

Distribution of faculty funding at SCI

Follow-up after *ledningsinternat* (14-15/9)



Faculty* funding:

- *Basmedel* (fixed, with sporadic “PLO”)
- *FoU “potten”* (~variable)
- *Externa “potten”* (~variable)**

**Järaranställning* = *bitr. lektor / lektor / prof.*

**Includes “*bibliometripotten*”, 2020-

- At *ledningsinternat*, we decided that it would be instructive to survey how faculty funding is used at SCI
- A one-slide summary follows (condensed from Excel file compiled by Madeleine following *prefektrådet* 13/10)

- **Summary:**

- Comparable situation across the Departments
 - Broadly speaking: 0.7-1 Mkr/prof; ~0.4 Mkr/lektor; bitr lektor varies, can be 0 kkr.
- Minor FoFU funding is reserved at Department/SCI
- NB: Important with transparent dispersal of funding to Divisions. This information should be communicated to all faculty.
- Significantly higher *GrU kontering* at Mathematics
- Divisions use FoFU to cover office rental, running costs, etc. i.e. full FoFU allocation is not available to cover salary costs.



	<i>Basmedel</i>	<i>Externa</i>	<i>FoU pott</i>	<i>Lokaler</i>	<i>Labb</i>
Applied Physics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 900 kkr/prof - 380 kkr/lektor - 400 kkr/Division - Rest distributed by "performance" 	To Division	To Division	Division-level (% lönebas)	Division-level
Physics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 Mkr/prof - 500 kkr/lektor 	Used as <i>basmedel</i>	To Division	Division-level (different models)	Division-level (different models)
Engineering Mechanics (under review)	<p>FoF&Mekanik:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 760 kkr-1 Mkr/prof - 400 kkr/lektor - Mek: 300 kkr/bitr. lektor. FLOW: 1 Mkr. - Hållf: lump sum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FoF: offset lab rent - Hållf: used as basmedel - Mek: used as basmedel 	To Division	Department-level (% lönebas)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - FoF: Division-level - Hållf: Div.-level - Mek: % lönebas
Mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decided annually. Typically: - 30%/prof - 20%/lektor (med forskning) - 5-10% PhD supervision - NB: 50% teaching required for FoFU 	To Division	To Division	Division-level	N/A

- **No strong motivation for further “incremental” review/adjustment of FoFU funding schemes**
 - Current arrangements have grown from discussions at the Departments based on local requirements
- The root problem is that a situation has arisen where faculty are internally under-financed.
 - (In my opinion) this is detrimental for the stable work environment required for research which is competitive internationally.
 - External funding is generally short-term - difficult to take risks, explore new ideas (and possibly fail...).
 - A major source of stress for faculty! Affects our attractiveness when recruiting.



SCI

- **Today's obvious statement:** A radical increase in FoFU funding levels is unlikely in the short-term. Significant change only possible by capping size of faculty?
- Central study initiated ([next slide](#)) to survey the situation:
 - Flow of state funding is not very transparent (as noted by Sigbritt at our internat)
 - Possibility for KTH to prioritise between areas? Close unproductive areas? Which metrics? Role of RAE?

Årsredovisning 2019

(<https://intra.kth.se/styrning/planering-och-uppföljning/årsredovisningar-1.466528>)

Figur 33

KTH:s finansiering 2019 (2018)

Intäkter totalt 4 962 (4 786) mnkr

Första gången att
internanslag < externanslag



Fördelning i procent	2019	2018
Anslag för utbildning på grundnivå och avancerad nivå	23,8	(24,2)
Forsknings- och forskar- utbildningsanslag	48,6%	49,4% Σ internanslag
Forskningsråd	24,8	(25,2)
Övriga statliga myndigheter	7,1	(7,3)
Strategiska stiftelser	16,3	(15,6)
EU:s institutioner	3,9	(3,5)
Övrigt/Privata	5,8	(5,9)

Källa: Ekonomisystem

V-2019-0531: "KTH styrning av forskning genom resursfördelning - utredning om alternativa modeller" (ska redovisas till rektor senast den 15 november 2019...).

So, where do we go from here?

- This is an issue which directly affects the work environment for our faculty and, therefore, the continued positive development of our School
- Natural for further discussion/analysis to directly involve the faculty
- SCI *fakultetskollegium* have established a working group
- If we wish to pursue further, should we link to this initiative?
- A complex issue with many inter-connections. No shortage of discussion areas:
 - What working environment do we want?
 - Is the faculty appropriately dimensioned? Should we cap the number of faculty?
 - Integration of funding conditions for bitr. Lektor (incl. startbidrag)
 - Integration of funding for permanent researchers?
 - Funding considerations for experimental (lab-based) research and theoretical research.
 - External funding opportunities for basic research, applied research, industry-allied research.
 - Greater flexibility if GrU allocations are centralised?
 - Funding of Ph.D. students is ~only possible with external funding.
 - Recruitment quality. Renewal after retirement. Subject-focus.
 - Tenure track leads to a top-heavy faculty. Desirable? Promotion requirements.
 - Salary levels, in particular for newly promoted professors.
 - Omvärldsanalys, t.ex. STRUT-utredning, forskningsprop., etc.



SCI

Rekrytering

- Som en följd av Amberg utredning (V-2013-0724) [2014-03-10], anställningsnämnden förväntar att:
 - för läraranställningar, ska det alltid avsättas resurser ur fakultets och grundutbildningsanslag:
 - Första åren (1-4 år) - helt finansierat av interna anslag
 - På längre sikt (5-8 år) - 50-75% interna anslag
 - Kostnader för att bedriver forskning och rekrytering av doktorander/postdoktorer bara nämns i samband med startbidrag
 - Förutsättningar beskrivs i ”skolans plan för fakultetsutveckling”. Numera en del av ”kontinuerlig uppföljning och kvalitetsdialog”. Skickas in av skolan i mitten av mars.



SCI