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A typical faculty budget

- **Lund faculty of science**: 1060 MSEK (2016)
  - GU: 145 MSEK
  - Research: 915 MSEK
- **963 employees**
  - 137 professors
  - 659 other teachers, researchers, PhD students
  - 167 technical and administrative personnel
- **Students**
  - GU: 1800 students (helårsstudenter)
  - FU: 307
- **Lund university as a whole**
  - Total: 7500 MSEK (GU 1/3, Research/FU 2/3)
  - students: 28000 (GU), 1800 (FU)
  - Central allocation 53%
  - External: 37 %
  - Other: 10%
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A typical faculty budget

- Lund faculty of science: 1060 MSEK (2016)
- GU: 145 MSEK
- Research: 915 MSEK
- The central allocation:
  - Bachelor/Master: 130 MSEK (planned 2016)
  - Research/PhD education: 453 MSEK (planned 2016)
- The 45% extern is (essentially) all research
- Yes, (undergraduate) teaching is not our major occupation (despite what the extended family thinks)
- This is for Lund, similar for the others
Main grant providers

- **Swedish government**
  - Vetenskapsrådet = Swedish Research Council
  - Vinnova: Innovation: (very) applied research
  - Rymdstyrelsen: Space research

- **Swedish private**
  - Wallenberg
  - SKB (via nuclear power programs)
  - Nobel
  - Göran Gustafsson
  - Crafoord
  - Strategiska stiftelsen

- **EU via framework programs and ERC**
- **Many more small players**
VR: main structure

- Board and general director
- Main areas and subboards:
  - **NT**: Science and technology
  - **M**: Medicine and health
  - **HS**: Humanities and social science
  - **RFI**: Research infrastructure
  - Educational science
  - Development research
  - Artistic research (konstnärlig forskning)
  - Clinical therapy research
  - National coordination of clinical studies

Covered in detail in the talks by Henrik Cederquist and Björn Halleröd
These officially take the decisions on grants (all professors)

- Per Persson (Chair), molecular geochemistry, Lund
- Henrik Cederquist, Atomfysik, Stockholms universitet
- Nils Dencker, mathematics, Lunds univeristet
- Dan Henningson, fluidmekanik, KTH
- Kerstin Johannesson, marin ekologi, Göteborgs universitet
- Kristina Luthman, läkemedelskemi, Göteborgs universitet
- David Sands, data- och informationsteknik, Chalmers tekniska högskola
- Maria Selmer, biologi, Uppsala universitet
- Kajsa Uvdal, molekylär fysik, Linköpings universitet

normally present but not member:
- Lars Kloo, Secretary general, oorganisk kemi, KTH
Type of grants

(check vr.se to be sure, changes often)

- **NT alone:**
  - Project grants (4 years 0.3-1.5 MSEK/year)
  - Project grants, starting grants (earlier young researchers) (2-7 years after PhD)

- **Together with others:**
  - International postdoc (twice a year, PhD less than two years)
  - Consolidator (Distinguished young researchers) (6 years, 2 MSEK/year, PhD 7-12 years ago)
  - Conference grant (to organize)
  - Research environments
Time frame (2016)

- early: Nominations of panel members finished
- 5 April: Closing date, Natural and Engineering Sciences
- 11 April: Meeting of the Scientific Council (Decision about evaluation panel members)
- 19 May: Meeting of the chairs of the evaluation panels
- 30 May: Last day to nominate applications to the interdisciplinary panel (Tvärgruppen)
- 31 May: Deadline for placing applications in evaluation panels and for moving applications
- 6 June: Last day for reports of conflict of interest
- 13 June: Deadline for allocation of applications to reviewers (internal)
- June: Dispatch of applications to reviewers
Time frame (2014)

- 22 August-15 September: Panel meetings
- 5 October: Redistribution Group
- 25 October: NT-rådsmöte (Grants official decision)
- 2 November: publication of results (barring unexpected delays)
Beredningsgruppen

- Reorganized every 5-6 years
- 19 Different ones
- Remember NT projects/young is about 1050 MSEK
Beredningsgruppen

1. Matematiska vetenskaper
2. Datavetenskap
3. Subatomär fysik, rymdfysik och astronomi
4. Atom- + molekylfysik, optik + kondenserade materiens fysik
5. Analytisk, fysikalisk och teoretisk kemi
6. Organisk och oorganisk kemi
7. Geologi och geofysik
8. Processer i mark, luft och vatten
9. Biokemi och strukturbio
10. Cell- och molekylärbiologi
11. Organismbiologi
12. Ekologi, systematik och evolution
13. Elektronik, elektroteknik,
14. Signaler och system

Note: all cover a very wide area
3. Subatomär fysik, rymdfysik och astronomi: Acceleratorfysik; Astrophysik; Astronomi; Astropartikelfysik; Fusion; Kosmologi; Matematisk fysik; Plasmafysik; Relativitetsteori; Rymdfysik; Strålningsfysik (icke-medicinska aspekter); Subatomär fysik

MN: Subatomär fysik, astrofysik, rymdfysik och fusion (2008-2013)

M: Subatomär fysik och astrofysik (until 2008)

Until 2000: NFR subatomär var en kommitee

Notes for next page:
- What is counted changes often
- % even more difficult, what is total changes
- Money spent in the area, not all in the beredningsgrupp (postdocs, . . .)
We had fairly small average grants/high degree of granting
We have very much salary support (Friköp)
VR considers all these a problem
Consequence: “our” share has problems in redistribution
Our argument: “VR is all we can get: so getting no is a very big problem” is probably understood (but ignored) by NT but not at higher levels (including politicians)
Argument: universities should take care of small groups
The process

- Grants that run out + some inflation correction + possibly other inputs: determine total budget in area
- Part to redistribution, 2016: 30 MSEK (all 19 groups)
- Remainder the group has free disposal over
- Bg 3: 2013: 8.5 MSEK + 2.8 MSEK (young) + LHC
- Bg 3: 2014: 9.4 MSEK + 2.2 MSEK (young) + LHC
- Bg 3: 2015: 16.3* MSEK + 2.6* MSEK (young) (incl LHC)
- Bg 3: 2016: 13.9 MSEK + 2.1 MSEK (young) (incl LHC)
- All groups 2013: 156 MSEK + 53 MSEK (young)
- All groups 2014: 183 MSEK + 40 MSEK (young)
- All groups 2015: 230* MSEK + 59* MSEK (young)
- All groups 2016: 210 MSEK + 36 MSEK (young)
- Average grant: wanted over 800 kSEK
  Bg 3 2015 about 824k (865k young)
- VR: before was 3 year, since 2014 100% 4 year

* includes redistribution, subtract about 15% to compare
We were: (area is my note and not trustable)

- Hannu Koskinen, Helsingfors, (chair), space/plasma
- Svetlana Ratynskaya, KTH, (vice chair) Fusion
- Alan Aylward, UCL London, Storbritannien, astro
- Ian Bearden, NBI Copenhagen, nuclear (exp heavy ion)
- Johan Bijnens, Lunds universitet, particle/nuclear theory
- Freya Blekman, VUB (Brussels), particle experiment
- Marcella Carollo, ETH, astro/plasma
- Peter Johansson, Helsinki, astro
- Kirsten Kraiberg Knudsen, Chalmers, plasma/fusion
- Ulf Lindström, Uppsala universitet, string/particle
- Mervi Mantsinen, Barcelona, plasma
- Jouni Suhonen, Jyväskylä, Finland, nuclear theory
- Lárus Thorlacius, University of Iceland, string/particle
- Henrik Cederquist, ämnesrådet NT, observatör
- Emma Olsson, Annika Johansen, Vetenskapsrådet
What we had

- 111 applications in total
- each read by (at least) three members, final report is from whole group
- 42 starting grants (2.1 MSEK + omfördelning)
- 68 Project (13.9 MSEK + omfördelning)
- 1 energy
- Each reads 20-35 applications, so that’s why there are page limits and a font size prescribed
Grading

- 7: Outstanding
- 6: Excellent
- 5: Very good to excellent
- 4: Very good
- 3: Good
- 2: Weak
- 1: Insufficient

Typically only very few are 1. or 2.

Grades for: Novelty and originality, scientific quality of the proposed research, merits of the (main) applicant and an overall grade

In addition: feasibility: 1, 2 or 3
Grade distribution (overall only)

Fig. 1 Distribution of the overall grade for all applications for Project Grants and Project Grants for Junior Researchers in the calls for proposals in Natural and Engineering Sciences 2013-2015.
Instructions

- Instructions for grading: [beredningshandboken](is public)
- Rank the applications, till for sure no chance for money
  In frame: directly yes; Remainder to redistribution process
  Ranking is NOT public, only the grades and whether or not money
- 40% lowest graded/ranked not discussed, unless someone asks
Statistics Bg 3: Projects only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Granted</th>
<th>“Frame”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F  M  Total</td>
<td>F  M  total</td>
<td>MSEK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>11 56 67</td>
<td>3 19 22 (32.8%)</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>10 63 73</td>
<td>4 27 31 (42.5%)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6 55 61</td>
<td>2 25 27 (44.3%)</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7 52 59</td>
<td>0 15 15 (25.4%)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>11 52 63</td>
<td>3 10 13 (20.6%)</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>14 62 76</td>
<td>5 16 21 (27.6%)</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9 59 68</td>
<td>– – — (—.—%)</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Can transfer money between projects and young/starting
- Projects young researchers/starting grants not included
- Starting grant, young researchers, Swedish postdoc, FoAss
- Some decreases: new grants type related to ’excellency’ (spetsforskning) and 3 to 4 year shift (9=3/4*12)
- LHC-K + redistribution in “frame” some years
## NT total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Granted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tips, tricks,…

- A well written application helps extremely much
- Describe what you want to do, avoid being overly vague, but also an overview, how it fits in the field
- Not too detailed but sufficient detail that we can judge that you know what you are doing
- No recommendation letters, the application is the information we have.
- Talk to some seniors when submitting an application
- System is electronic: don’t wait till the last day
- Many local requirements: must be satisfied before head of department can sign
- Ansökningar blir allmänna handlingar (can be important for patents)
What NOT to do

- Do not submit late the deadlines are strict
- Do not brag or exaggerate Be objective and realistic, list what you want the panel to know (prizes, referee, . . . ), have an accurate research plan
- Do not preach to the choir accessible to a broad panel, avoid jargon and many acronyms, clean and concise language
- Do not submit a sloppy budget tell us what you want and have a reasonable budget
- Do not be discouraged Competition is strong, many good proposals do not get money, submit again, there are fluctuations from year to year
What you really **should** to do

- **Do follow the instructions:** they might have changed from last year and include all information asked for
- **Do seek out advice from colleagues and mentors:** ask them to read your application
- **Do learn the rules and regulations of your institution**
- **Do follow through on reviewer feedback**
  (we try to write decent reports but short of time)
- **Do check your spelling and grammar**
  Bad spelling = unconscious bad bias
- **Do submit a reasonable budget**
- **be CONCISE and have a CLEARLY STRUCTURED**
  application
Conclusions

- Idea: give you some feeling how things go
- [http://www.vr.se](http://www.vr.se)
- and remember: if you don’t apply you also don’t get it