

Evaluation System for Public Higher Education Institutions

The Evaluation System for Public Higher Education Institutions forms the basis for annual performance evaluation for academic staff, i.e. persons hired in accordance with a qualifications assessment who are members of the State University Professors' Union or another union that is party to the Evaluation System (for example, the Association of University Teachers at UI or the Association of University Teachers in Akureyri).

Annual performance evaluations cover research, teaching, administration, service and other work. Evaluation is based on the annual performance report, which academic staff at public universities can access through Ugla. At the University of Iceland, published works and materials not marked with the name of the University of Iceland are not evaluated. No points will be awarded, for research, teaching or anything else, before a satisfactory performance report has been submitted.

Following recruitment of academic staff members, they will undergo an initial evaluation of their previous work based on a CV, bibliography or other available documentation. New staff members are not required to identify written works for the initial evaluation. If a staff member has undergone initial evaluation but is later recruited for a different position, the earlier initial evaluation shall be valid. In case of a temporary hiatus in the employment contract, points may be awarded for publications and work completed in that period.

Evaluation is conducted in accordance with an agreement between the University of Iceland, the University of Akureyri, Hólar University College, the Agricultural University of Iceland, the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs, the State University Professors' Union, the Association of University Teachers at the University of Iceland, and the Association of University Teachers at the University of Akureyri, signed on 1 December 2020.

Research

Evaluation of research is largely based on the publication outlet. Research published by a channel that requires rigorous academic standards is considered to have been already evaluated with regard to 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 relevant field. Publication distribution, accessibility and impact are also evaluated.

Works, in particular articles in academic journals, are awarded points whether they are published online only or also in print.

Teaching

Teaching activity and quality are evaluated, including publication of teaching materials, innovation in teaching, and supervision of final projects for undergraduate and graduate students. Emphasis is placed on rewarding innovation in teaching, contributions to pedagogical development, teaching portfolios, and participation in pedagogical courses.

Administration, service and other

Section C of the Evaluation System covers university administrative work. Points are awarded for specific administrative positions, in particular positions serving the University as a whole or its schools. Section D covers work defined as service and education for the public, the government, organisations, stakeholder groups, charities and other parties performed by university employees based on their specialist knowledge.

A. Research – evaluation criteria, special evaluation and re-evaluation

a) Division of points for jointly authored material

This rule applies to written works, including books (A2), book chapters (A3), journal articles (A4), conference publications (A5), academic editorial work (A7), reports, reviews and translations (A8). The rule for jointly authored material is also applied to published, accessible works that are not conventional academic publications, e.g. learning material (A9), and to innovation (A10). It also applies to pedagogical works (B2), advisory opinions and reports (D4), and educational material for the public (D6). 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 who have published 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 who have published four or fewer jointly authored works in a year shall receive additional points for one work. Staff members who have published 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 five authors, each of whom is awarded 8 points ($2 \times 20 / 5 = 8$). Then (in accordance with item 1 above), the difference is calculated between points awarded (8) and points prior to division (20), which is 12 points. In accordance with the rule, each author receives additional points totalling half of this difference, or 6 points. The work therefore earns an author 14 points (8+6). 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.

This rule means that the more authors a work has, the greater the number of additional points awarded. If there were 10 authors rather than 5 in the above example, the number of additional points awarded would be 8 rather than 6, making the total number of points awarded per author 12 rather than 14.

b) Ranking and classification system for books and journals

Evaluation of books (A2), book chapters (A3) and journals (A4) relies on recognised international databases such as Scopus and Web of Science. The Finnish Publication Forum

rating and classification system is also used to some extent. The Finnish Publication Forum divides academia into 23 disciplines. Academic journals and publishers are ranked by 23 panels of experts in these disciplines. The main requirement is that work must be published by peer-reviewed academic publishers with editorial boards made up of leading experts in the discipline.

The Finnish system classifies journals, publishers and conferences into three levels:

Basic level. Peer-reviewed publication channels (publishers or journals) that are specialised in the publication of scientific research outcomes and have an editorial board of experts of the discipline. The majority of all publication channels are classified as Level 1, which is the basic level.

Leading and highest level. Peer-reviewed journals, conferences and publishers of the highest level and impact as judged by the expert panels. They are mostly international publication channels but in humanities and social sciences, Level 2 also includes domestic channels.

Publication channels that have been evaluated but do not meet all of the Level 1 criteria are marked as Level 0. Current classifications are available through the *JUFO-portal*, see link below.

See further details on the Finnish Publication Forum here: [Julkaisufoorumi \(tsv.fi\)](http://julkaisufoorumi.tsv.fi)

The Norwegian Register for Scientific Journals, Series and Publishers is also used. Journals that are classified as level 1 or 2 in this system meet the criteria for category A4.3 in the Evaluation System for Public Higher Education Institutions. See the Norwegian Register for Scientific Journals, Series and Publishers here: <https://dbh.nsd.uib.no/publiseringskanaler/Forside>

If there is any discrepancy between different systems regarding the level of a publication channel, points are always awarded based on the classification level that is most advantageous for the employee.

c) Special evaluation

Alongside the annual performance report, teaching and research staff may request that works within categories A.2-A.5, A7.2 and A8.1 be evaluated specially. Under these circumstances, a productivity evaluation committee is authorised to deviate from the evaluation framework (maximum points) that applies to the work. If a member of teaching or research staff wishes a work to be awarded more points than the maximum stated here, a special supporting argument must be submitted. The staff member must show that the work in question is exceptionally significant or has been published by a channel that meets particularly rigorous academic standards. Specialist input shall be sought in making a special evaluation.

d) Re-evaluation

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

Evaluation categories A1 to A12

A1 Theses

The name of the university at which the final thesis was written must be stated, along with the length and title of the thesis. If an individual reports two theses, points are awarded for both. If articles, books or other material based on a final thesis are published in a recognised academic channel, these publications shall be evaluated separately in the appropriate category.

<i>A1.1 Candidate's, Master's or M.Phil thesis</i>	<i>15 points</i>
<i>A1.2 Doctoral thesis</i>	<i>30 points</i>

A2 and A3 Books and book chapters

Books are organised into four categories, see below. A special committee of three specialists, appointed by the board for the Evaluation System for Public Higher Education Institutions, shall carry out the evaluation and classification of books and book chapters. The committee shall, as appropriate, seek the input of other specialists in evaluating individual books and book chapters. The evaluation will consider whether the work meets international standards concerning editorial format and scholarly contribution, regardless of the language in which it is written. The process for evaluating journal articles is also taken into consideration (see categorisation in A4).

The board for the Evaluation System is authorised to issue more detailed guidance on the evaluation and classification of books.

A2 Books

<i>A2.1 Peer-reviewed publications by the world's most respected academic publishers</i>	<i>80 points</i>
--	------------------

Extensive books published by the world's most respected academic publishers. A list of publication channels that come under this classification in accordance with the Finnish Publication Forum can be found [here](#).

This list is not exhaustive. Please note that employees may submit a reasoned argument requesting that certain internationally respected book publishers that meet particularly rigorous academic standards be evaluated under this category.

Book series that are eminent within a certain narrow academic field may be evaluated in A2.1. Books that are categorised as more minor works or pamphlets are evaluated in category A2.3 or, as appropriate, in A2.4, even if they are published by one of the world's most respected academic publishers.

<i>A2.2 Peer-reviewed publications with international significance</i>	<i>60 points</i>
--	------------------

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

- 1) The works meet the highest standards for knowledge creation in academic research and are written with clear reference to contemporary international academic debate.
- 2) The publisher guarantees that works are accessible on an international platform (through 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 performs academic editorial work.

- 4) If the work is in Icelandic, it must include an abstract in English or another language that is generally used and understood by scholars in the relevant discipline.

A2.3 Icelandic or international peer-reviewed publications primarily aimed at the domestic academic community *40 points*

This category includes peer-reviewed works published by recognised publication channels, which are aimed primarily at the domestic academic community and do not satisfy all requirements stipulated for category 2. Publications in this category must be based on independent research, but their value may also lie in knowledge transfer, i.e. their role in disseminating international academic debates and theories to the domestic academic community.

In exceptional circumstances, a work in this category may be awarded up to 60 points. To be worth 60 points, a work must be particularly extensive and meet international peer review, editorial and distribution standards. The board for the Evaluation System, in consultation with a book committee, shall establish more detailed evaluation criteria for these requirements.

A2.4 Other books *0-25 points*

Academic works primarily aimed at the domestic academic community. Evaluation is based on peer review and editorial practices and the scope of the work.

A2.5 Republications *5 points*

Points are awarded for republications that involve significant revisions. A book committee will determine whether the revisions are significant. A book committee may seek the opinions of external experts to inform its decision.

A3 Book chapters

Book chapters fall into five evaluation categories, with criteria corresponding to the categories for books (A2.1 to A2.4). The combined evaluation of chapters by the same author in the same work cannot award more points than the maximum points value of the book in the relevant category. No points are awarded for book chapters that have been published previously by another channel and have undergone no or minor changes.

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 Icelandic or international peer-reviewed publications 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 *0-10 points*

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 findings. Extensive chapters in handbooks and encyclopaedias with a bibliography, published by the most respected academic publishers in the world, are awarded up to 10 points, while other chapters in handbooks and encyclopaedias which do not meet the aforementioned requirements are awarded 0-5 points.

A4 Journal articles

Academic journal databases

The evaluation of journal articles is based on two of the most major academic journal databases, namely Clarivate's Web of Science (WoS) and Elsevier's Scopus. The Finnish Publication Forum rating and classification system introduced above is also used.

The board for the Evaluation System shall determine the classification of Icelandic journals.

A4.1 Article published in WoS or Scopus journal with a high impact factor and citescore 20 points

Articles in ISI journals with an impact factor and citescore high enough to place them in the top 20% in their category are awarded 20 points.

Where the impact factor is not published, employees may submit a reasoned argument requesting that their articles published in particularly prestigious journals be evaluated under this category.

A4.2 Other articles in WoS and Scopus journals, articles in journals at Level 2 and 3 of the Finnish Publication Forum, as well as articles in the WoS [Emerging Sources Citation Index](#) 15 points

The WoS Emerging Sources Citation Index is a kind of waiting room or probationary period for journals that have been added to the WoS database. For further information, see the link above.

A4.3 Articles in journals at Level 1 of the Finnish Publication Forum and Level 1 and 2 of the Norwegian Register (10 points).

A4.4 Other articles in academic journals that do not meet the criteria for categories A4.1 to A4.3 0-5 points

The board for the Evaluation System ranks Icelandic academic journals into the above categories in accordance with international quality criteria, explained in more detail in Appendix I. These criteria are also considering when evaluating other journals that are not included in the above databases, see A4.1 to A4.3. Under category A4.4, points may be awarded for a 'letter' or 'comment' published in a peer-reviewed journal.

Articles in so-called 'predatory' journals are **not** awarded points. Please note that Appendix III contains guidance on the tell-tale signs of these journals and that the Division of Science and Innovation can provide further information. If you are in doubt about how a journal is classified, please contact the Division of Science and Information.

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. At least 5 of these speakers must work outside the country in which the conference is held.

Abstracts and extended summaries are not awarded points.

A5.1 Article published in an outstanding conference publication *10 points*
Peer-reviewed articles in conference publications published in a format recognised in the relevant discipline. Such conference publications must be accessible in international databases. Examples of this kind of database can be found [here](#).

Conference publications archived only in open digital repositories such as Opinn Vísindi and Hirslan are not included in this category.

This list is not exhaustive. Productivity evaluation committees shall evaluate individual cases that arise.

A5.2 Article in a conference publication not classed as outstanding *3-5 points*
This refers to peer-reviewed conference publications. When determining the number of points to be awarded, peer review procedures are taken into account.

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

<i>A6.1 Plenary lecture or keynote address at an international academic conference</i>	<i>5 points</i>
<i>A6.2 Public guest lecture at a university outside Iceland</i>	<i>3 points</i>
<i>A6.3 Lecture at an international conference (see definition in A5)</i>	<i>3 points</i>
<i>A6.4 Lecture at a domestic conference</i>	<i>2 points</i>
<i>A6.5 Lecture at an academic symposium, seminar or forum for professional groups</i>	<i>1 point</i>
<i>A6.6 Poster at an international conference</i>	<i>2 points</i>
<i>A6.7 Poster at a domestic conference</i>	<i>1 point</i>

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). A plenary lecture at a very large conference (over 1,000 participants) may be awarded 10 points. For a public guest lecture at a university outside Iceland (A6.2), emphasis is on the invitation and the international recognition it represents. This means that the employee must submit information on who issued the invitation and confirming that it was a public lecture. Generally, points are not awarded for a series of lectures at the same university (e.g. 2-5 lectures in a series), since this is considered to be teaching.

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.

No distinction is drawn between online and in-person conferences.

A7 Academic editorial work

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

A7.1 Editor of an academic journal

3-5 points per issue

Only academic editorial work on peer-reviewed articles is awarded points. Three points are awarded for editorial work that chiefly involves making decisions on publication of material. If editorial work also pertains to the content and treatment of individual articles, criticism and academic commentary, two additional points are awarded. An editor responsible for both tasks shall therefore receive 5 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.

3 points may be awarded for sub or co-editing, for example as a national editor or editor for a specific topic area. It remains the case that no points are awarded for membership of an editorial board.

A7.2 Book editor

3-15 points

Editing of peer-reviewed books only. It is assumed that for such books, the editor determines what material is 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.

An employee may request special evaluation of very substantial editorial work, e.g. in the case of a large collection of material by a number of scholars, e.g. in a book that reviews an extensive academic field, where the editor takes an active role in this mapping process, i.e. through structuring the work, writing introductions to individual sections, and so forth.

Editing a series of books also falls under this category. 3 points are awarded for each book, up to a maximum of 15 points per year.

A8 Reports, reviews and translations

A8.1 Reports

0-5 points

Evaluation is based on the extent of data acquisition, originality and contribution to advancement of knowledge. This category includes published academic reports, university publication series with publication numbers, and reports falling under legal deposit legislation, e.g. having an ISBN or ISSN.

Reports may also be awarded service points under D4. Reports which are the output of contract research generally fall under category D. Evaluation of reports is generally based on whether their content could, if necessary, be published by a channel which requires rigorous academic standards.

A8.2 Reviews

1-3 points

Points are awarded for reviews published in journals in categories A4.1 to A4.4. Reviews must involve academic discussion and criticism; this category does not include short reports on the material content of individual books or other publications.

Evaluation is based on the publication channel. Reviews published by channels in the categories A4.1/A4.2 are awarded 3 points, A4.3 is worth 2 points and A4.4 is worth 1 point.

A8.3 Translations of academic articles and book chapters

1-5 points

Evaluation is based on the publication channel. Translations published by channels in the categories A4.1/A3.1 are awarded 5 points, A4.3/A3.3 is worth 3 points and A4.4/A3.4 is worth 1 point. The article or book chapter must be unabridged.

A8.4 Translations of academic books

10-25 points

Points are awarded for translations of material in the employee's discipline and of significant academic value. This category does not include translations of the employee's own work, since this would be defined rather as a republication. Evaluation is based on the extent of the work and the publication channel. Translations of academic books that would be categorised in A2.1 are awarded 25 points, A2.2 is worth 20 points, A2.3 is worth 15 points and A2.4 is worth 10 points.

Republications of works in other languages are awarded up to 10 points. This refers to translations of academic works by university scholars published by an international publication channel. If such a work receives significant academic acclaim, it may be evaluated for more points in accordance with the provisions for special evaluation.

A9 Creation of learning material for preschools, compulsory schools or upper secondary schools

A9.1 Learning material

0-10 points

The research element of creating learning material for preschools, compulsory schools or upper secondary schools may be awarded points if it meets the following requirements:

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

If these criteria are not met, learning material is evaluated for service points. Please note that learning material for higher education is evaluated under the teaching section (B2).

A10 Innovation and knowledge transfer

Evaluation of innovation, including societal innovation and knowledge transfer, involves strict requirements concerning connection to research, originality and knowledge innovation. Artistic creation in an academic context also falls under this category. Innovation and knowledge transfer may also be awarded service points if the connection to research is minimal or unclear.

A10.1 Participation in design and planning competition *1-5 points*

Design and planning competitions held by public institutions or recognised professional organisations in the relevant field. Participation in such competitions is only awarded points if the entry is judged eligible and included in an exhibition of design entries. If the entry reaches the finals or is purchased, the number of points awarded is doubled. The employee must submit evidence confirming that the entry was eligible and that it reached the final, where applicable. A statement detailing the employee's contribution to the work is also required. Evaluation is based on the scope of the project.

A10.2 Research software *5 points*

Research software must be accompanied by a published and peer-reviewed academic article that refers to the software, explains it, and utilises it for research purposes. The peer-reviewed academic article may also be evaluated under A4 where appropriate.

A10.3 Psychological tests and comparable measuring tools *0-5 points*

Points are only awarded for tests or measuring tools that are published and accessible and involve research work that has not been published in any other format.

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

Points are only awarded for bills that involve original research and research work that has not been published in any other format. Service points may be awarded for work on a bill that does not meet the above criteria. Drafting a bill may in some instances involve considerable research work. In such cases, up to 10 points may be awarded for it. The author must specifically request special evaluation and submit supporting arguments. Evaluation of legislative bills is generally based on whether their content could, if necessary, be published by a channel that requires rigorous academic standards. Where the author(s) are not identified in the bill itself, confirmation of authorship must accompany the performance report.

A10.5 Patents *5-15 points*

5 points are awarded for submission of a priority patent application (the first application that describes the new technology). 10 additional points are awarded for submission of an international PCT patent application or national patent application based on the priority application within 12 months. No points are awarded for resubmission of a patent application that has already been awarded points.

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

Development work in schools or other organisations based on the employee's research. Development projects in this category involve the transfer of new knowledge within the domain of a school/organisation, and are evaluated upon completion. A project description and implementation plan must be submitted. The connection between the development project and the employee's research must be explained. Evaluation of development projects will consider the extent of the project. Service points may be awarded for development projects that do not meet the above criteria.

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

Points for artistic creation are only awarded to teaching staff who perform regular teaching that relates specifically to artistic creation and works of art (including literature). Teaching staff are only awarded points for artistic creation in their own discipline, meaning that a visual arts instructor, for example, may not be awarded points for a musical or literary creation. For further details on evaluation of artistic creation and works of art, see Appendix II.

A11 Citations

Only citations recorded in WoS or Scopus are evaluated. Citations are evaluated at the start of employment. An employee may choose which database is used to count citations, if a recount is requested in the annual performance report. If no preference is stated, WoS is used. See instructions on searching for citations in WoS and Scopus [here](#).

Citations are awarded points 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.

Citations exceeding 4,000: 0.01 point per citation.

Points for citations are not used to calculate payments from productivity evaluation funds.

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 relevant university. Points are only awarded for grants that are recorded in the accounting system of the relevant university or its affiliated institutes. The project manager or coordinator for a grant application also receives points unless otherwise agreed with the grant recipient. If the grant is awarded from an international competitive fund, it is worth double the points listed below.

Grants from competitive funds are worth:

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.

Points for grants are not used to calculate payments from productivity evaluation funds and are not included in the initial evaluation on recruitment.

B Teaching

B1 Teaching experience

- B1.1 Adjunct lecturer, lecturer, senior lecturer or professor, full-time position* 10 points per year
- B1.2 Sessional teacher with supervision of courses* 2 points per year
Two points for each course, though not exceeding 6 points per year

Teaching in academic mobility programmes is evaluated as sessional teaching.

- B2 Pedagogical works, textbooks or online teaching material* 0-60 points
Evaluation of pedagogical works is based on the publisher and scope.

Consideration will be given to originality and pedagogical innovation. The criteria in categories A2 and A3 (books and book chapters) will also be taken into account, e.g. with regard to publication channel, accessibility and distribution.

B3. Supervision of students and thesis opposition

- B3.1 Master's thesis* 2-4 points
- B3.2 Main supervisor for PhD thesis* 10 points
- B3.3 Member of doctoral board* 3 points
- B3.4 Thesis opponent* 3 points
- B3.5 BA/BS project* 0.5 points

Points are awarded for supervision of students upon completion of the thesis. The names of the students and their thesis titles must be stated. The number of points awarded for a Master's thesis depends on its scope. 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.

If a PhD thesis confers an MPhil degree, the points awarded to academic supervisors and members of the doctoral committee are halved.

A main supervisor may split points earned in category B3.2 with one secondary supervisor, where applicable, proportionally in line with the responsibility they had for supervision. A main supervisor and secondary supervisor will generally receive 3 points each for membership of the doctoral committee.

B4 Innovation in teaching

- B4.1 General innovation in teaching* 1-5 points per year
Innovation in teaching and teaching methods, such as the organisation and definition of study programmes, significant reorganisation of courses, definition of new courses, development of teaching methods, creation of project databases and so forth. The employee must submit a report on innovation work to be evaluated in this category, confirmed by the faculty head or department head. The report must explain the function of the innovation in the work of the relevant faculty.
- B4.2 Successful application for reduction in teaching duties to facilitate pedagogical development* 1 point per year
- B4.3 Successful application to the Academic Affairs Fund* 1 point
- B4.4 Teaching Academy (points awarded on admission)* 10 points
- B4.5 Teaching portfolio* 1 point

This refers only to the first evaluation of the teaching portfolio by international experts in connection with application to the Teaching Academy. The employee must have completed a course on writing a teaching portfolio.

B4.6 Development of courses also offered at universities abroad 3 points

B4.7 Courses on pedagogy 0-2 points

2 points are awarded for a longer, formal course. No points are awarded for participation in individual lectures.

C Administration

Points are awarded for administrative work as outlined below:

<i>C1</i>	<i>Head of department</i>	<i>10 points/year</i>
<i>C2</i>	<i>Chair of a University Council working committee or school standing evaluation committee</i>	<i>10 points/year</i>
<i>C3.</i>	<i>Chair of an important school working committee</i>	<i>5 points/year</i>
<i>C4.</i>	<i>Director of research institute</i> <i>Evaluated based on turnover.</i>	<i>5-15 points/year</i>
<i>C5.1</i>	<i>Head of faculty</i> <i>Evaluated based on turnover, number of employees and number of students at the faculty.</i>	<i>30, 40 or 50 points/year</i>
<i>C5.2</i>	<i>Deputy head of faculty</i> <i>Only evaluated if the deputy head of faculty is not head of department</i>	<i>3 points/year</i>
<i>C6.</i>	<i>Dean of school</i>	<i>75 points/year</i>
<i>C7.</i>	<i>Rector</i>	<i>100 points/year</i>
<i>C8.</i>	<i>Pro-rector</i>	<i>50 points/year</i>
<i>C9.</i>	<i>Member of the University Council</i>	<i>5 points/year</i>
<i>C10.</i>	<i>Member of a committee under the auspices of the University Council or the rector</i>	<i>2 points/year</i>
<i>C11.</i>	<i>Chair of a committee under the auspices of the University Council or the rector</i>	<i>3 points/year</i>
<i>C12.</i>	<i>Member of an evaluation committee or selection committee for positions at the university</i> <i>2 points are awarded for each evaluation committee and each selection committee, up to a maximum of 10 points/year</i>	<i>2 points</i>
<i>C13.</i>	<i>Member of research institute board</i>	<i>1 point</i>
<i>C14.</i>	<i>Member of school working committee</i>	<i>1 point</i>
<i>C15</i>	<i>Director of academic development</i>	<i>3 points/year</i>

D Service

D1 Organisation of international academic conference (see definition under A5)
Chair of committee for an international conference held in Iceland or abroad 10 points
Member of committee for an international conference held in Iceland or abroad 1 point

D2 Evaluation work for the public sector 0-2 points
Member of public evaluation committees, specific temporary projects.

D3 Member of committee or board
This applies in particular to committees and boards under the auspices of public entities, international institutions and international academic organisations.
Chair 3 points
General member 2 points

D4 Advisory opinions and reports 0-5 points
The category includes reports that do not meet the criteria for A8 or are unpublished and advisory opinions published by or for parties outside the relevant university. The productivity evaluation committee must have access to a report for it to be awarded points. Evaluation is generally based on the scope of the report (see A8). A maximum of total 20 points per year may be awarded for category D4.

D5 Transfer of specialist knowledge 0-20 points
This must be a written work and/or dissemination of material undertaken by employees on the basis of their specialist academic knowledge.

1. *Published books for a general audience in general distribution* 0-20 points
Generally points are awarded as follows: If under 50 pages, then evaluated in D5.2, 50-100 pages = 5 points, 100-150 = 10 points, 150-200 = 15 points, 200+ = 20 points
2. *Book chapters for a general audience* 0-5 points
3. *Translations for a general audience* 0-10 points
Everything under 5 pages = 0 points. Other articles 1-2 points
Book translations generally 10 points, although 5 points for shorter books
4. *Editing of books and journals for a general audience* 0-6 points
Editing of unabridged book = 6 points. Editor of an academic journal, 2 points per issue, up to a maximum of 6 points per year
5. *Article in journal for a general audience* 0-5 points
6. *Review or critique in the media (maximum: 10 points per year)* 1 point
7. *Newspaper article (0-3 points) or composition of item appearing in other traditional or social media* 0-10 points
(maximum: 10 points per year)
8. *Address at a forum, seminar or symposium aimed at the public or other interest groups* 1 point
(maximum 10 points per year)
9. *Dissemination of information, media interviews and advisory work (maximum: 10 points per year)* 0-10 points

10. *Knowledge transfer that utilises methods in the field of art and technology* 0-10 points
11. *Software that involves practical software development and is distributed nationally or internationally either as merchandise or open source software, including open repositories such as github.com.* 0-6 points
2 points per package, up to a maximum of 6 points per year

A maximum of 20 total points per year may be awarded for categories D5.2 to D5.11.

D6 Start-up companies and licensing agreements (0-50 points)

Points are based on an evaluation of the impact of start-up companies founded by one or more employees where the university owns shares and of licensing agreements for the exploitation of certain knowledge created within the university. Employees must submit information explaining the societal impact of the start-up company / licensing agreement and their contribution to the company / licensing agreement. Employees may apply for re-evaluation if the impact increases, but the total number of points awarded must not exceed 50.

- D6.1 Significant international impact* 20-50 points
- D6.2 Moderate international impact* 5-30 points
- D6.3 Significant impact for Iceland and/or individual countries* 5-30 points
- D6.4 Moderate impact for Iceland and/or individual countries* 2-20 points

For further details see guidelines.

D7 Grants from sources other than competitive funds 0-20 points

Total value of grants from funding sources outside the university. Points are only awarded for grants that are recorded in the accounting system of the relevant university or its affiliated institutes. 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.

Points for grants are not included in the initial evaluation on recruitment.

E Previous employment (for initial evaluation)

Points shall be awarded for previous employment in positions not enumerated here, on the condition that they were in the employee's discipline and relevant to the current teaching or research position.

Employment experience 10 points per year

The sum of points awarded for previous employment combined with points for teaching may not exceed 10 points per year.

F Fixed annual points

Research specialists, research scholars and research scientists with 40% research duties shall be awarded 10 fixed annual points for performing duties other than research, in conformity with the 10 fixed annual points awarded for teaching 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.

G Deviations

Points may be awarded for projects falling outside the framework of this Evaluation System, if a reasoned request or proposal has been submitted. This applies in particular to work inside or outside the university benefiting the academic community in a broad sense and extensive publicity or education for the public. In such cases, external opinions may be sought.

Appendix I. On the classification of journals not included in international databases

The board for the Evaluation System for Public Higher Education Institutions shall rank academic journals not included in international journal databases into three categories, see Section A4 (A4.2, A4.3 and A4.4). In ranking these journals, attention is primarily given to their peer review practices, the academic position of the editor and editorial board, publication frequency and, in particular, the journal's status in the relevant discipline, i.e. whether it is a leading journal. Finally, the board looks at the rigour of the academic standards that the journal uses to select articles for publication.

International criteria and classification systems are used to rank journals, including the Finnish Publication Forum, developed by the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies (tsv.fi). See also: <https://julkaisufoorumi.fi/en/evaluations/classification-criteria>

1. Category A4.2

15 points

This category includes journals that meet all accepted standards for peer review practices and require authors to meet rigorous academic standards, for example regarding innovation and academic practices. Journals in this category must have clear, public rules on peer review procedures in both Icelandic and English. The journal must be published regularly and employ leading international experts in the discipline on the editorial board and as editor. The journal must also enjoy a strong academic status in the discipline and be considered a desirable publication channel for scholars. In this context, consideration is given to the proportion of 'external' authors, i.e. authors from outside the immediate environment of the journal and its publisher. It is assumed that journals in this category are working systematically toward inclusion in one of the journal databases named in Section 4.

2. Category A4.3

10 points

The editor and editorial board must have graduate degrees in the journal's discipline as well as considerable research experience, including having published articles in internationally recognised academic journals. Journals in this category primarily publish previously unpublished research findings and have clear, public rules on peer review procedures. Consideration is given to the proportion of 'external' authors, i.e. authors from outside the immediate environment of the journal and its publisher.

3. Category A4.4

0-5 points

This category includes journals that publish peer-reviewed academic articles. The editor and editorial board must have graduate degrees in the journal's discipline as well as some research experience. The content of articles is generally intended for the domestic academic community.

Appendix II On evaluation of artistic creation and works of art

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

Points for artistic creation are only awarded to teaching staff who perform regular teaching that relates specifically to artistic creation and works of art (including literature). Teaching staff are only awarded points for artistic creation in their own discipline, meaning that a visual arts instructor, for example, may not be awarded points for a musical or literary creation.

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

A major 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 involvement 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 displayed. 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 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 this is not a solo performance, on the condition that they have been selected to perform on the basis of their artistic ability. In general, such events are only awarded 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, Skifan, Stöðin Inc., Thule Musik, Tónaflóð and known record labels outside Iceland.

A10.7.8 Literary texts *0-10 points*

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

A10.7.9 Literary books *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 a play has already been evaluated for points.

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

A10.7.11 Translations of books of artistic value *10-25 points*

A10.7.12 Design, curating or directing work *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 employee's expertise in designing the piece is acknowledged by other parties, such as an arts council or selection committee.

Appendix III. Guidance on the tell-tale signs of predatory journals

University employees are urged to be on their guard against predatory journals, which 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 regarding publishing fees and speed. Experience shows that it is easy 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.
- 'Publishing companies' often begin by establishing several journals at the same 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 which set no quality standards (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 included in a recognised database or list. Examples of trustworthy databases include:

- Den Bibliometriske Forskningsindikator (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 in accordance with the Evaluation System for Public Higher Education Institutions
- Publication Forum (Finland): <https://www.tsv.fi/julkaisufoorumi/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 these are worth having as a reference. The most famous is 'Beall's list', but it is no longer maintained. Here are a few examples of such lists:

- Beall's list of predatory journals and publishers (archived most recent version of Beall's list): <https://beallslist.net/>
- 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 channel.