evaluation systems, or articles in journals awarded grade 1 in the survey for Icelandic journals, cf. appendix 1 (15 points).*

The Finnish evaluation system has three levels: 1. Basic 2. Leading 3. Top.  
<https://www.tsv.fi/julkaisuforum/haku.php?lang=en>

The Norwegian evaluation system has three levels: 1. Lower Level, 2 Higher Level  
<https://dbh.nsd.uib.no/publiseringskanaler/Forside>

The Danish evaluation system has three levels: Level 1, Level 2 and Level 3.

<https://ufm.dk/forskning-og-innovation/statistik-og-analyser/den-bibliometriskeforskningsindikator/BFI-lister>

*A4.3. Articles in journals ranked at the second or, as applicable, third level in the Finnish, Norwegian and Danish evaluation systems. Also articles in the Web of Science: Emerging Sources Citation Index and articles receiving a grade 2 rating in the survey for Icelandic journals, cf. Appendix I (10 points).*

The Emerging Source Citation Index is one of Clarivate's databases of journal quality. Far fewer demands are made of journals in the ESCI than those included in the standard parts of the WoS database. Articles in journals included in the WoS ESCI are evaluated for 10 points in the category A4.3.

*A4.4. Articles published in journals receiving a grade 3 rating in a journal survey, cf. Appendix I, and articles in so-called predatory journals (5 points).*

For further details see Appendix III.

Those criteria upon which the survey is based, and the way in which journals are categorised on the basis of results, appear in Appendix I.

### **A5 Articles in conference publications**

An international academic conference must meet the following requirements:

1. Public programme.
2. Participants chosen on the basis of their specialist knowledge.

3. A minimum of 15 speakers.
4. A minimum of 5 speakers working in another country.

Abstracts and extended summaries are not evaluated for points.

*A5.1 Article published in a distinguished conference publication (10 points)*

Peer-reviewed articles in conference publications published in a format recognised in the relevant academic field. Such conference publications must be accessible through international databases. Examples of this kind of database are:

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 exhaustive. Productivity evaluation committees shall evaluate individual cases that arise.

*A5.2 Article in another conference publication (3-5 points)*

This refers to peer-reviewed conference publications. When awarding points, procedures for peer review are taken into account.

**A6 Lectures and posters (maximum of 20 points per year)**

*A6.1 Plenary lecture or keynote address at an international academic conference (5 points).*

*A6.2 Public guest lecture at a university outside of Iceland (3 points).*

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

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

*A6.5 Lecture at an academic symposium, seminar or forum for academic groups (1 point).*

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

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

The programme for a conference or forum must be available. A letter of invitation must accompany the performance report in the case of a plenary lecture or keynote address (A6.1) or a public guest lecture at a university outside of Iceland (A6.2). A plenary lecture at a very large conference (over 1,000 participants) may be evaluated for 10 points. Points for lectures and posters are awarded to the individuals presenting them. Teaching and research staff do, however, receive points if a lecture/poster is presented by their student, in which case the number of points is calculated according to the general rule for division of points, as if there were two authors. If two or more members of teaching or research staff present the same lecture, points are divided amongst them equally; the joint authorship rule does not apply to category A6.

It is not possible to receive more than 20 points per year for lectures and posters evaluated in category A6.

If a member of teaching or research staff makes an exceptionally high number of contributions (posters and/or lectures) to the same conference, the number of points may be capped should it be deemed that there are grounds to do so.

### **A7 Academic editorial work**

Academic editorial work denotes editorial work which is subject to the editor's specialist knowledge. Copy-editing, therefore, does not fall under this category.

#### *A7.1 Editor of an academic journal (3-6 points per issue)*

Only academic editorial work on peer-reviewed articles is evaluated for points. Three points are awarded for editorial work that chiefly involves making decisions regarding publication of material. If editorial work also pertains to the content and treatment of individual articles, criticism and academic commentary, three additional points are awarded. An individual responsible for both tasks shall therefore receive 6 points per issue.

Points are awarded for a maximum of three issues per year if the journal falls under the categories A4.1 and A4.2. For journals in category A4.3, points may only be awarded for two issues per year, and for journals in category A4.4 only one issue per year.

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

Editing of peer-reviewed books only. It is assumed that for such books, the editor determines the material published and is also responsible for editing individual book chapters. Evaluation of editorial work furthermore depends upon the scope of the book, and its categorisation in accordance with A2.

A request may be made for special evaluation of very substantial editorial work, e.g. in the case of a large collection with material by a number of scholars, e.g. in books reviewing an extensive field, where the editor takes an active role in this mapping process, i.e. through the organisation of the work, introductions to individual sections, and so forth.

### **A8 Reports, reviews and translations**

#### *A8.1 Reports (0-3 points)*

Evaluation is based on the scope of the gathering of data, originality and contribution to advancement of knowledge. Reports include published academic reports, working papers, university publication series with publication numbers and reports falling under legal deposit legislation (e.g. having an ISBN).

Reports may also be evaluated for service points under D4. Reports which are the products of contract research generally fall under category D. Evaluation of reports is generally based on whether their content could, should there be cause to do so, be published in an outlet which makes rigorous academic demands.

#### *A8.2 Reviews (1-3 points)*

Points are awarded for reviews in journals falling under categories A4.1-A4.4. Reviews involve academic 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 works (0-5 points)*

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

Points are awarded for translations of material of significant academic value, within the field of the individual in question.

Republications of works in other languages are evaluated for up to 10 points. This refers to translations of academic works by individuals working at universities, published in an international outlet. Should such a work be published to significant academic acclaim, it may be evaluated for more points in conformity with provisions on special evaluation in these rules.

## **A9 Creation of teaching material for preschools, primary schools or secondary schools**

### *A9.1 Teaching material (0-10 points)*

Teaching material for preschools, primary schools or secondary schools may be evaluated for points if it meets the following requirements:

1. The subject matter of this teaching material falls within the author's area of research.
2. Teaching material shows clear signs of original research having taken place.
3. Teaching material is peer-reviewed by specialists and published by respected publishers.
4. The goals, methods and process of creating the teaching material are stated, for example in teaching guidelines or in an accompanying statement by the author.
5. The teaching material represents a considerable body of work.

Should these requirements not be met, teaching material is evaluated for service points.

## **A10 Innovation and transfer of knowledge**

Evaluation of innovation and transfer of knowledge involves strict requirements concerning connections to research, originality and knowledge innovation. Artistic creation in an academic context also falls under this category. Innovation and transfer of knowledge may also be evaluated for service points.

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

Evaluation is based on conventional evaluation criteria, cf. the introduction to this Regulation. These items are evaluated for points when they involve the publication of new knowledge or scientific innovation.

### *A10.2 Software (0-20 points)*

Only software involving the creation of knowledge and/or new solutions in software design is evaluated for points. The release format shall be 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 published in any other format.

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

Only bills involving original research and research work that has not been published in any other format 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 it. An author must specifically request special evaluation and submit supporting arguments.

Evaluation of legislative bills is generally based on whether their content could, should there be cause to do so, be published in an outlet which makes rigorous academic demands. Where the author(s) 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. 10 points are awarded for the publication of a patent application, and 5 additional points if the patent is granted. Points are not awarded for republished patents or patent applications.

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

Development work in schools based on the research of the individual 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 available. Connections between the development project and the research of the individual in question must be outlined. Evaluation of a development project shall be based on the above factors, as well as the extent of the project and whether peer evaluation has taken place. Should a development project not meet the requirements outlined above, it may be evaluated for service points.

A comparable transfer of knowledge within other institutions may also be evaluated in this category, providing that it satisfies requirements similar to those outlined above.

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

To receive points for artistic creation, teaching staff must perform regular teaching relating specifically to artistic creation and works of art (including literature). In this respect, teaching staff are not limited to individual art forms (a visual arts teacher may, for example, receive points for a dramatic play or concert performance). For further details on evaluation of artistic creation and works of art, see Appendix II.

**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 per citation.

Next 20 citations: 0.5 point per citation.

Citations exceeding 30: 0.1 point per citation.

Citations exceeding 2,000: 0.05 point per citation.

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 of citation.

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

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

Points are based on the total sum of grants awarded from research funds outside the university in question. Only those grants entered in the accounting system of the university in question, or its affiliated institutions, are evaluated. The project manager or coordinator for a grant application also receives points unless otherwise agreed otherwise with the 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 ISK 0.5-1.999 million per year

2 points for ISK 2-3.999 million per year

3 points for ISK 4-6.999 million per year

4 points for ISK 7-9.999 million per year

One point is then awarded for every additional ISK 10 million per year, up to a maximum of 20 points per year.

Points for grants do not lead to payments from productivity evaluation funds, such as the Writing and Research Fund.

## **B. Teaching**

### **B1. Teaching experience**

<i>B1.1. Adjunct lecturer, lecturer, senior lecturer or professor, full-time position</i>	10 points per year
<i>B1.2. Sessional lecturer with supervision of courses</i> 2 points per year for each course, though not exceeding 6 points per year	2 points per year
<i>B1.3 Teaching technology courses</i>	0-2 points

Teaching in academic mobility programmes is evaluated as sessional teaching.

### **B2. Teaching material**

<i>B2.1. Short booklets or online teaching material</i>	0-3 points
<i>B2.2. Educational publications, textbooks.</i>	5-60 points

Preliminary editions 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**

<i>B3.1. Master's thesis</i>	2-4 points
<i>B3.2. Doctoral thesis</i>	10 point
<i>B3.3. Member of doctoral board</i>	3 point
<i>B3.4. Thesis opponent</i>	3 point
<i>B3.5 BA/BS thesis</i>	0,5 point

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

## **4. Innovation in teaching**

2-10 points

It is possible to apply to have work in innovation in teaching and teaching methods evaluated, such as the organisation and definition of new study programmes, the reorganisation of courses, definition of new courses, development of teaching methods, creation of a project database and so forth. A report detailing the nature of the work must accompany an application for evaluation of teaching innovation.

## C. Administration

Points are awarded for administrative work 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.

<i>C1. Head of department</i>	5-10 points per year
<i>C2. Chair of a University Council working committee or school standing evaluation committee</i>	10 points per year
<i>C3. Chair of a principal school working committee</i>	5 points per year
<i>Director of research institute</i>	5-15 points per year
<i>C5. Head of faculty</i>	25-50 points per year
<i>C6. Dean of school</i>	75 points per year
<i>C7. Rector</i>	100 points per year
<i>C8. Pro-rector</i>	50 points per year
<i>C9. Member of the University Council</i>	5 points per year
<i>C10. Member of a committee under the auspices of the University Council or the rector</i>	2 points per year
<i>C11. Chair of a committee under the auspices of the University Council or the rector</i>	3 points per year
<i>C12. Member of an evaluation committee for positions at the university</i>	2 points
<i>C13. Member of a board of a research institute</i>	1 point
<i>C14. Member of a standing evaluation committee of Academic School</i>	1 point

This is evaluated for points only after the work is concluded. Two points are awarded for every evaluation committee as per C12, up to a maximum of 10 points per year.

## D. Services

*D1. Organisation of international academic conference (2-10 points)*  
Chair/member of conference committee.

*D2. Evaluation work within public sector (0-2 points)*  
Membership in public evaluation committees, specific temporary projects.

*D3. Member of committee or board (0-2 points)*  
Outside university in question.

*D4. Advisory verdicts and reports (0-5 points)*  
Reports published without formal peer review or unpublished reports and advisory verdicts appearing under the auspices of or for parties outside the university in question. A productivity evaluation committee must have access to a report for it to be evaluated for points.

*D5. Software (0-10 points)*

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

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

In all instances, this must be the composition and/or dissemination of material undertaken by the individual in question because of his or her specialist academic knowledge.

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 (maximum: 10 points per year)	1 point
6. Newspaper article (0-3 points) or composition of item appearing in other media (maximum: 10 points per year)	0-10 points
7. Speech at seminar or symposium aimed at the general public	1 point
8. Dissemination of information and advisory activity (maximum: 10 points per year)	0-10 points

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

Start-up companies and licence agreements with parties outside the university in question are evaluated. After a company has been operating for some time (e.g., after 5-10 years), the company or license agreement may be re-evaluated for up to 50 additional service points. Evaluation shall be based on employee and student participation, ownership and the visibility of the university in question in connection with the project.

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

Total value of grants from parties outside the university in question. Only those grants which go through the accounting system of the university in question, or its affiliated institutions, are evaluated.

The project manager or coordinator for a grant application also receives one point unless agreed otherwise.

Points:

- 1 point for ISK 0.5-1.999 million per year
- 2 points for ISK 2-3.999 million per year
- 3 points for ISK 4-6.999 million per year
- 4 points for ISK 7-9.999 million per year

One point is awarded for every additional ISK 10 million per year, up to a maximum of 20 points per year.

## **E. Previous employment (for initial evaluation)**

Previous employment in positions not enumerated here shall be evaluated, on the condition that it was in the academic field of the member of teaching or research staff and relevant to the current position.

Employment experience: 10 points per year

Employment experience points shall be taken into consideration when making initial wage bracket placements for new appointments. The sum of points awarded for previous employment combined with points for teaching may not exceed 10 points per year.

## **F. In general**

Research specialists, research scholars and research scientists with 40% research duties shall be awarded 10 points for employment experience per year, in conformity with the 10 points per year awarded for teaching experience to teaching staff with 40% research duties (see B1). Research specialists, research scholars and research scientists with 60% research duties shall receive 7 points per year, while research specialists, research scholars and research scientists with 80% research duties receive 3 points per year. The sum of these points combined with points awarded for overtime teaching shall not, however, exceed 10 points per year.

A performance evaluation committee is authorised to award points for projects falling outside the framework of this Regulation, on the condition that a reasoned request or proposal is available. This applies in particular to work inside or outside of the university benefiting the scientific community in a broad sense, or extensive promotion or lifelong education work for the general public.

It is possible to deviate from these rules in exceptional circumstances.

## **Appendix I - On the categorisation of Icelandic journals**

In evaluating an Icelandic journal, it is emphasised that the working practices at the journal be in keeping with international practice. To this end, the requirements used by *Thomson Reuters* in the database indexing of international academic journals are taken into consideration. The categorisation of Icelandic journals should be valid for a three-year period. The current categorisation applies to publications in 2010, 2011 and 2012. Icelandic scientific and academic journals will next be categorised at the end of 2012, which categorisation shall be valid for articles published in 2013, 2014 and 2015. Journals are sorted into three categories in conformity with the following requirements, the opinions and evaluation of a team of specialists for the categorisation of journals. The team of specialists shall comprise the Science Committee for Public Higher Education Institutions as well as five specialists involved in the academic management of scientific and academic journals, selected by the committee.

1. **5 points** are awarded for articles in journals meeting at least four of the first group of requirements.
2. **10 points** are awarded for articles in journals meeting the first 16 requirements.
3. **15 points** are awarded for articles in journals meeting the first 16 of requirements, and considered to satisfy those considerations described in items 17, 18 and 19.

**Requirements for the 5-point category:**

1. Publication of previously unpublished results.
2. Editor and editorial staff have postgraduate education in the academic field and considerable research experience.
3. Comments from the editor, editorial staff and reviewers are substantive.
4. Peer-reviewed articles are specifically marked in journals which also publish material which has not been peer-reviewed.

**Additional requirements and considerations for the 10-point category:**

5. The journal has a clear policy on peer review.
6. The article is subject to preliminary review by the editor or academic editorial staff - accepted/rejected.
7. Submitted articles are never published without undergoing anonymous peer review from two or more specialists in the relevant field.
8. The rejection rate must be at least 15% of submitted articles. As a rule, this rate shall be based on the previous three years.
9. Regular, scheduled publication frequency. As a rule, this shall be based on 5 years.
10. Abstract in Icelandic.
11. Abstract in English.
12. Descriptive journal title.
13. Descriptive article titles.
14. Satisfactory bibliographical information for all citations.
15. Satisfactory indication of authors' addresses.
16. The ratio of authors of peer-reviewed articles who are 'external' is considered, i.e. who come from outside the immediate environment of the journal, e.g. from outside the university or institute in question responsible for publication of the journal.

**Considerations for the 15-point category:**

17. Online access to articles and/or abstracts.
18. Indexation of, or plans to index, the journal in international databases.
19. Consideration is given to whether the journal is a leading academic journal in its field.

**Appendix II - On evaluation of artistic creation and works of art**

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

To receive points for artistic creation, teaching staff must perform regular teaching relating specifically to artistic creation and works of art (including literature). In this respect, teaching staff are not limited to individual art forms (a visual arts teacher may, for example, receive points for a dramatic play or concert performance).



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

A large solo exhibition at a recognised art gallery, endorsed by an arts council, denotes a solo exhibition of visual and design pieces at, e.g.: the National Gallery of Iceland, Reykjavik Art Museum, Kópavogur Art Museum, the ASÍ Art Gallery, Hafnarborg - the Hafnarfjörður Centre of Culture and Fine Art, the Nordic House in Reykjavík, Akureyri Art Museum or other recognised art galleries.

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

Solo exhibition here denotes a solo exhibition of pieces not previously shown. Recognised art galleries are the same as enumerated above.

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

Musical compositions falling under this category include operas and orchestral pieces performed in a public concert hall, e.g. 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 dramatic play performed publicly by recognised artists (0-10 points)*

Shorter compositions performed by recognised artists 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 outside of Iceland. Public subscription concerts include the Iceland Symphony Orchestra concert series and Tíbrá concert series in Salurinn, the Kópavogur Concert Hall.

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

Concert here refers to solo performances or artistic direction of concerts under the auspices of a respected concert holder or cultural institution. Artistic direction here refers to conduction of an orchestra, choir or chamber music ensemble.

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. As a rule, concert premieres receive more points.

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 Iceland Symphony Orchestra, even where a solo performance is not at issue, on the condition that they have been selected to perform on the basis of their artistic ability. In general, such events are only evaluated for points if they amount to more than two in a year.

Respected concert holders and cultural institutions include: Iceland 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, e.g. the Icelandic National Broadcasting Service (RÚV). Recognised record labels include: Association of Icelandic Musicians, Ísdiskar, Iceland Music Information Centre, Jazzís, Klassís, Bad Taste, Skífan, Stöðin Inc., Thule Musik, Tónaflóð and known record labels outside of Iceland.

*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) (10-40 points)*

Novels, poetry collections, short story collections, lengthy plays and other literary works of artistic value. Previous publication of individual sections of a work 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) (0-10 points)*

Organisation and management of an exhibition or performance for an art gallery or theatre.

Design work here denotes 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 is acknowledged by other parties, such as an arts council or selection committee.

### **Appendix III.**

## **Changes to the Evaluation System for Public Higher Education Institutions concerning so-called predatory journals**

At the end of December 2018, the Evaluation System Committee decided to add specific provisions to the Evaluation System addressing predatory journals. These provisions allow articles published in such journals to be evaluated for a maximum of 5 points, which is in accordance with the practices of the Division of Science and Innovation and evaluation committees. Please note that the 5-point evaluation category is the lowest journal category and is not an 'advanced point category'.

In light of the fact that there was no clear provision in the Evaluation System for these journals, the conclusions of the Division of Science and Innovation and evaluation committees were frequently referred to the appellate committee, which without exception awarded 10 points for the articles, which therefore also counted for advanced points. Due to this interpretation by the appellate committee, it was necessary to include in the Evaluation System specific provisions for these journals in order to keep them in the lowest journal category.

Some people have argued that these journals should not be evaluated for points at all. This is how they have been treated, for example, in the Finnish evaluation system. But this practice has been criticised on the grounds that academics are systematically tricked into publishing in predatory journals. In light of the fact that almost without exception, people only publish in these journals because they were duped, we believe it is fair to award the minimum number of points for them. But of course it is not possible to republish the same research results in a recognised scientific outlet.

The reach of predatory journals is always increasing; they are known for using aggressive tactics to dupe academics into using them to publish their research. They do this, for example, through spam emails and misleading offers. Experience shows that it is easy for academics to fall into the trap. The tell-tale signs of these journals, which generally are open access, include:

- Publishing fees are low and peer review is generally completed very quickly
- A publishing company has started a large number of journals at the same or similar time
- There is significant overlap in editors and editorial boards for journals from the same publisher, across different academic disciplines
- They often specify registration in databases with no quality criteria (e.g. Copernicus, WorldCat and Academia.edu)
- They often specify an impact factor with unknown or unscrupulous organisations (e.g. International Scientific Indexing, abbreviated to ISI, which is obviously intentionally misleading)
- Such journals are in some cases interdisciplinary and often have international titles (e.g. International Journal of Scientific Study!)
- The journal's address is not in the same country as the title would suggest

When selecting a journal, it is best to choose one that is registered in a recognised database or list. Examples of trustworthy databases include:

- Den Bibliometriske Forskingsindikator (Denmark): <https://ufm.dk/forskning-og-innovation/statistik-og-analyser/den-bibliometriske-forskningsindikator/BFI-lister>
- Directory of Open Access Journals (doaj.org)
- Icelandic journals evaluated according to the Evaluation System for Public Higher Education Institutions
- Publication Forum (Finland): <https://www.tsv.fi/julkaisuforum/haku.php?lang=en>
- Register over vitenskapelige publiseringskanaler (Norway): <https://dbh.nsd.uib.no/publiseringskanaler/Forside>
- Scopus (scopus.com)
- Web of Science (webofknowledge.com)

Individuals have also created lists of journals and publishers that bear the marks of being predatory and it is worth checking these. The most famous is 'Beall's list', but this is no longer maintained. Here you can see examples of such lists:

- Beall's list of predatory journals and publishers (archived most recent version of Beall's list): <https://bealllist.weebly.com/>
- List of Predatory Publishers: <https://predatoryjournals.com/publishers/>
- List of Predatory Journals: <https://predatoryjournals.com/journals/>

If in doubt, the Division of Science and Innovation are happy to advise on publication outlet.