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A typical faculty budget

- Lund faculty of science: 1070 MSEK (2016)
  - GU: 150 MSEK
  - Research: 920 MSEK
- 945 employees
  - 133 professors
  - 661 other teachers, researchers, PhD students
  - 151 technical and administrative personnel
- Students
  - GU: 1750 students (helårsstudenter)
  - FU: 300
- Lund university as a whole
  - Total: 8000 MSEK (GU 1/3, Research/FU 2/3)
  - students: 28000 (GU), 1800 (FU)
  - Central allocation 55%
  - External: 35%
  - Other: 10%
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A typical faculty budget

- Lund faculty of science: 1070 MSEK (2016)
- GU: 150 MSEK
- Research: 920 MSEK
- The central allocation:
  - Bachelor/Master: 130 MSEK (2016)
  - Research/PhD education: 453 MSEK (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
NT Ämnesrådet

These officially take the decisions on grants (all professors)

- Per Persson (Chair), molecular geochemistry, Lund
- Henrik Cederquist, Atomfysik, Stockholms universitet
- Nils Dencker, mathematics, Lunds universitet
- 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)
Time frame (2017)

- early: Nominations of panel members finished
- 4 April: Closing date, Natural and Engineering Sciences
- April: Meeting of the Scientific Council (Decision about evaluation panel members)
- 10 May: Meeting of the chairs of the evaluation panels
- 15 May: Deadline for placing applications in evaluation panels and for moving applications
- 30 May: Last day for reports of conflict of interest
- 7 June: Deadline for allocation of applications to reviewers (internal)
- June: Dispatch of applications to reviewers
Time frame (2014)

- 21 August-19 September: Panel meetings
- 13 October: Redistribution Group
- 26 October: NT-rådsmöte (Grants official decision)
- 31 October: publication of results
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, halvledarfysik och fotonik
14. Signaler och system

Note: all cover a very wide area
Beredningsgrupp 3, MN, M

- NT-3 Subatomär fysik, rymdfysik och astronomi:
  Acceleratorfysik; Astrofysik; 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 kommittee

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, . . .)
Beredningsgruppen
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Beredningsgrupp 3, MN, M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M/3</td>
<td>36 202</td>
<td></td>
<td>67 445</td>
<td>71 072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>19 588</td>
<td>66 914</td>
<td>67 456</td>
<td>69 160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- We had fairly small average grants/high degree of granting
- We still 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”
- 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)
- Bg 3: 2017: 13.3 MSEK + 2.9 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)
- All groups 2017: 214 MSEK* + 63* MSEK (young)
- Average grant: now around 850 kSEK/year
- VR: before was 3 year, since 2014 100% 4 year
We were: (area is my note and not trustable)

- Kirsten Kraiberg Knudsen, Chalmers, (chair) astro
- Johan Bijnens, Lund, (vice chair) particle/nuclear theory
- Joao Alves, Vienna, Austria, astro
- Freya Blekman, VUB (Brussels), particle experiment
- Jens Jørgen Gaardhøje, NBI, nuclear/particle experiment
- Peter Johansson, Helsinki, astro
- Suzanne Madden, CEA Saclay, astro
- Mervi Mantsinen, Barcelona, plasma
- Niels Obers, NBI, strings
- Svetlana Ratynskaya, KTH, fusion
- Sunniva Siem, Oslo, nuclear experiment
- Lee Thompson, Sheffield, neutrino/astroparticle exp
- Rami Vainio, Abo Akademi, Finland, plasma
- Henrik Cederquist, ämnesrådet NT, observatör
- Emma Olsson, Ida Hansson, Vetenskapsrådet
What we had

- 104 applications in total
- each read by (at least) three members, final report is from whole group
- 38 starting grants (2.9 MSEK + omfördelning)
- 69 Project (13.3 MSEK + omfördelning)
- Each reads 20-35 applications, so that’s why there are page limits and a font size prescribed
- Those close to boundaries: for ’sifting’ and (expected) funding were looked at by some more people (new this year)
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 7 (like one per panel)
- The funding cut goes in the 5 range
- 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)

![Grade distribution graph](image)

*Fig. 1 Distribution of the overall grade for all applications for Project Grants, Project Grants for Junior Researchers and Starting Grants in the calls for proposals in Natural and Engineering Sciences 2013-2016.*
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>Year</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Granted</th>
<th>“Frame”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Can transfer money between projects and young/starting
- 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 (projects, not starting grants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th></th>
<th>Granted</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>1231</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>45</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, etc.), 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** 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
- and remember: if you don’t apply you also don’t get it