



Rektor

**BESLUT** SLU ua 2017.2.5.3-2383

2017-06-08 Exp.

Sändlista

## Fördelning av SLU:s karriärbidrag 2017

### Beslut

Rektor beslutar

att fördela Karriärbidrag – Junior, omfattande 1 mnkr per helår under perioden 1 juli 2017- 30 juni 2020, till följande forskare:

Adam Felton, Sydsvensk skogsvetenskap

Anne-Lie Blomström, Biomedicin och veterinär folkhälsovetenskap

Eva Forsgren, Ekologi

Karina E. Clemmensen, Skoglig mykologi och växtpatologi

Lutz Ahrens, Vatten och miljö

att fördela Karriärbidrag – Senior, omfattande 1 mnkr per helår under perioden 1 juli 2017- 30 juni 2022, till följande forskare:

Agneta Egenvall, Kliniska vetenskaper

Claudia Köhler, Växtbiologi

Hjalmar Laudon, Skogens ekologi och skötsel

Riccardo Bommarco, Ekologi

Rickard Ignell, Växtskyddsbiologi

att bidraget utbetalas till mottagarens institution men är personligt och får disponeras fritt av mottagaren inom ramen för anställningen,

att bidraget utbetalas under förutsättning att mottagaren är anställd vid och bedriver hela sin verksamhet vid SLU. Om mottagaren lämnar SLU dras medel motsvarande resterande bidragsperiod in. Mottagaren är skyldig att omgående meddela rektor i det fall man lämnar sin anställning vid SLU,

att mottagaren är skyldig att på anmodan av rektor lämna en kortfattad rapport över bidragets användning och resultat, samt

att kostnaden under 2017 belastar rektors medel (kostnadsställe 1000000, projekt 68000) och därefter införlivas i den ordinarie anslagsfördelningen.

## Redogörelse för ärendet

Rektor tog under 2016 initiativ till en satsning på karriärbidrag till framstående juniora och seniora forskare. I samband med att riktlinjerna för bidragen fastställdes i december 2016 (dnr SLU ua 2016.1.1.1-4908) inbjöds alla institutioner att föreslå lämpliga kandidater. Varje fakultet har därefter gjort ett urval och nominerat fyra (NJ sex) forskare i varje kategori, med lika antal kvinnor och män i varje kategori.

Rektorsgruppen (rektor, prorektor samt vicerektorerna) granskade den 13 mars 2017 alla inkomna nomineringar och beslutade att samtliga skulle lämnas vidare till sakkunniggranskning. Sakkunniggranskningen genomfördes av forskningsrådet Formas på uppdrag av SLU, med anlitan av internationella experter (beredningsprocessen beskrivs i bilaga 1 till detta beslut). De kriterier som SLU fastställt användes vid bedömningen. Bedömningen utmynnade i att kandidaterna grupperades i fyra prioritetskategorier, utan individuell rangordning inom respektive kategori.

Vid möte med rektorsgruppen den 1 juni 2017 gjordes det slutliga urvalet av mottagarna av bidragen (se bilaga 2). Urvalet utgick från sakkunniggranskningen, med beaktande av rimlig spridning av bidragen till olika forskningsområden av betydelse för universitetets profil. Urvalet resulterade i en jämn fördelning av bidragen mellan kvinnor och män.

Karriärbidragen ger de tio mottagarna ökade möjligheter att fritt utveckla sin forskning. För juniora forskare kan bidragen också underlätta utvecklingen av en självständig forskningsprofil.

Fördelningen av bidrag 2017 är det första steget i en långsiktig satsning vid SLU för att uppmärksamma och stötta individer som gör goda prestationer inom forskningen. Satsningen är också ett uttryck för universitetets allmänna strävan att främja en hög vetenskaplig kvalitet.

Beslutet om fördelning av karriärbidrag kan inte överklagas.

Beslut i detta ärende har fattats i rektors frånvaro av prorektor Karin Holmgren efter föredragning av enhetschef Boel Åström och i närvaro av universitetsdirektör Martin Melkersson.

Karin Holmgren

Boel Åström

## Sändlista

Mottagarna av karriärbidrag

Övriga nominerade kandidater

## Kopia för kännedom

Dekaner

Berörda prefekter

Planeringschefen

Ekonomichefen

Kommunikationschefen

Internrevisionen

## Bilaga:

1. Beskrivning av Formas process för sakkunniggranskning
2. Protokoll från rektorsgruppens möte den 1 juni 2017



Forskningsrådet för miljö, areella näringar och samhällsbyggande, Formas  
*The Swedish Research Council for Environment, Agricultural Sciences and Spatial Planning*

## Description of the evaluation process of SLU career grants 2017

Evaluation of the nominations for career grants (below called applications) was performed by international scientific experts. Each application was evaluated by four experts. First, individual assessments were performed for each application, thereafter the applications were discussed on group level. Finally, the applications were ranked, junior applications and senior applications separately.

### **Competence of experts**

Experts were selected per Formas' standard criteria for scientific evaluators; all experts must be active researchers, i.e. they should actively publish articles and be active in networks and other scientific fora. They should also be, at least, associate professors (or with similar competence, differences between countries). In addition, experts should mainly be active in other countries than Sweden, as this broadens the competence and adds international perspectives to the evaluation.

### **Impartiality**

All experts engaged by Formas have the responsibility to report conflicts of interest and, on their own initiative, report any circumstances that could be believed to influence their opinions. If there is a conflict of interest the panel member cannot participate in the processing and evaluation of that application. Formas guidelines for conflicts of interest are described in the Ethical policy, Appendix 1.

### **Experts in this evaluation process**

An expert panel was created with experts from universities and research institutes in Europe and USA. A total of 25 experts were recruited to guarantee competence to evaluate all areas needed. Ten members constituted a core evaluation panel, assessing several applications per person. 15 members acted as external experts with competence on single application. Each application was evaluated by four experts. Two chairmen were appointed, one for senior-candidates and one for junior candidates, with a mission to read all the application in their respective group and assist in the final ranking.

## How the applications were processed

Each application was assessed by at least one expert with excellent scientific competence in the area and three experts with good scientific knowledge in the area. Applications were appointed to experts after declarations of competence and eventual conflicts of interest from each expert. One of experts with highest competence for each application was appointed rapporteur, being responsible for writing the final written statement.

The defined criteria from SLU Career Grant call were used. All experts graded each criterion per Formas' scale 1-7, and gave a few short comments on each application.

**7 – Outstanding.** The application successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Shortcomings are insignificant.

**6 – Excellent.** The application successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Shortcomings are minor.

**5 – Very good.** The application addresses the criterion very well, but with some notable shortcoming.

**4 – Good.** The application addresses the criterion well, but with several notable shortcomings.

**3 – Acceptable.** While the application broadly addresses the criterion, but there are considerable weaknesses.

**2 – Poor.** The application addresses the criterion in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

**1 – Insufficient.** The application fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.

The individual assessments for each application were summarized and the rapporteur for each application compiled, in discussion with the other readers of the application, comments and grades into a consensus in the group. These

compiled evaluation reports, in combination with their own assessments, were used by the chairmen to rank the applications. The ranking was discussed with Formas, comparing grades and comments and analysing individual comments and grading in cases where applications were on the boundary between two groups in the final ranking.

The applications were divided into three groups: A, B and C

- A was used for applications that were **excellent to outstanding** with an overall grading of 6 or above (A+ was used for the applications considered to be in top by the expert group).
- B was used for applications with grading between 5 and 6, translating to **very good or excellent**.
- C was used for application with the grade 4 meaning **good**.

## Appendix 1

### Ethical Policy

As a governmental, tax-financed research council Formas is accountable to the public for all the work that is performed and for how this work is carried out.

The Formas Ethical Policy and Ethical Guidelines are intended to provide guidance for all who participate in the activities of the research council: members of the Scientific Council, review panel members and employees of Formas. Everyone covered by our policies and guidelines are responsible for ensuring that their activities comply with these policies and guidelines.

The work performed by Formas and the various bodies of Formas (i.e. representatives of Formas) must be performed in a transparent, impartial and professional manner. Decisions shall be based on best scientific and professional practices, after taking all views into consideration. Submitted documents shall be processed impartially and in accordance with the Formas guidelines.

It is not possible to anticipate every individual situation and question that may arise with regard to the review of applications and the awarding of funding. It is therefore essential the members of the Formas Scientific Council, the various bodies within Formas and the employees of Formas discuss problems and are supported by certain common and general guidelines.

#### Ethical guidelines

The ethical guidelines that steer the work of Formas are presented below. These are intended to provide guidance for everyone who participates in the activities of the research council: members of the Scientific Council, review panel members and Formas employees (hereafter referred to collectively as 'Members of the various bodies within Formas').

- Members of the various bodies within Formas have an official responsibility. Personal opinions or preferences must not impede an objective assessment of any matter concerning research funding, research priorities, strategies or appointments.
- Members of the various bodies within Formas must themselves evaluate and openly declare any associations that may be of importance to an impartial review of research grant applications or official matters. A high standard of personal integrity is expected.
- Members of the various bodies within Formas shall show respect for other researchers and their work. Disparaging statements and unfounded claims in



written or oral form concerning research colleagues and research groups or their research work must not be made.

- Members of the various bodies within Formas shall promote scientific credibility by objectively reviewing applications and other official matters (i.e. all submitted documents). The review of applications and other official matters must be formulated objectively and fairly and must as objectively as possibly state the scientific strengths and weaknesses of the applicants and the application.
- Members of the various bodies within Formas are not permitted to make use of information provided by researchers via submission of applications or equivalent to benefit their own research or to provide scientific advantage for colleagues to the detriment of the operations of others.
- Members of the various bodies within Formas shall observe and comply with Swedish laws, EU regulations and other agreements ratified by Sweden. This applies to research and professional ethical regulations and legislation that has been established by other organisations (such as animal protection regulations, plant protection regulations, regulations concerning the spread of infection and regulations for transgenic organisms), as well as intellectual property and access issues.
- For applications that contain elements that require evaluation by an ethics review board, approval must be issued by the relevant board before the project can begin.
- Members of the various bodies within Formas should work to ensure that the research is performed in an ethically acceptable manner.
- Members of the various bodies within Formas shall be aware that the school of thought within their own scientific field may result in biased preconceptions towards different scientific approaches.
- Members of the various bodies within Formas must not participate in the review of applications or other official matters where close friendship, personal conflict or other animosities may exist. Reviews shall not be performed by researchers from the same department or, if the department is large, from the same section. Neither shall review panel members review applications submitted by their own doctoral students or visiting researchers/postdoctoral researchers.
- Close collaboration with colleagues shall also result in a panel member abstaining from reviewing the application. An absolute limit for when a collaboration with a previous doctoral student or colleague shall no longer be regarded to affect objectivity, of have a negligible effect, is impossible to determine. A general guideline may be 5 years after the collaboration has ended.
- The panel member in question must leave the meeting room when applications are discussed in which her/his impartiality can be called into question.
- When applications and official matters are assessed, the grounds for assessment must be the evaluation criteria as determined by Formas. The qualifications of the applicant must be considered in relation to the corresponding qualifications of other applicants. There must be no discrimination based on gender, race, ethnicity or other such grounds.

**Members of the various bodies within Formas must work to ensure compliance with these guidelines.**

## Formas' Expert panel-SLU career Grant 2017

| Name             | Surname             | University  | Division/Faculty   |
|------------------|---------------------|---|--|
| Birte            | Boelt               | Århus universitet   | Department of Agroecology - Crop Health                                |
| Janne            | Winther Christensen | Århus universitet   | Department of Animal Science   |
| Trine Kastrop    | Dalsgaard           | Århus universitet   | Department of food science   |
| Lars             | Wiking              | Århus universitet   | Department of food science   |
| Walter           | DeJong              | Cornell University  | Plant Science, plant breeding  |
| Pieter           | De Frenne           | Ghent University  | Faculty of Bioscience Engineering                                      |
| Luc              | Duchateau           | Ghent University  | Faculty of Veterinary Medicine   |
| Christel         | Moons               | Ghent University  | Department of Nutrition, Genetics and Ethology                         |
| Niek             | Sanders             | Ghent University  | Department of Nutrition, Genetics and Ethology                         |
| Peter Egelund    | Holm                | Köpenhamns universitet  | Section for Environmental Chemistry and Physics                        |
| Annemarie Thuri  | Kristensen          | Köpenhamns universitet  | Internal Medicine, Clinical Oncology and Veterinary Clinical Pathology |
| Søren Kjærsgaard | Rasmussen           | Köpenhamns universitet  | Section for Plant and Soil Sciences                                    |
| Cornelis         | Grimmelikhuijzen    | Köpenhamns universitet  | Center for Functional and Comparative Insect Genomics                  |
| Vivian Kvist     | Johannsen           | Köpenhamns universitet  | Forest, Nature and Biomass.  |
| Lisbeth          | Thygesen            | Köpenhamns universitet  | Forest, Nature and Biomass.  |
| Bernhard         | Freyer              | Univ of Natural Resources and Life Sciences (BOKU), , Austria | Division of Organic Farming  |
| Douglas L        | Godbold             | Univ of Natural Resources and Life Sciences (BOKU), , Austria | Institute of Forest Ecology  |
| Johan (David)    | Kotze               | University of Helsinki  | Urban ecology, Entomology, Forest Ecology, Conservation biology        |
| Paula            | Elomaa              | University of Helsinki  | Department of Agricultural Sciences                                    |
| Timo             | Hytönen             | University of Helsinki  | Department of Agricultural Sciences                                    |
| Heli             | Hyytiäinen          | University of Helsinki  | Equine and Small Animal Medicine                                       |
| Heikki           | Hokkanen            | University of Helsinki  | Department of Agricultural Sciences                                    |
| Christian        | Peham               | University of Veterinary Medicine, Vienna                     | Department for Companion Animals and Horses                            |
| Norbert          | Nowotny             | University of Veterinary Medicine, Vienna                     | Pathobiology,  |
| Jetse            | Stoorvogel          | Wageningen University   | Soil Geography and Landscape Group                                     |



## Protokoll från rektorsgruppens möte om karriärbidrag den 1 juni 2017

### Närvarande

Rektor Peter Högberg  
Prorektor Karin Holmgren  
Vicerektor Erik Fahlbeck  
Vicerektor Ylva Hillbur

### Förhindrade

Vicerektor Kevin Bishop

### Övriga närvarande

Forskningssekreterare Boel Åström (föredragande, mötessekreterare)

**Ärende: Urval av mottagare av SLU:s karriärbidrag för seniora  
respektive juniora forskare 2017**

### *Handlingar*

Formas beskrivning av processen för sakkunniggranskning samt rapport med bedömningsresultatet

Riktlinjer för SLU:s karriärbidrag (SLU.ua 2016.1.1.1-4908)

### *Förutsättningar*

Enligt SLU:s riktlinjer ska rektor besluta om fördelning av karriärbidragen efter diskussion i rektorsgruppen, där sakkunnigbedömningen ska vara rådgivande. Det slutliga urvalet ska göras med hänsyn till jämställdhet och målet att bidragen ska fördelas över flera, strategiskt viktiga områden. Vid lika kvalifikationer ska jämställdhetsaspekten vara avgörande.

Rektorsgruppen konstaterade inledningsvis att Formas sakkunnigbedömning gett ett bra underlag för beslut och att de nominerade kandidaterna som helhet höll mycket hög kvalitet. De sakkunniga identifierade ett tydligt toppskikt med kandidater som rankades som A+ eller A. I och med att antalet kandidater i denna kategori var fler än antalet tillgängliga bidrag blev konkurrensen mycket hård.

Rektorsgruppen enades om att bidrag bör tilldelas samtliga kandidater som av de sakkunniga bedömts som A+ (4 juniorer och 3 seniorer). Diskussion fördes därefter om vilka av de kandidater som rankats som A (3 juniorer och 4 seniorer) som bör

tilldelas bidrag. Gruppen valde här att grunda sina överväganden på sakkunniggruppens bedömning, med viss hänsyn tagen till fördelningen över olika forskningsområden. Slutresultatet framgår nedan.

Gruppen konstaterade att utfallet utifrån ovan nämnda principer blev mycket bra ur ett jämställdhetsperspektiv, dvs. fem kvinnor och fem män. Urvalet resulterade också i en rimlig fördelning över forskningsområden av strategisk betydelse för SLU.

Rektorsgruppen konstaterade att antalet förslag inom humanistisk eller samhällsvetenskaplig inriktning var mycket litet och att man i samband med nästa utlysning (2019) bör se över om särskilda åtgärder kan vara aktuella.

*Beslut:*

att karriärbidrag 2017 bör fördelas till följande forskare:

---

*Karriärbidrag - Junior*

---

|                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| Adam Felton          | Sydsvensk skogsvetenskap                    |
| Anne-Lie Blomström   | Biomedicin och veterinär folkhälsovetenskap |
| Eva Forsgren         | Ekologi                                     |
| Karina E. Clemmensen | Skoglig mykologi och växtpatologi           |
| Lutz Ahrens          | Vatten och miljö                            |

---

*Karriärbidrag - Senior*

---

|                   |                             |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Claudia Köhler    | Växtbiologi                 |
| Hjalmar Laudon    | Skogens ekologi och skötsel |
| Riccardo Bommarco | Ekologi                     |
| Agneta Egenvall   | Kliniska vetenskaper        |
| Rickard Ignell    | Växtskyddsbiologi           |

Peter Högberg deltog inte i beslutet rörande Hjalmar Laudon pga jäv.  
Ylva Hillbur deltog inte i beslutet rörande Rickard Ignell pga jäv.

Boel Åström  
Sekreterare

Karin Holmgren  
Prorektor

Peter Högberg  
Rektor