

*31 August 2012*

---

## Evaluation of the Research Council of Norway

**Background Report No 7 - Users' experiences of and interaction with the Research Council of Norway. Results from surveys of researchers, research institution leaders and participants in RCN meeting places (Evaluation of RCN 2012)**

Liv Langfeldt  
Fredrik Piro  
Inge Ramberg  
Hebe Gunnes

## **Evaluation of the Research Council of Norway**

Background Report No 7 - Users' experiences of and interaction with the Research Council of Norway. Results from surveys of researchers, research institution leaders and participants in RCN meeting places (Evaluation of RCN 2012)

Liv Langfeldt, Fredrik Piro, Inge Ramberg and Hebe Gunnes

NIFU, August 2012

# Table of Contents

Executive summary	1
1. Introduction	5
1.1 Three surveys for the evaluation of the Research Council of Norway	5
1.2 Samples and response rates	5
1.3 Overview of respondent groups and their interaction with RCN	8
2. Motives to apply for grants and opinions about RCN funding schemes	10
3. RCN management and review procedures	17
4. Added value of RCN funding	21
5. Support for internationalisation	26
6. Organisation, strategy, institutional interaction and framework conditions	32
6.1 RCN organisation and strategy	32
6.2 Interaction with research institutions	36
6.3 Framework conditions	37
7. RCN meeting places	40
Appendix A Samples, survey details and overview of respondents	45
Appendix B Tables	56
Appendix C Survey free text replies	109

# List of Tables

Table 1.1 Survey to Norwegian researchers: Response rate by sector and gender. Percentages.....	6
Table 1.2 Survey to research institution leaders: Response rate by sector and gender. Percentages.....	7
Table 1.3 Survey to participants in RCN meeting places: Response rate by sector and respondent group. Percentages. ....	8
Table 2.1 Researchers' motives to apply for RCN grants. Percentages. ....	11
Table 2.2 Leaders at research institutions: recommendations regarding RCN grants. Percentages.....	12
Table 2.3 Researchers' reasons not to apply for RCN grants. Percentages. ....	12
Table 2.4 Survey replies: 'In your view, how attractive are the following RCN funding schemes, as a funding source for your (unit's)* research activities?' Per cent by survey group.....	14
Table 2.5 Survey replies: 'In general, when comparing RCN funding schemes with relevant international funding sources (such as the EU framework programme), are the RCN schemes poorer, about the same or better, concerning:?' Per cent by survey group.....	15
Table 2.6 Survey replies: 'In general, when comparing RCN funding schemes with relevant international funding sources (such as the EU framework programme), are the RCN schemes poorer, about the same or better, concerning:?' Percentage point difference, better – poorer, by sector. ....	16
Table 3.1 Satisfaction ratings with RCN processes. Average responses for researchers and leaders at research institutions (1=Not at all; 5=To a high extent). ....	17
Table 3.2 Satisfaction with the application and review process by research sector. Average of applicants replies (1= Not at all; 5= To a high extent). ....	18
Table 3.3 Satisfaction with RCN processes. Results from researcher surveys in 2001 and 2012. Percentages.....	19
Table 4.1 Research institution leaders' views of RCN activities and impacts. Percentages.....	21
Table 4.2. Most recent project funded by the Research Council of Norway (RCN) for which you are able to indicate results. Percentages, by year and RCN Programme type. ....	22
Table 4.3 RCN Project beneficiaries' assessments of the outcomes of their most recent project funded by the Research Council of Norway, which the researcher is able to indicate results for. Percentages. ....	23
Table 4.4 Norwegian researchers' assessments of the outcome from their own RCN projects and FP6 projects. Percentages. ....	24
Table 4.5 RCN project characteristics compared to other projects. RCN project beneficiaries' assessment. Percentages. ....	25
Table 4.6 RCN and FP6 project characteristics, compared to researchers' other projects. Project beneficiaries' assessment. Percentages.....	25

Table 5.1 Survey replies: ‘Have you engaged in any international research project collaboration during the last 3 years?’ By sector and gender. Percentages.....	26
Table 5.2 Research project collaboration by country/region. Average of percentages reported by sector. ....	26
Table 5.3 Acquaintance with RCN schemes for internationalisation, by respondents’ international research project collaboration during the last 3 years. Percentages.....	27
Table 5.4 Researchers’ and leaders’ views on the usefulness of RCN schemes for internationalisation. Percentages.....	27
Table 5.5 ‘To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the Research Council’s (RCN) support for the internationalisation of research?’ Percentages. ....	29
Table 5.6 ‘Thinking about Norway, and your unit in particular, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the internationalisation of research’ Percentages. ....	30
Table 6.1 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (I). Research institution leaders’ opinions. Percentages. ....	33
Table 6.2 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). Percentages. ....	34
Table 6.3 Leaders at research institutions: views on institutional interaction with RCN. Percentages. ....	37
Table 6.4 Leaders at research institutions: perceived changes in framework conditions during the last ten years. Percentages.....	38
Table 6.5 Opinions about framework conditions over the last ten years, researchers and leaders. Percentages. ....	39
Table 7.1 RCN Meeting place function (I): views on RCN activities within communication and dissemination. Percentages. ....	40
Table 7.2 RCN Meeting place function (II): views on results from participation in RCN ‘strategy meetings’. Percentages.....	41
Table 7.3 RCN Meeting place function (III): views on the impacts from participation in RCN ‘dissemination meetings’. Percentages.....	42
Table 7.4 RCN Meeting place function (IV). Percentages.....	43
Table 7.5 Survey to Norwegian researchers: Replies as percentage of total population by sector and gender. Percentages. ....	45
Table 7.6 Survey to participants in RCN meeting places: Sample and response rate by meeting/conference. Percentages. ....	46
Table 7.7 Respondents in the survey to researchers, by age and gender. Percentages.....	47
Table 7.8 Respondents in the survey to researchers, by sector and gender. Percentages. ....	47
Table 7.9 Respondents in the survey to researchers, by research area and gender. Percentages. ....	47
Table 7.10 Respondents’ research funding in 2011. Average percentages of funding by sources. ....	48
Table 7.11 Respondents’ research funding. Change in funding sources 2005 to 2011. Per cent Decreased/Unchanged/ Increased by source. ....	48
Table 7.12 Respondents in the survey to researchers, by sector and RCN division. Percentages. ....	48

Table 7.13 Respondents in the survey to researchers: interaction with RCN. Percentages.....	49
Table 7.14 Respondents in the survey to researchers: relations to the RCN. Percentages.....	49
Table 7.15 Respondents in the survey to research institution leaders, by sector and research area. Percentages.....	50
Table 7.16 Respondents in the survey to research institution leaders, by position and research area. Percentages.....	50
Table 7.17 Respondents in the survey to research institution leaders, by level and research area. Percentages.....	51
Table 7.18 Respondents in the survey to research institution leaders, by gender and size of research unit/institution. Percentages.....	51
Table 7.19 Respondents in the survey to research institution leaders, by sector and RCN division. Percentages.....	51
Table 7.20 Respondents in the survey to research institution leaders: relations to the RCN. Percentages.....	52
Table 7.21 Respondents in the survey to research institution leaders: interaction with RCN. Percentages.....	52
Table 7.22 Participants in RCN meeting places: Respondents' positions by sample category. Percentages.....	52
Table 7.23 Participants in RCN meeting places: Respondents' institutional affiliation by sample category. Percentages.....	53
Table 7.24 Participants in RCN meeting places: 'Which division of the Research Council is of most interest to you/your organisation?' Per cent by sector.....	53
Table 7.25 Participants in RCN meeting places: Respondents by sector of activity and sample category. Percentages.....	54
Table 7.26 Participants in RCN meeting places: Respondents by research area and sample category. Percentages.....	54
Table 7.27 Respondents in the survey to participants in RCN meeting places: interaction with RCN. Percentages.....	54
Table 7.28 Respondents in the survey to participants in RCN meeting places: interaction with RCN. Percentages.....	55
Table 7.29 Respondents in the survey to participants in RCN meeting places: interaction with RCN. Percentages.....	55
Table 7.30 Researchers' motives to apply for RCN grants by sector. Percentages.....	56
Table 7.31 Researchers' motives to apply for RCN grants by sector. Percentages. (continued).....	57
Table 7.32 Leaders at research institutions: recommendations regarding RCN grants by sector. Percentages.....	58
Table 7.33 Researchers' reasons for not to apply for RCN grants. Percentages.....	59
Table 7.34 Survey replies: 'In your view, how attractive are the following RCN funding schemes, as a funding source for your unit's research activities?' Per cent by sector.....	60
Table 7.35 Survey replies: 'In general, when comparing RCN funding schemes with relevant international funding sources (such as the EU framework programme), are the RCN schemes poorer, about the same or better, concerning?' Per cent by sector...	61

Table 7.36 Survey replies: ‘In general, when comparing RCN funding schemes with relevant international funding sources (such as the EU framework programme), are the RCN schemes poorer, about the same or better, concerning:’ Per cent by sector. (continued).....	62
Table 7.37 Researchers' satisfaction with RCN processes. Percentages.....	62
Table 7.38 Research institution leaders' satisfaction with RCN processes. Percentages. ....	63
Table 7.39 FRIPRO applicants’ satisfaction with the application and review process. Average of applicants replies (1= Not at all; 5= To a high extent) by result of application. ....	63
Table 7.40 Satisfaction with RCN processes by type of programme. Averages for replies of researchers and leaders at research institutions (1=Not at all; 5=To a high extent). ....	64
Table 7.41 RCN Project beneficiaries valuation of project outcome of most recent project funded by the Research Council of Norway which the researcher is able to indicate results.....	64
Table 7.42 RCN Project beneficiaries valuation of project outcome of most recent project funded by the Research Council of Norway which the researcher is able to indicate results.....	67
Table 7.43 RCN project characteristics compared to other projects. RCN project beneficiaries’ valuation. Per cent by type of RCN project.....	69
Table 7.44 RCN project characteristics compared to other projects. RCN project beneficiaries’ valuation. Per cent by Sector.....	70
Table 7.45 ‘To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the Research Council’s (RCN) support for the internationalisation of research?’ Percentages. ....	71
Table 7.46 ‘Thinking about Norway, and your unit in particular, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the internationalisation of research?’ Percentages.....	72
Table 7.47 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (I). Research institution leaders’ opinions. By sector. Percentages. ....	73
Table 7.48 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). Research institution leaders’ opinions. By research area. Percentages. ....	73
Table 7.49 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). Research institution leaders’ opinions. By most important RCN Division. Percentages. ....	75
Table 7.50 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). Research institution leaders’ opinions. By most participation in RCN Boards. Percentages.....	76
Table 7.51 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). By sector. Percentages. ....	77
Table 7.52 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). By academic field. Percentages.....	79
Table 7.53 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). By most important RCN Division. Percentages. ....	81
Table 7.54 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). By position. Percentages. ....	82
Table 7.55 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). By participation in RCN Board. Percentages. ....	83

Table 7.56 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). By questionnaire/survey sample. Percentages.....	84
Table 7.57 Leaders at research institutions: Institutional interaction with RCN. Per cent by sector.....	85
Table 7.58 Leaders at research institutions: Changes in framework conditions last ten years. Per cent by sector.....	86
Table 7.59 RCN Meeting place function (I): RCN activities within communication and dissemination. By sector. Percentages.....	87
Table 7.60 RCN Meeting place function (I): RCN activities within communication and dissemination. By academic field. Percentages.....	88
Table 7.61 RCN Meeting place function (I): RCN activities within communication and dissemination. By RCN Division of most interest/importance. Percentages.....	89
Table 7.62 RCN Meeting place function (I): RCN activities within communication and dissemination. By position. Percentages.....	89
Table 7.63 RCN Meeting place function (I): RCN activities within communication and dissemination. By participation in RCN Boards. Percentages.....	90
Table 7.64 RCN Meeting place function (I): RCN activities within communication and dissemination. By questionnaire. Percentages.....	90
Table 7.65 RCN Meeting place function (II): Results from participation in RCN boards/meetings. By sector. Percentages.....	91
Table 7.66 RCN Meeting place function (II): Results from participation in RCN boards/meetings. By academic field. Percentages.....	92
Table 7.67 RCN Meeting place function (II): Results from participation in RCN boards/meetings. By RCN division of most interest/importance. Percentages.....	93
Table 7.68 RCN Meeting place function (II): Results from participation in RCN boards/meetings. By position. Percentages.....	94
Table 7.69 RCN Meeting place function (II): Results from participation in RCN boards/meetings. By participation in RCN Boards. Percentages.....	95
Table 7.70 RCN Meeting place function (II): Results from participation in RCN boards/meetings. By questionnaire. Percentages.....	96
Table 7.71 RCN Meeting place function (III): Importance of RCN. By sector. Percentages.....	97
Table 7.72 RCN Meeting place function (III): Importance of RCN. By academic field. Percentages.....	99
Table 7.73 RCN Meeting place function (III): Importance of RCN. By RCN Division of most interest/importance. Percentages.....	101
Table 7.74 RCN Meeting place function (III): Importance of RCN. By position. Percentages.....	102
Table 7.75 RCN Meeting place function (III): Importance of RCN. By participation in RCN Boards. Percentages.....	103
Table 7.76 RCN Meeting place function (III): Importance of RCN. By questionnaire. Percentages.....	104
Table 7.77 RCN Meeting place function (IV): Importance of RCN. By sector. Percentages.....	105
Table 7.78 RCN Meeting place function (IV): Importance of RCN. By academic field. Percentages.....	106



Table 7.79 RCN Meeting place function (IV): Importance of RCN. By RCN Division of most interest/importance. Percentages. .... 106

Table 7.80 By RCN Meeting place function (IV): Importance of RCN. By position. Percentages. .... 107

Table 7.81 RCN Meeting place function (IV): Importance of RCN. By participation in RCN Boards. Percentages. .... 107



# Executive summary

This report presents the results from three surveys performed as part of the evaluation of the Research Council of Norway (RCN): one survey of a random, proportional sample of researchers at Norwegian research institutions (1183 respondents), one survey of leaders at Norwegian research institutions (213 respondents) and one survey of a selection of participants in RCN ‘meeting places’ (662 respondents). The main findings are summarised below.

## RCN grants: largely positive, but room for improvement

In the Norwegian research community, opinions about the RCN grant schemes seem to be largely positive, and the schemes’ attractiveness profiles are generally in line with the schemes’ target groups. However, there is room for improvement in terms of the attractiveness of the RCN’s schemes compared to international alternatives; some challenges also appear regarding funding for high-risk research:

Most (78 per cent) of the researchers who have applied for RCN grants indicate that funding for their own research is an important motive, and 53 per cent indicate that funding for recruitment positions is an important motive. Other important motives include broadening the field of expertise (41 per cent), and creating new international research networks (38 per cent). Conducting scientifically/technologically risky research is less often a motive to apply for RCN grants, and a large proportion of the leaders at the research institutions do not know what they would recommend in terms of funding sources for conducting risky research, indicating a large proportion of them think that neither the RCN nor other funding sources support such research adequately.

All RCN schemes are considered to be more attractive by leaders at the research institutions than by researchers. Splitting results by institutional sectors shows, not surprisingly, that FRIPRO, the basic research programmes and the SFF scheme are more attractive at universities and specialised university institutions, whereas the large-scale programmes, the SFI scheme, the FME scheme and user-directed innovation programmes are more attractive for the institutes, and that policy-oriented programmes are more attractive for the university colleges. Including respondents from all sectors, the most open/free scheme (independent projects – FRIPRO) is considered most attractive overall, and the one type of scheme restricted to particular research topics (FME) as least attractive.

When comparing RCN and international funding sources (such as the EU framework programme), RCN schemes are considered better in terms of flexibility of use of funds and the opportunities offered for doing unique/original research, but not on any of the other aspects studied, including the opportunities offered for: addressing high-risk topics; doing interdisciplinary research; broadening one’s field of expertise; building new international scholarly networks; support for young scientists; support for new projects without requiring preliminary research; the amount of funding; impact on the prestige and career of the awarded investigators. The universities come out as having the most negative views of RCN schemes compared to international schemes, and the institutes as most positive.

## RCN management and review procedures: moderate contentment

Both the researchers and leaders were asked about their satisfaction with the RCN application and review process – indicating their satisfaction on a scale from 1 to 5 (1=‘Not at all’ and 5=‘To a high extent’). Not surprisingly, researchers who have obtained RCN funding are generally somewhat more satisfied than those who have not. In addition, we find the leaders to be markedly more satisfied concerning these issues than the researchers.

Both funded and non-funded applicants are most satisfied with the access to relevant background information for the call, and the clarity of this information (average score of 3.7); they are least satisfied with transparency regarding funding decisions (average score of 2.6). Moreover, the fairness of the proposal assessment process and the overall cost efficiency of the application process is also

fairly poorly rated (average score of 2.9). We also find some differences when responses are split by type of research institution. Respondents at the independent institutes make a slightly more positive assessment of the application and review process compared to respondents at higher education institutions. Comparing these figures with results from a survey used in the former evaluation of the RCN, it seems that there is somewhat less dissatisfaction with the applications process in 2012 than in 2001.

## Added value: positive outcome of RCN grants

The researchers who have received RCN funding generally report positive outcomes of their projects. A majority of these respondents fully or partly agree that: 'My/my group's overall research capabilities have been significantly improved as a result of the project' (86 per cent); that 'My/my group's overall innovation capabilities have been significantly improved as a result of the project' (65 per cent); that 'Research and innovation management skills have been significantly improved as a result of the project' (62 per cent); that 'Long term international cooperation links have been considerably extended as a result of the project' (61 per cent); that 'The project had a positive impact on my research career' (50 per cent); and, that 'Through the project new research areas of significant importance for our future research/innovation activities have been explored' (76 per cent). The respondents were more doubtful about effects on the ability to compete for international funding (only 33 per cent fully or partly agree).

The researchers were moreover asked to compare the characteristics of their RCN project with their other projects. On all aspects studied, the RCN projects come out *better* than the respondents' other projects, including orientation towards basic research, strategic importance to their organisation, new scientific results, high scientific quality, international orientation, long-term and multidisciplinary research. Hence, the respondents are considerably more positive when comparing their RCN projects with their other projects, than when comparing RCN schemes with international funding alternatives (see above).

## Support for internationalisation: limited reach, but useful

A large proportion of researchers report that they are not familiar with the RCN's schemes for internationalisation. Nearly half (46 per cent) of those engaged in international collaboration and 61 per cent of those not engaged in such collaboration, report that they do not know of Project Establishment Support (PES). The other schemes studied are even less well known. Overall, 63 per cent reply that they do not know of grant schemes for collaboration with US/Africa/Asia South and Central America, 53 per cent do not know of the top-up funding for Marie Curie grants, and 61 per cent do not know of the Norwegian funding for the European Research Council (ERC) Starting Grant applicants.

When asked about the usefulness of these internationalisation schemes, PES comes out as the most useful, both among the researchers and the leaders: 56 per cent of leaders and 25 per cent of researchers consider PES to be 'very useful' or 'useful'. Funding of ERC Starting Grant applicants comes out second: 45 per cent of the leaders and 11 per cent of the researchers consider the Norwegian funding of the 'almost successful' applications to be 'very useful' or 'useful'. A majority of those who have an opinion also consider the top-up funding for Marie Curie grants and the grant schemes for collaboration with US/Africa/Asia South and Central America to be helpful.

Asked more generally about the RCN's support for internationalisation, the respondents are most positive concerning RCN support for international mobility helping the career development of individual researchers, and least positive concerning the accessibility of information on how various RCN schemes may be used for internationalisation.

Both the researchers and their leaders are clearly in favour of the aim or aspiration of internationalisation of research. When asked about the costs of internationalisation and the role EU framework programme, the majority disagrees that 'international activities weaken domestic cooperation' and that 'the costs of international activities outweigh the benefits'. The majority (79 per cent of the leaders and 60 per cent of the researchers) also fully or partly agree that 'Norway's

participation in the EU framework programme is very important for the internationalisation of Norwegian research’.

## RCN organisation and strategy: call for more independent funds

A substantial share of the respondents believes that RCN funds the best research (42 per cent agrees fully or partly), while 20 per cent (fully or partly) disagrees. The most positive respondents are found in trade and industry and government/public sector, while the specialised university institutions are the most negative group on this issue. Comparing the respondents by academic field, the least satisfied respondents are found within humanities and social sciences. Somewhat surprisingly, those respondents who are/have been member of RCN boards are less positive than those who have not been a member of these boards.

The majority of the leaders at research institutions agreed that the quality and leanness of the RCN funding processes is in line with international good practice, and that RCN ensures gender equality in research funding. Two statements, both related to the composition and scale of funding were met with a clearly negative reception: a large proportion of leaders fully or partly disagree that there is an appropriate balance between ‘free’ and programmed resources in the RCN instrument portfolio, and that the volume of funding associated with each instrument is adequate for the need it is intended to address. Moreover, many of the researchers’ free text comments on the RCN’s policy and priorities concerned the perceived imbalance between curiosity driven/basic research and policy driven/applied research; they call for more funds for independent, basic research.

Asked about the effects of the 2010 reorganisation of RCN divisions, 80 per cent of the leaders at research institutions did not have an opinion on whether this has led to an improved efficiency or effectiveness. It is interesting that the share of leaders who did not know, or disagreed with this statement was slightly higher among those leaders who are/had been member of either the RCN Executive Board/Division Research Boards/Programme Boards, compared to those leaders who had not.

## Institutional interaction: RCN influence the focus of the research institutions

When asked about the relations between the RCN and research institutions, a large proportion of leaders at the institutions respond that RCN schemes constitute an integral component of their unit’s strategic activities (73 per cent fully or partly agree). Moreover, 81 per cent of the institutional leaders fully or partly agree that ‘RCN research and innovation programmes influence the focus of universities’ and other research performers’ strategies’. The statement ‘RCN supports the development of new research and innovation capacity’ is fully or partly supported by 73 per cent of leaders. On the other hand, one in five (20 per cent) fully or partly disagree that ‘RCN research and innovation programmes create positive structural changes in the research and innovation system’.

The leaders also agree that RCN evaluations are valuable: 81 per cent of leaders at the universities fully or partly agree that ‘the research evaluations organised by RCN (of research fields and institutions) have been valuable to my unit’ and 91 per cent fully or partly agree that the evaluations ‘have been valuable to the Norwegian research community’.

The leaders found the questions about the performance-based component of core funding (PBRF) difficult to answer (32 to 44 per cent responded ‘cannot say’ to the statements on this issue). Nonetheless, 37 per cent fully or partly agree that PBRF adds distinct value and performs a role that is differentiated from project funding, whereas 29 per cent fully or partly agree that there is a clear distinction between the objectives, tasks and criteria for the RCN instruments and the PBRFs.

The majority of the leaders *disagree* that RCN funding is a threat to the autonomy of the research institutions. RCN funding is somewhat more often perceived a threat to institutional autonomy at universities; 32 per cent of leaders at universities fully or partly agree that RCN’s role in allocating research funds is a threat to the autonomy of the research institutions, and 23 per cent that RCN’s role in funding recruitment positions is a threat to the autonomy of the research institutions.

## RCN meeting places: participants report limited outcomes

RCN's activities within communication and dissemination of research results are generally described as good. Nearly half (45 per cent) fully or partly agree that the RCN maintains best practice activities in science communication and that RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and industry (50 per cent fully or partly agree). A smaller share, 37 per cent, fully or partly agree that RCN facilitates the creation of such partnerships between the research/higher education sector and public service sector. Similarly, 47 per cent fully or partly agree that RCN facilitates the development and strengthening of strategic intelligence among research performers, national and regional authorities and RCN itself. Only around 10 per cent of respondents disagree (fully or partly) with these statements about RCN's communication and dissemination activities (the remaining answers 'neither/nor' or 'cannot say').

Few of the respondents consider RCN as the most important national meeting place for discussing research or innovation policy, but a large majority of respondents believe that RCN is 'among the important national meeting places'. The proportion of respondents who consider RCN an important meeting place for discussion of Norwegian research policy is substantially larger than the proportion who thinks RCN has such importance in discussions of innovation policy.

Asked about the outcome of RCN meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes, the share who reported that their participation had limited or no effect at all on RCN funding schemes or policy/processes was substantial (41 to 50 per cent). In particular researchers, and somewhat surprisingly, those respondents who were member of an RCN board, believed that their participation had limited effects.

Meetings disseminating results from RCN programmes were thought, to a limited degree, to lead to the creation of partnerships with other institutions in the research or higher education sector (19 per cent 'to a large/very large extent'), with industry (10 per cent 'to a large/very large extent') or with the public services sector (8 per cent 'to a large/very large extent'). The shares who reported that the meetings led to commercialisation of research results, innovation in the public service sector, or change in the focus of the respondents' research units, were modest (8-11 per cent 'to a large/very large extent' and 22-29 per cent 'to a moderate extent'), but may still be considered as a positive result.

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Three surveys for the evaluation of the Research Council of Norway

This report presents the results from three surveys performed as part of the evaluation of the Research Council of Norway (RCN): one survey was sent to a random sample of research personnel at higher education institutions, university hospitals and independent research institutes; one went to leaders at all Norwegian universities, specialised university institutions, university colleges and independent research institutes; and, one to a selection of participants in RCN ‘meeting places’. In all surveys, respondents were asked about their interaction with RCN and their experiences of and opinions about relevant RCN policy/meeting places/funding instruments. Some common topics and questions were addressed to several groups of respondents, and this report is organised around the key topics in the survey, not around each group of respondents surveyed. Chapters 2 to 6 report results from both the leader survey and researcher survey on the respective topics, and the final chapter, on the RCN meeting places, draws upon results from all three surveys.

The sample and response rates for each survey are described below. More detailed information on the samples and surveys can be found in Appendix A, and the questionnaires in Appendix D.

## 1.2 Samples and response rates

### 1.2.1 Survey of researchers

For the Researcher Survey, a random proportional sample of 2500 individual researchers was drawn from NIFU’s Register of research personnel.<sup>1</sup> The sample was proportional to the total population of researchers in the register in terms of gender and institution type (university; specialised university institution; university college; health trust with university functions/university hospital). In this way, the sample took no account of the researchers’ interaction and experiences with the RCN.<sup>2</sup> The higher education institutions sample includes researchers in the roles of full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, head of department, postdoctoral fellow and researchers with a doctoral degree. In the institute sector researchers and postdoctoral fellows are included. At the university hospitals, physicians and psychologists participating in R&D, researchers with a doctoral degree and postdoctoral fellows were included. Lecturers and other personnel who do not have research as a major part of their defined tasks were not included in the sample. The sample population should be representative of the RCN’s main target groups.

To ensure that no one received more than one questionnaire, researchers who were also listed as a potential respondent to the survey of leaders at research institutions, or the parallel survey sent to applicants for RCN independent project support<sup>3</sup>, were removed from the sample. Of the remaining 2314 researchers, we obtained e-mail addresses for 2062, of which 1183 researchers replied to the questionnaire (giving a 57 per cent response rate). The table below shows the response rate, calculated based on the sample of 2062 researchers invited to participate in the researcher survey. Responses as a proportion of the total population of researchers can be found in Appendix A.

---

<sup>1</sup> NIFU’s Register of research personnel is an individually based register which covers researchers/university graduated personnel that participated in R&D at Norwegian higher education institutions, as well as the research institutes and health trusts. The register is based on regularly reports from the institutions to NIFU and includes information on position, age, gender, educational background and workplace (institution, faculty, institute and field of science). The register does not cover research personnel in private enterprises, e.g. persons with a degree in social sciences employed at consultancy firms. The register was established in 1961, and data is collected every other year until 2007, then annually. Last available data collection is per October 1st 2010.

<sup>2</sup> A similar sample was drawn for the survey for the evaluation of the RCN in 2001: Gulbrandsen M (2001) *The Research Council of Norway and its different funding mechanisms: The experiences and views of researchers in universities, colleges and institutes. Background Report No 1 in the evaluation of the Research Council of Norway*. Oslo: NIFU.

<sup>3</sup> Liv Langfeldt, Inge Ramberg, Gunnar Sivertsen, Carter Bloch and Dorothy S. Olsen (2012). Evaluation of the Norwegian scheme for independent research projects (FRIPRO). Oslo: NIFU Report 8/2012.

Table 1.1 Survey to Norwegian researchers: Response rate by sector and gender. Percentages.

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>N (total sample)</b>	<b>Response rate</b>
Universities	Women	268	66.0
	Men	542	61.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>810</b>	<b>62.7</b>
Specialised university institutions	Women	39	51.3
	Men	92	48.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>49.6</b>
University colleges	Women	89	53.9
	Men	147	53.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>53.4</b>
Institute sector	Women	203	66.0
	Men	428	62.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>631</b>	<b>63.9</b>
Health trusts with university functions (University hospitals)	Women	88	37.5
	Men	166	28.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>31.9</b>
<b>Total</b>	Women	687	60.0
	Men	1375	56.1
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2062</b>	<b>57.4</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers. Response rates are calculated from the sample of 2062 researchers invited to participate in the researcher survey. Obtained responses, as a proportion of the total population of researchers can be found in Appendix A. Respondents were directed to different sets of questions depending on their interactions with RCN. Respondents could skip questions they did not want to reply to. Hence, the number of replies varies between questions. Of the 1183 total responses, 239 are from respondents who did not complete the last page of the questionnaire.

The response rate varies somewhat between sectors. The highest response is obtained for the universities and the institute sector (63 to 64 per cent), and the lowest for university hospitals (32 per cent). Presumably a higher proportion of researchers who have had more active interaction and experiences with the RCN will have replied, as those without any connection or experiences may consider it less worthwhile to contribute to such an evaluation. Several researchers reported back that they had no connection to the RCN and therefore would not fill in the questionnaire. A slightly higher proportion of female researchers replied (60 per cent of women versus 56 per cent of men, table above).

When we take into consideration that not all the 2062 researchers who were invited to participate received the invitation, we get an adjusted response rate of 63 per cent (after removing 88 invalid email addresses and 87 persons reported to be on leave, ill or otherwise unavailable, from the sample).<sup>4</sup>

### 1.2.2 Survey of research institution leaders

For the leader's survey, 260 leaders at the 8 universities, 9 specialised university institutions, 36 university colleges and 93 research institutes, were identified and invited to participate. The sample included rectors and deans at the higher education institutions, and directors of independent research institutes, see Appendix A for details. The table below shows the response rate by sector and gender.

---

<sup>4</sup> In addition a number of persons reported to be unwilling to participate. The response rate is not adjusted for this category.



Table 1.2 Survey to research institution leaders: Response rate by sector and gender. Percentages.

<b>Sector</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>*N (total sample)</b>	<b>Response rate</b>
Universities	Women	10	100.0
	Men	37	89.2
	Total	47	91.5
Specialised university institutions	Women	3	66.7
	Men	6	100.0
	Total	9	88.9
University colleges	Women	44	75.0
	Men	66	68.2
	Total	110	70.9
Institute sector	Women	27	96.3
	Men	67	86.6
	Total	94	89.4
Total	Women	84	84.5
	Men	176	80.7
	<b>Total</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>81.9</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of research institution leaders. Response rates are calculated from the sample of 260 leaders invited to participate in the survey. Respondents were directed to different sets of questions depending on their interactions with RCN. Respondents could skip questions they did not want to reply to. Hence, the number of replies varies between questions. Of the total 213 responses, 42 are from respondents who did not complete the last page of the questionnaire.

\*Two invitations were sent to leaders of units we later learnt had ceased to exist as separate units as of 1 January 2012 (automatic email replies) – these are not included among the 260. Email addresses for all 260 leaders were obtained. In 4 cases the email addresses generated rejection messages – these addresses were updated and invitations resent. Two of the leaders receiving the invitation reported back that another leader at the unit was a more relevant respondent, and the invitations were redirected to these leaders.

Of those invited, 82 per cent of leaders replied to the survey. The highest response is obtained for the universities (92 per cent), the lowest for the university colleges (71 per cent). A few leaders, particularly those at university colleges, reported that their unit had very little contact with the RCN and that they did not feel qualified to reply. A slightly higher proportion of female leaders replied (85 per cent of women versus 81 per cent of men).

### 1.2.3 Survey of participants in RCN meeting places

The survey of participants in RCN ‘meeting places’ included members of RCN boards and programme boards, and participants in meetings organised by RCN. Two different sources were used to draw the sample: lists of members of RCN boards and committees (sample A) and lists of participants in meetings and conferences organised by RCN (sample B). Both sets of lists were obtained from the RCN, see Appendix A for details. Sample A comprises 372 members of RCN Programme Boards, the Executive Board and the Research Boards and other committees for the period 2009 to 2011, whereas sample B comprises 933 persons listed as participants in one or more open meeting/conference in 2011.

As researchers and institutional leaders who had participated in the RCN meeting places would also be asked questions about RCN meeting places through the researcher survey or research institution survey respectively (for more on the overlap between questionnaires, see Appendix D), they were excluded from the separate sample drawn for the meeting place survey: for the participants in meetings (sample B) only non-researchers were included in the extra sample; for the participants in RCN boards and committees (sample A) researchers who were on the lists for one of the other surveys were excluded from the separate meeting places sample. The table below shows response rates by sector and sample category.

Table 1.3 Survey to participants in RCN meeting places: Response rate by sector and respondent group. Percentages.

Sector	Respondent group	N (total sample)	Response rate
University	RCN board/committee	128	75.8
Specialised university institutions/University colleges	RCN board/committee	29	62.1
Institute sector	RCN board/committee	41	70.7
Government/Public service/Politicians	Participant in meeting	266	46.2
	RCN board/committee	57	63.2
	Total	323	49.2
Trade and industry (private sector)	Participant in meeting	509	48.1
	RCN board/committee	75	56.0
	Total	584	49.1
Unions, NGOs and undefined sector	Participant in meeting	158	34.8
	RCN board/committee	42	40.5
	Total	200	36.0
Total	Participant in meeting	933	45.3
	RCN board/committee	372	64.2
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1305</b>	<b>50.7</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of meeting place participants. Response rates are calculated from the sample of 1305 participants invited to the survey. Respondents were directed to different sets of questions depending on their interactions with RCN. Respondents could skip questions they did not want to reply to. Hence, numbers of replies varies between questions. Of the total 662 responses, 93 are from respondents who did not complete the last page of the questionnaire.

Of those invited to complete the survey, 51 per cent replied. A substantially higher proportion of board/committee members replied than meeting participants (64 per cent of sample A versus 45 per cent of sample B). The highest response rate was obtained for the universities (76 per cent), the lowest for unions, NGOs and participants in undefined sector (36 per cent).

When we take into consideration that not all of the 1305 who were invited to participate received the invitation, we get an adjusted response rate of 55 per cent (after removing 96 invalid email addresses and 10 persons reported to be on leave, ill or otherwise unavailable, from the sample).<sup>5</sup>

### 1.3 Overview of respondent groups and their interaction with RCN

Appendix A.2 gives a detailed overview of the respondents to the three surveys by characteristics such as type of research institution, sector of activity, position, research area, age, gender, funding sources and interaction and relations to the RCN. A brief overview is provided below.

#### 1.3.1 Researchers

In the researcher survey, the majority (60 per cent) of respondents are between 40 and 59 years old; 18 per cent are younger than 40, and 22 per cent are 60 years or older. A minority, 35 per cent, are women. A large proportion is affiliated to universities (43 per cent) or independent research institutes (30 per cent). The three ‘largest’ research areas are the social sciences (21 per cent), the natural sciences (20 per cent), and the medical sciences (18 per cent).

On average, the respondents receive 19 per cent of their research funding from the RCN, and 46 per cent from basic funding. In all sectors except the university hospitals, the RCN is the largest external funding source. A quarter (26 per cent) of respondents report that their RCN funding decreased in the period 2005 to 2011, whereas 22 per cent report it has increased. Meanwhile, 28 per cent report that their funding from international sources has increased in the same period.

Nearly half (46 per cent) have been project leader for a RCN funded project in the period 2003 to 2011. A quarter (23 per cent) of respondents have not applied for RCN grants in this period. Other contact with the RCN includes: 27 per cent of the respondents having participated in meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes; and, 41 per cent have participated in meetings disseminating research results/results from RCN programmes.

<sup>5</sup> In addition, a number of persons reported being unwilling to participate. The response rate is not adjusted for this category.

### *1.3.2 Research institution leaders*

Among the leaders, 39 per cent are based at independent research institutes, 37 per cent at university colleges, 20 per cent at universities and 4 per cent at specialised university institutions. Most of them lead units with less than 200 researchers: 38 per cent are in charge of a unit with less than 50 researchers, while 41 per cent lead a unit with 50 to 200 researchers, while 13 per cent lead a unit with 200 to 500 researchers. Moreover, a few of the leaders (8 per cent) are in charge of institutions with more than 500 researchers.

When it comes to links with the RCN, 20 per cent of the leaders have been a member of a RCN programme Board, 4 per cent have been a member of the RCN Executive Board, 5 per cent have been a member of a RCN Division Research Board, 14 per cent have been a member of RCN review panels/groups, and 20 per cent have been a member of other RCN committees or steering groups. The majority of the respondents have: participated in meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes (59 per cent); participated in meetings disseminating research results/results from RCN programmes (57 per cent); or assessed applications for the RCN (57 per cent).

### *1.3.3 Participants in RCN meeting places*

Among respondents in this group, 19 per cent indicate that they have a research position, the majority as a full professor, research director or similar. Most of this group (68 per cent) indicate that they hold an administrative position. When it comes to links with the RCN, 42 per cent of the respondents have been a member of a RCN Programme Board, 4 per cent have been a member of the RCN Executive Board, 6 per cent have been a member of a RCN Division Research Board, 27 per cent have been a member of RCN review panels/groups, and 26 per cent have been a member of other RCN committees or steering groups. A large proportion (67 per cent) of the respondents have participated in meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes and a similar share (67 per cent) have participated in meetings disseminating research results/results from RCN programmes. Moreover, 33 per cent have assessed applications for the RCN.

## 2. Motives to apply for grants and opinions about RCN funding schemes

Respondents in the researcher survey and leader survey were asked several questions about the RCN's funding schemes. Researchers who indicated they had applied for RCN grants were asked about their motives to apply; those who had not applied for RCN grants were asked why; and, leaders at research institutions were asked about the kinds of projects they would recommend their colleagues/researchers apply for RCN grants for.

Funding for their own research or for recruitment positions emerge as the most frequent motives for applying for RCN grants: 78 per cent of researchers who have applied for RCN grants indicate that funding for their own research is an important motive, while 53 per cent indicate funding for recruitment positions is an important motive (Table 2.1). Researchers in the institute sector more often indicate funds for their own research as an important motive (81 per cent), and less often indicate that funds for recruitment positions are important (42 per cent, see Table 7.30 in Appendix B). Other important motives to apply include to broaden the field of expertise (41 per cent), and to create new international research networks (38 per cent, Table 2.1). To conduct scientifically/technologically risky research is a less common motive to apply for RCN grants: 21 per cent answer that conducting risky research is an important motive to apply for RCN grants and 11 per cent consider that RCN schemes are not helpful for achieving this aim.

Splitting responses by type of institution, we find that researchers at university colleges more often apply for RCN grants to gain access to complementary expertise (34 per cent consider this an important motive), while researchers at independent institutes more often apply RCN grants to create new national networks (33 per cent), and researchers at universities more often apply RCN grants to create new international networks (41 per cent) and strengthening existing international networks (42 per cent). Researchers at independent institutes are also more likely to report that their motives to apply for RCN grants include: to broaden their field of expertise (48 per cent), conduct scientifically/technologically risky research (29 per cent), and to create or strengthen collaboration with industry (30 per cent) (see Table 7.30 and Table 7.31 in Appendix B).

Table 2.1 Researchers' motives to apply for RCN grants. Percentages.

In general, how important are the following motives when you apply for grants from the Research Council of Norway (RCN)?	Important motive to apply for RCN grants	Partly/sometimes a motive to apply for RCN grants	No, this is not important in my research projects	No, no RCN scheme would be helpful in achieving this	Cannot say	N
a) Get funding for my own research activities	78.3	14.1	4.0	0.9	2.7	669
b) Get funding for recruitment positions to my institution	52.5	30.5	8.3	3.1	5.7	653
c) Gain access to complementary expertise	22.1	39.0	21.9	5.6	11.3	638
d) Gain access to scientific excellence	24.6	36.5	18.0	8.7	12.3	635
e) Create new national research networks	29.6	43.5	14.6	4.3	8.0	646
f) Create new international research networks	37.7	39.4	10.4	4.7	7.8	653
g) Strengthen existing national research networks	32.9	43.7	13.0	2.3	8.1	645
h) Strengthen existing international research networks	36.1	42.2	11.1	3.4	7.2	640
i) Create or strengthen collaboration with industry	17.3	23.0	38.7	8.8	12.3	626
j) Broaden our field of expertise	40.5	36.6	12.7	4.0	6.3	632
k) Conduct scientifically/ technologically risky research	21.0	18.3	37.2	10.8	12.7	623
l) Conduct cross-sector research	17.9	32.1	32.1	6.4	11.5	626
m) Conduct interdisciplinary research	29.3	43.1	16.9	4.1	6.6	634
n) Conduct research in collaboration with key international institutions	34.7	39.6	14.5	3.7	7.6	629
o) Prepare for participation in international funding programmes	19.0	39.2	25.4	4.8	11.6	627

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers. This question was posed only to those researchers who indicated that they had applied for RCN grant at least once in the period 2003 to 2011 (question number 7, Appendix D).

There are some notable differences between responses from researchers and leaders (comparing figures in Table 2.1 and 2.2). Whereas creating or strengthening national research networks are the most frequent objectives for leaders to recommend RCN grants<sup>6</sup>, researchers appear to more often apply for these grants to broaden their research field and to create or strengthen international research networks (the leaders were not posed the question concerning funding for own research and for recruitment).

Notably, 42 per cent of leaders do not know what funding source they would recommend for conducting risky research, indicating that a large proportion of them think that neither the RCN nor other funding sources are adequate for such research (Table 2.2).

<sup>6</sup> These are the most frequent objectives for which the leaders at the universities would recommend RCN grants (Table 7.32 in Appendix B).

Table 2.2 Leaders at research institutions: recommendations regarding RCN grants. Percentages.

Depending on the particular objectives of a project, which kind of funding scheme would you recommend your colleagues/researchers at your unit to apply for, in order to:	Would recommend			Cannot say/NA	N
	RCN scheme	Partly RCN scheme/ partly other schemes	Other funding schemes		
c) Gain access to complementary expertise	23.2	36.1	12.3	28.4	155
d) Gain access to scientific excellence	29.5	41.0	4.5	25.0	156
e) Create new national research networks	39.1	35.9	6.4	18.6	156
f) Create new international research networks	15.2	39.9	25.9	19.0	158
g) Strengthen existing national research networks	37.6	38.9	5.1	18.5	157
h) Strengthen existing international research networks	14.3	40.9	24.0	20.8	154
i) Create or strengthen collaboration with industry	15.4	35.9	14.7	34.0	156
j) Broaden our field of expertise	26.1	37.9	11.1	24.8	153
k) Conduct scientifically/technologically risky research	22.5	21.9	13.9	41.7	151
l) Conduct cross-sector research	20.3	43.1	11.1	25.5	153
m) Conduct interdisciplinary research	27.3	46.1	7.8	18.8	154
n) Conduct research in collaboration with key international institutions	15.8	42.4	22.2	19.6	158
o) Preparing for participation in international funding programmes	35.5	34.8	9.7	20.0	155

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of leaders at research institutions. Item a and b in the previous table/researcher survey were not included in the leader survey.

The answers from researchers who have not applied for RCN grants indicate that reasons for this vary. The answers are distributed fairly evenly across three reasons: (1) the researcher has sufficient funding from other sources; (2) the RCN rejection rates are too high to warrant an application; and, the (3) lack of adequate RCN funding schemes. Few consider the grants being too small to be an important reason (Table 2.3). There are some differences between the institutional sectors. At the university colleges and the specialised university institutions sufficient funding from other sources is a less frequent reason not to apply for RCN grants (but numbers here are small as there are few ‘non-applicants’ from these sectors who replied to the survey, see Table 7.33 in Appendix B).

Table 2.3 Researchers’ reasons not to apply for RCN grants. Percentages.

How important have the following reasons not to apply for RCN grants (Forskningsrådsmidler) been for you?	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	N
I/my unit had sufficient funding from other sources	33.5	34.2	32.3	155
It was not worth it because each grant is too small	8.1	20.6	71.3	136
The rejection rate is too high to warrant an application	37.7	29.5	32.9	146
There is no funding scheme that fits my needs	32.7	31.3	36.1	147

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers. This question was posed only to those researchers who indicated that they had not applied for an RCN grant in the period 2003 to 2011 (question number 7, Appendix D).

Reasons for not applying were elaborated on in free text comments. Some researchers described gaps in the RCN funding instruments/priorities, some that they considered themselves to have no chance of obtaining RCN funds, while others expressed more general distrust about RCN policy or review procedures. Comments include:

- *The RCN is not very relevant for development and innovation oriented work in the professions (university college based)*
- *Especially multidisciplinary projects have so many participants that the funding for each part is too low, with high demands on deliveries.*
- *Although the building industry is the largest on-shore industry in Norway, it seems neglected by RCN.*
- *Grants for basic research in the social sciences are quite limited in the RCN. Beyond the FRISAM, which is competitive, there are no general schemes encouraging basic research in my field.*
- *I am an MD, and GP. General practice research has traditionally been small scale projects with funding available from the Norwegian Medical association, and grants from the RCN have not obviously fitted my needs. Hopefully this will change with ‘samhandlingsforskning’ in PHC. It is important that the health perspective is not left out. Too little resources are allocated for health research in Russia, and over all too little funding is offered to global health projects.*
- *The funding policy is totally misconstrued and nothing but a big waste of money.*

- *Too much work for nothing.*
- *I have applied with others, but not on my own, because only larger groups receive funds. Applying to the RCN is not worth the effort.*
- *Other sources preferred, mostly Nordic.*
- *Artistic research projects are not prioritised by RCN.*
- *Personal networks have too much influence on the selection of winners.*
- *Priorities are too politicised, rejection rate far too high to merit the time spent on writing an application.*
- *Associate professors at university colleges are not necessarily those scientists who are prioritised for RCN funding/grants. They never have been. It is far easier to get funding from municipalities, county governments, or work with international partners and getting funding from their research councils (or other).*
- *Applying for research money for separate projects and not being part of a centre of Excellence would create a lot of work with the application form and with a minor chance of success.*

Table 2.4 shows the leaders' and the researchers' replies concerning the attractiveness of the RCN funding schemes. All RCN schemes are considered more attractive by leaders, than by the researchers. Overall, the independent projects (FRIPRO) are the most attractive schemes, whereas the FMEs are the least attractive.

Splitting responses by institutional sectors we find, unsurprisingly, that FRIPRO, the basic research programmes and the SFF scheme are more attractive at universities and specialised university institutions, while the large-scale programmes, the SFI scheme, the FME and the user-directed innovation programmes are more attractive for the institutes. Policy-oriented programmes are more attractive for the university colleges. Respondents affiliated with university hospitals are often unable to answer this question (Table 7.34 in Appendix B).

Table 2.4 Survey replies: 'In your view, how attractive are the following RCN funding schemes, as a funding source for your (unit's)\* research activities?' Per cent by survey group.

Survey group	Very attractive	Somewhat attractive	Neither attractive nor unattractive	Somewhat unattractive	Very unattractive	NA	N
<b>Independent projects (FRIPRO)</b>							
Researchers	47.7	22.1	11.7	2.5	3.4	12.6	865
Leaders	50.3	26.7	8.1	5.6	4.3	5.0	161
Total	48.1	22.8	11.1	3.0	3.5	11.4	1026
<b>Large-scale programmes (Store programmer)</b>							
Researchers	31.2	29.1	16.4	6.8	4.7	11.8	836
Leaders	43.8	29.0	10.5	5.6	3.7	7.4	162
Total	33.3	29.1	15.4	6.6	4.5	11.1	998
<b>Policy-oriented programmes (Handlingsrettede programmer)</b>							
Researchers	13.3	26.1	24.4	10.4	7.0	18.7	824
Leaders	39.9	30.4	13.3	5.7	1.3	9.5	158
Total	17.6	26.8	22.6	9.7	6.1	17.2	982
<b>User-directed innovation programmes (Brukerstyrte innovasjonsprogrammer)</b>							
Researchers	16.8	23.5	23.3	11.1	7.7	17.7	821
Leaders	29.9	32.5	19.5	6.5	1.9	9.7	154
Total	18.9	24.9	22.7	10.4	6.8	16.4	975
<b>Basic research programmes (Grunnforskningsprogrammer)</b>							
Researchers	34.8	25.4	17.1	4.6	2.7	15.2	841
Leaders	33.3	22.6	16.4	14.5	5.0	8.2	159
Total	34.6	25.0	17.0	6.2	3.1	14.1	1000
<b>Centres of Excellence (SFF)</b>							
Researchers	25.1	26.7	21.3	5.5	5.3	16.1	836
Leaders	40.9	21.4	17.6	6.3	4.4	9.4	159
Total	27.6	25.8	20.7	5.6	5.1	15.1	995
<b>Centres for Research-based Innovation (SFI)</b>							
Researchers	12.5	18.8	28.4	10.1	7.0	23.2	814
Leaders	31.6	22.2	16.5	7.6	5.1	17.1	158
Total	15.6	19.3	26.4	9.7	6.7	22.2	972
<b>Centres for Environment-friendly Energy research (FME)</b>							
Researchers	7.4	11.8	27.7	9.9	10.6	32.6	815
Leaders	20.0	16.1	18.1	13.5	9.0	23.2	155
Total	9.4	12.5	26.2	10.5	10.3	31.1	970
<b>Networking measures (nettverkstiltak)</b>							
Researchers	15.6	34.6	23.7	4.8	3.9	17.4	827
Leaders	26.6	31.0	21.5	5.1	1.9	13.9	158
Total	17.4	34.0	23.4	4.9	3.6	16.9	985

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers and survey of leaders at research institutions.

\*The questionnaire to the leaders asked about attractiveness for the unit: 'In your view, how attractive are the following RCN funding schemes, as a funding source for your unit's research activities?'

A substantial share of the free text comments at the end of the survey concerned the RCN's programme portfolio and priorities, for example comments that there is too much emphasis on applied, policy-driven research programmes and too little funding for basic/free research. See Appendix C, Table C.1.

When comparing RCN and international funding sources (such as the EU framework programme) the leaders are more in favour of RCN schemes, than the researchers are. For all the issues, the majority answer either 'About the same' or 'Cannot say' (58 to 80 per cent of the total replies; leaders more often answer 'About the same, while researchers more often answer 'cannot say').

When positive and negative responses are taken in aggregate (those rating funding sources better, against those weighting them as poorer) the RCN schemes are considered better in terms of flexibility of use of funds and slightly better in terms of the opportunities offered for doing unique/original research and for supporting young scientists, but the same or worse for the other issues examined (Table 2.5).

The same questions were posed, in a separate survey, to applicants to the RCN scheme for independent research projects (FRIPRO). The respondents were asked to compare FRIPRO with ERC<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> The European Research Council.



schemes in particular (see Table 2.5 for more detail). In this context (comparing FRIPRO with ERC schemes) the RCN schemes score better on the flexibility of use of funds only. Compared to the researcher survey for the evaluation of the RCN, the proportions of respondents in the FRIPRO survey scoring RCN as 'better' is generally lower on all aspects, and particularly low in terms of 'Opportunities offered for doing unique/original research' and 'Amount of funding'<sup>8</sup>.

Table 2.5 Survey replies: 'In general, when comparing RCN funding schemes with relevant international funding sources (such as the EU framework programme), are the RCN schemes poorer, about the same or better, concerning:?' Per cent by survey group.

Survey group	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
<b>Opportunities offered for doing unique/original research?</b>					
Researchers	17.9	25.5	15.6	41.0	847
Leaders	23.9	41.9	6.5	27.7	155
Total	18.9	28.0	14.2	38.9	1002
<b>Opportunities offered for addressing high-risk topics?</b>					
Researchers	9.4	19.7	16.0	54.9	832
Leaders	18.7	29.7	12.3	39.4	155
Total	10.8	21.3	15.4	52.5	987
<b>Support for new projects without requiring preliminary research?</b>					
Researchers	11.7	24.9	12.6	50.8	836
Leaders	16.7	35.9	12.2	35.3	156
Total	12.5	26.6	12.5	48.4	992
<b>Opportunities offered for doing interdisciplinary research?</b>					
Researchers	6.8	33.8	12.5	46.8	837
Leaders	11.7	48.7	11.7	27.9	154
Total	7.6	36.1	12.4	43.9	991
<b>Opportunities offered for broadening your field of expertise?</b>					
Researchers	8.7	32.3	14.2	44.8	830
Leaders	16.9	40.3	12.3	30.5	154
Total	10.0	33.5	13.9	42.6	984
<b>Amount of funding?</b>					
Researchers	17.1	16.5	23.1	43.2	835
Leaders	27.6	25.6	22.4	24.4	156
Total	18.8	18.0	23.0	40.3	991
<b>Flexibility of use of funds?</b>					
Researchers	23.4	19.8	9.1	47.7	833
Leaders	44.2	24.4	6.4	25.0	156
Total	26.7	20.5	8.7	44.1	989
<b>Support for young scientists?</b>					
Researchers	14.6	23.5	10.6	51.3	830
Leaders	19.2	34.0	12.8	34.0	156
Total	15.3	25.2	11.0	48.6	986
<b>Impact on the prestige and career of the awarded investigators?</b>					
Researchers	5.2	20.4	27.1	47.3	830
Leaders	7.1	33.3	31.4	28.2	156
Total	5.5	22.4	27.8	44.3	986
<b>Opportunities for building new international scholarly networks?</b>					
Researchers	5.2	19.9	29.4	45.5	833
Leaders	4.5	25.8	41.9	27.7	155
Total	5.1	20.9	31.4	42.7	988

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers and survey of leaders at research institutions.

Table 2.6 summarises the replies in Table 2.5 by type of research institution. The percentage point difference between responses of 'better' and 'poorer' are summarised for all 10 items. The universities

<sup>8</sup> In the FRIPRO survey 10 per cent score FRIPRO better, and 16 per cent score FRIPRO poorer for 'Opportunities offered for doing unique/original research'. Moreover, 8 per cent score FRIPRO better, and 30 per cent score FRIPRO poorer for 'Amount of funding'. Langfeldt, L, I Ramberg, G Sivertsen, C Bloch and DS Olsen (2012). Evaluation of the Norwegian scheme for independent research projects (FRIPRO). Oslo: NIFU Report 8/2012, page 63. The questions were designed for a survey to applicants to the Human Frontier Program (HFSP). The HFSP scored substantially better than other international funding sources on all aspects. See Langfeldt, L (2006): Review of the Human Frontier Science Program's Initiatives 2000-2005. Oslo: NIFU STEP Working Paper 26/2006, page 44 and 96.

come out as the most negative towards RCN schemes compared to international schemes (with a cumulative result of -65 percentage points for the 10 items); the institutes are the most positive (with a cumulative result of -8 percentage points for the 10 items).<sup>9</sup> On two aspects the institutes are clearly more positive towards RCN schemes than relevant international funding sources: the flexibility of use of funds (27 percentage points lead for those rating this as better), and support for young scientists (13 percentage points lead for positive ratings). In the other sectors, RCN schemes score better than international funding schemes on the flexibility of use of funds, but in these sectors the RCN do not score better on the support for young scientists (Table 7.35 and Table 7.36 in Appendix B). The most likely explanation of these differences is that different sectors compare the RCN schemes with different types of international schemes, when replying to this question, for example with ERC starting grant in some cases and Marie Curie grants in others.<sup>10</sup>

Table 2.6 Survey replies: ‘In general, when comparing RCN funding schemes with relevant international funding sources (such as the EU framework programme), are the RCN schemes poorer, about the same or better, concerning:?’ Percentage point difference, better – poorer, by sector.

Sector	SUM of difference better - poorer
Universities	-65.3
Special. univ.inst.	-40.9
University colleges	-51.5
Institute sector	-7.6
University hospitals	-24.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>-39.1</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers and survey of leaders at research institutions. Results show the percentage point difference between ‘better’ and ‘poorer’ responses summarised for all 10 items in the previous tables.

<sup>9</sup> There are also less ‘cannot say’ responses in the institute sector.

<sup>10</sup> One respondent (from a university) commented that he/she answered based on the assumption that the ‘EU framework programme’ did not include the ERC – indicating that the answer would be different if comparing RCN schemes with ERC schemes. A leader at a research institute commented that the basic grant from RCN was particularly useful for high risk projects and broadening the field of expertise.

### 3. RCN management and review procedures

This chapter addresses issues relating to the application review process including application types and terms, and the review system. In their surveys, the researchers and leaders were asked to indicate their satisfaction with the application and review process, using a scale from 1 to 5 (1= 'Not at all' and 5= 'To a high extent'). Researchers' and research institution leaders' satisfaction with RCN management and review processes are compared in Table 3.1. Not surprisingly, those researchers who obtained RCN funding are generally somewhat more satisfied than those who did not. In addition, we find the leaders to be markedly more satisfied on these issues than the researchers.

Table 3.1 Satisfaction ratings with RCN processes. Average responses for researchers and leaders at research institutions (1=Not at all; 5=To a high extent).

Considering your experiences the last 3 years, to what extent were the following characteristics of the Research Council of Norway's (RCN) funding processes satisfactory?	Researchers			Leaders		
	RCN funding 2003-2011		Total average	N	Average	N
	Yes	No				
Access to relevant background information for the call	3.8	3.5	3.7	508	4.2	132
Clarity and easy to understand information about the call	3.8	3.4	3.7	513	4.0	133
Clarity of the distinction between application types	3.7	3.4	3.6	490	3.9	130
User-friendliness of the online application form	3.7	3.5	3.6	503	3.9	125
Support during the application process	3.5	3.1	3.4	413	3.8	114
Time from application to project startup	3.4	3.1	3.4	453	3.4	122
Fairness of the proposal assessment process	3.0	2.7	2.9	438	3.1	117
Thoroughness of the proposal assessment	3.1	2.8	3.0	453	3.5	118
Transparency regarding funding decisions	2.7	2.5	2.6	461	2.9	127
Clarity and completeness of the feedback to applicants	3.0	2.9	2.9	479	3.3	130
Administrative obligations in the application, reporting and payment processes	3.7	3.2	3.5	409	3.9	123
User-friendliness of the Reporting System	3.6	3.3	3.6	400	3.7	120
The overall cost efficiency of the application process	3.0	2.6	2.9	460	3.1	114

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of Norwegian researchers and leaders at research institutions. These questions/items were posed only to researchers who have applied for RCN grants in the period 2003-2011 and to leaders at research institutions. Respondents answering 'cannot say' are not included in the calculation.

The differences between researchers with and without RCN funding are most notable concerning the issues of 'clarity and easy to understand information about the call', 'support during the application process', 'administrative obligations in the application, reporting and payment processes' and 'the overall cost efficiency of the application process. On average the researchers with RCN funding rate these issues 0.4-0.5 higher than those without such funding. However, differences are not as marked as in the separate survey sent to FRIPRO applicants, were successful applicants rated several of these questions 0.7-0.8 higher than unsuccessful applicants on average.<sup>11</sup>

Both funded and non-funded applicants are most satisfied with the access to relevant background information for the call, and the clarity of this information; both groups are least satisfied with the transparency regarding funding decisions (similar results are found for the two surveys for the evaluation of the RCN and the separate survey for the evaluation of FRIPRO). Moreover, the fairness of the proposal assessment process and the overall cost efficiency of the application process receive low ratings (an average of 2.9 for the researchers and 3.1 for the leaders on both issues).

We also find some differences by type of research institution. Table 3.3 indicates that respondents at the independent institutes have a slightly more positive valuation of the application and review process, compared to respondents at the higher education institutions. This tendency is strongest concerning the user-friendliness of the online application form and the administrative obligations in the application, reporting and payment processes.

<sup>11</sup> Table 7.39 in Appendix B below shows the 'average replies' for funded and non-funded applications of the FRIPRO scheme.

Table 3.2 Satisfaction with the application and review process by research sector. Average of applicants replies (1= Not at all; 5= To a high extent).

Considering your FRIPRO applications in general, to what extent were the following RCN (funding) processes satisfactory?	Sector					Total	N
	Universities	Specialised university institutions	University colleges/ colleges	Institute sector	Hospitals		
Access to relevant background information for the call	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.0	3.8	675
Clarity and easy to understand information about the call	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.7	682
Clarity of the distinction between application types	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.8	3.1	3.6	654
User-friendliness of the online application form	3.5	3.4	3.7	3.9	3.1	3.7	660
Support during the application process	3.4	3.0	3.5	3.5	2.7	3.4	554
Time from application to project startup	3.4	2.7	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.4	598
Fairness of the proposal assessment process	2.9	2.9	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.9	583
Thoroughness of the proposal assessment	3.0	2.9	3.2	3.1	3.5	3.1	596
Transparency regarding funding decisions	2.6	2.2	2.7	2.7	3.0	2.7	617
Clarity and completeness of the feedback to applicants	2.9	2.6	3.0	3.1	3.3	3.0	640
Administrative obligations in the application, reporting and payment processes	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.8	3.3	3.6	552
User-friendliness of the Reporting System	3.5	3.3	3.6	3.7	3.0	3.6	537
The overall cost efficiency of the application process	2.9	2.6	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.9	599

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of Norwegian researchers and leaders at research institutions. These questions/ items were posed only to researchers who have applied for RCN grants in the period 2003-2011 and to leaders at research institutions. Respondents answering ‘cannot say’ are not included in the calculation.

The legitimacy of the review system was pointed out as a challenge in the 2001 evaluation of the RCN. In the 2001 researcher survey, almost half of respondents (44 per cent) fully or partly disagreed with the statement ‘feedback about the review result is good’. The table below shows figures from the 2001 and 2012 surveys concerning the application process. The 2001 and 2012 surveys do not provide data on the same statements. Neither is the five point reply scale formulated the same way (5 ‘Agree fully’ – 1 ‘Disagree fully’ in 2001 vs. 5 ‘To a great extent’ - 1 ‘Not at all’ in 2012). Moreover, the 2012 reply option included ‘Cannot say’ whereas this was no option in 2001. Hence, these data are not comparable, the table merely illustrates results from 2001 and 2012 on similar issues. Nonetheless, it seems that there is somewhat less dissatisfaction with the application process in 2012 than there was in 2001. Whereas 44 per cent expressed dissatisfaction with the feedback about the review in 2001, 31 per cent are dissatisfied in 2012; the percentage stating they are satisfied on this issue is unchanged (around 27 per cent in both surveys). Differences since 2001 are greater when it comes to the two other aspects of the application process reported in the table below. A narrow majority (54 per cent) expressed dissatisfaction with the duration of the application process in 2001, compared to just 15 per cent in 2012; and, a higher proportion express satisfaction with the duration of the application process in 2012 (36 per cent) than they did in 2001 (12 per cent in 2001). On the issue of assistance in the application process, nearly half (47 per cent) were dissatisfied in 2001, compared to 14 per cent in 2012. However, most of this latter difference may be due to differences in the formulation of the question (the 2001 survey asked whether RCN had assisted the respondent, the 2012 survey asked more generally about the assistance).

Table 3.3 Satisfaction with RCN processes. Results from researcher surveys in 2001 and 2012. Percentages.

Experience with the RCN application process	% positive replies		% negative replies	
	2001	2012	2001	2012
<b>Assistance</b> 2001: 'RCN has assisted me in the application phase' (positive = Agree fully or Agree partly; negative = Disagree fully or Disagree partly) 2012: 'Support during the application process' (positive = 5 or 4; negative = 1 or 2)	18.5	36.0	47.1	14.1
<b>Time</b> 2001: 'The application process takes longer time than it should' (positive = 'Disagree fully or Disagree partly; negative = Agree fully or Agree partly) 2012: 'Time from application to project start-up rate' (positive = 5 or 4; negative = 1 or 2)	12.1	35.7	54.4	14.6
<b>Feedback</b> 2001: 'Feedback about the review result is good' (positive = Agree fully or Agree partly; negative = Disagree fully or Disagree partly) 2012: 'Clarity and completeness of the feedback to applicants' (positive = 5 or 4; negative = 1 or 2)	27.8	27.2	43.6	31.0

Sources: Researcher survey for the evaluation of RCN 2001: 'What is your experience with the application process?' (5 point scale agree fully - disagree fully, 'cannot say' not included as an option) N=535-539. Researcher survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012: 'Considering your experiences the last 3 years, to what extent were the following characteristics of the Research Council of Norway's (RCN) funding processes satisfactory? (5 point scale 5= 'To a great extent' - 1 = 'Not at all', plus 'cannot say'). N=413-479.

The survey of leaders at research institutions contained a separate field for comments on the RCN application process. The comments submitted include views on a perceived biases and lack of transparency in the review process, as well as frustrations concerning the costs of the application process, short deadlines and unclear instructions for the calls:

- 
- *The funding regime creates monopolistic situations and a lack of real, free competition. Too few have too much to say when it comes to how and who should get funding.*
- *The referee process sometimes shows surprising results. This might be due to the span of the competence required to assess the portfolio. It is particularly so that a project which is somewhat away from your own core field tend not to be given top marks. This is a problem when the competition is as strong as it is, and only top marked projects are funded.*
- *Systems are good. Use of expert reviewers and review panels varies a lot between different programmes. Some appear thorough and trustworthy, others not.*
- *There are variations between each program and each call. Difficult to give a fair general answer here.*
- *Too much competition. An inefficient way to fund research projects. When well below 10% of the applications are funded, an enormous amount of work in the research institutes and in the RCN is a waste of time. When more research proposals get high evaluation scores than can be funded, strategic priorities (like building of long-term competence in a few institutions) adopted in advance should be crucial for funding instead of the subjective judgement made by program-committee members.*
- *As a small developing institution concerning research, we have put energy and costs into application processes that gains us nothing. Some partners involved no longer work in the institution, so these costs do not build expertise for the next time.*
- *In their totality the application processes are far too costly.*
- *Transparency regarding the programme board decision-making is absent.*
- *Difficult to see the impact of external reviewers' work and the impact of the NCR administration on funding decisions.*
- *The calls come too late - 6 weeks is too short. The instructions for the call are sometimes incomprehensible, categories seem redundant, and the document for the call strongly needs some serious editing. Recommend that you start using NIH as a model, those instructions are crystal clear.*

Two more leaders commented on short deadlines for the calls, explaining that organising partnership with industry is particularly time consuming, and that a six-week deadline for submitting applications is too short.

A substantial share of the free text comments at the end of the researcher survey concerned the RCN's application processes, emphasising many of the same issues found among the leaders, and in addition more specific frustrations relating to their rejected applications. Concerns included views that reputation, whether an applicant is already known to RCN (i.e. having received funding previously), the size of the application or geographic/regional concerns, influence the distribution of grants too strongly. The statements below illustrate these issues (see also Appendix C, Table C.2):

- *Personal networks have too much influence on the selection of winners.*
- *The formal requirements for funding support only larger institutions. Research that could have been important for smaller institutions and for our society does not have the possibility to develop the support needed to fulfil the requirements in order to receive funding. The network and facilities becomes more important than the research idea.*
- *Entrance... demands a lot of publications. As a small institution, we lose out to the universities.*
- *When evaluating larger projects, one should look closer at what the various individual participants have actually produced. Having participated in various larger projects within humanities, I have experienced that some of those who have taken the most resources, without publishing hardly anything, are again included in new larger projects or even given large individual grants, where they again publish close to nothing. When deciding which projects should be awarded grants, the RCN should have the opportunity to have some of the applicants removed if they have a history of not publishing.*
- *The trend is that larger projects with participants from several countries are given priority. This is a good model for major basic research challenges, but not for industrial innovation.*
- 

Some respondents described the RCN review process as hesitant or unsupportive of new ideas and methods, preferring 'safe' projects:

- *It [RCN] is a monolithic structure without competition. Mainstream approaches dominate the appointment of panels and decisions, hence new and heterodox perspectives are usually turned down.*
- *I understand that research [with] immediate applications has its well-deserved attraction. Yet such work has to be complemented by research that may become relevant in the longer run. Often the more original and rewarding concepts lie there. I'd wish the RCN could take this into consideration, and allow for more concept-driven research to warrant diversity in research.*
- *There is a great risk of 'conservation of old ideas' by being too strict on competitiveness and evaluation of CVs and publication lists. More priorities should be put on the value of new ideas and new thinking, and interdisciplinary research and development..... A challenge is to avoid the 'Matthew effect' and to be able to fund the new, innovative ideas rather than always running after those with the longest CV.*

Another issue that was frequently mentioned by the respondents was that it has become increasingly difficult to win funds based on a good scientific application alone. Administrative issues are thought to have become an increasingly important aspect of the applications, and some feel this has damaging effects on the research project itself:

- *A main problem with applications is continuous, upscaled competition. It sadly appears to me that the best projects/ideas do not necessarily get funding, since it is more important to answer every question on the application to an extent that [involves] some optimum [state of] bureaucracy..... Good ideas will not necessarily be funded if all questions have not been filled out in a meticulous manner.*
- *The RCN spend an awful lot of their funding on detailed strategic processes, going into way too much detail when it comes to the research topics. These processes also takes a lot of time, and when it comes to the details a lot may have changed from the time the strategies are made to the point when the research is done. These processes show little respect for the researchers' own ability to define details when it comes to important research questions/topic.*
- *There is a tendency that the requirements of involving several partners, regionalization and building consortia has led to increased bureaucracy, more reporting and time consumption, as well as a fragmentation of national research efforts, which over time will lead to drop of quality.*
- *There is a large problem that interdisciplinary projects do not result in good research. The projects are organised in order to fit with the proposals, but that is a result forced by the proposals and not the best way to achieve the goals.*

## 4. Added value of RCN funding

What is the added value of RCN funding for the research environments? This chapter looks first at the responses of research institution leaders and then at researchers' perceptions of the impact RCN funding has on their research activities.

Table 4.1 shows a high level of positive responses from research leaders concerning the added value of RCN funding. A total of 81 per cent of the leaders fully or partly agree that 'RCN research and innovation programmes influence the focus of universities' and other research performers' strategies'. Moreover, the statement 'RCN supports the development of new research and innovation capacity' is fully or partly supported by 73 per cent of the institution leaders.

Table 4.1 Research institution leaders' views of RCN activities and impacts. Percentages.

LQ 11. To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements? (question items posed only to research institution leaders)	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Cannot say	N
RCN supports the development of new research and innovation capacity	26.6	46.8	11.4	8.2	0.6	6.3	158
RCN research and innovation programmes have lasting effects on national research capacities	28.8	41.0	16.0	2.6		11.5	156
RCN research and innovation programmes create positive structural changes in the research and innovation system	14.7	27.6	25.6	16.0	4.5	11.5	156
RCN research and innovation programmes influence the focus of universities' and other research performers' strategies	33.1	47.8	7.6	5.1	0.6	5.7	157
In general, RCN research and innovation programmes generate the expected outputs and outcomes	6.5	39.4	29.7	14.2		10.3	155
RCN research and innovation programmes strengthen the breadth of long term, fundamental research in Norway	22.6	35.5	16.8	14.2	1.9	9.0	155
RCN strengthen research to serve the knowledge needs of industry sectors and public administration	12.8	39.7	14.7	13.5	1.3	17.9	156

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of leaders at research institutions.

Relatively few institution leaders disagree with these statements about RCN activities and impacts. The highest level of disagreement is found for the statement 'RCN research and innovation programmes create positive structural changes in the research and innovation system' (20 per cent fully or partly disagree). The institution leaders are also somewhat reluctant to give a clear view on the statement 'In general, RCN research and innovation programmes generate the expected outputs and outcomes', where more than 40 per cent say they 'neither agree nor disagree' or 'cannot say'.

Turning to the researcher survey and the different type of RCN funding schemes, a number of questions address the applicant's valuation of the impact of the funding in the 2003-2011 period. Six categories of RCN scheme are used in this analysis, indicated in Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2. Most recent project funded by the Research Council of Norway (RCN) for which you are able to indicate results. Percentages, by year and RCN Programme type.

Project start-up year	Large-scale programme (Store programmer)	User-directed programme (Brukerstyrt innovasjonsprogram)	Policy-oriented programme (Handlingsrettet program)	Basic research programme including independent projects (FRIPRO)	RCN centre scheme funding	Other RCN funding	Total
2003	6.3		5.9	6.1	11.8	5.3	5.4
2004			5.9	3.0	5.9	2.6	2.5
2005	3.1	2.4	5.9	7.6	.0	5.3	4.7
2006	9.4	23.8	11.8	7.6	5.9	2.6	10.4
2007	9.4	4.8	19.6	13.6	17.6	7.9	11.9
2008	28.1	16.7	15.7	9.1		13.2	15.8
2009	20.3	19.0	13.7	18.2	29.4	7.9	17.3
2010	10.9	11.9	11.8	19.7	17.6	31.6	16.5
2011	12.5	21.4	9.8	15.2	11.8	23.7	15.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
<b>N</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>278</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers. These questions/ items were posed only to researchers who had received RCN grants in the period 2003-2011.

During the last nine years, we find respondents with funding from all six programme categories, with somewhat more from the large-scale programmes and basic research programmes; only a few respondents answer the questions on outcomes referring to a RCN centre funding scheme.

In the following description of results, we present answers to these questions irrespective of the type of RCN scheme that financed the researchers' most recent project. Table 4.3 below shows overall responses to the battery of outcome related items.



Table 4.3 RCN Project beneficiaries' assessments of the outcomes of their most recent project funded by the Research Council of Norway, which the researcher is able to indicate results for. Percentages.

15. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning this particular project?	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Not relevant	N
a) My/my group's overall <i>research capabilities</i> have been significantly improved as a result of the project	46.0	39.6	9.5	1.5	.9	2.5	326
b) My/my group's overall <i>innovation capabilities</i> have been significantly improved as a result of the project	28.0	37.0	20.5	2.8	.6	11.2	322
c) Research and innovation <i>management skills</i> have been significantly improved as a result of the project	22.7	40.2	24.0	5.0	1.2	6.9	321
d) A new research group was established as a result of the project	22.5	28.1	15.7	7.1	13.6	13.0	324
e) The project has changed our research activities towards larger collaborative projects	18.0	32.3	28.3	6.8	8.7	5.9	322
d2) The project has changed our way of doing research	7.5	24.3	34.9	13.7	14.0	5.6	321
e2) Long term international cooperation links have been considerably extended as a result of the project	27.6	33.5	17.7	9.0	7.5	4.7	322
f) The project has enabled us to successfully compete for funding from other external national sources	14.6	28.0	22.1	9.7	10.3	15.3	321
g) The project has enabled us to successfully compete for international funding (within or outside of the EU Framework Programme)	9.0	24.0	25.2	9.7	12.5	19.6	321
h) The project led to significantly increased publication output in my unit	24.3	43.6	18.4	6.9	2.2	4.7	321
i) The project had a positive impact on my research career (new research position/promotion based on research resulting from the project)	22.7	26.8	30.5	5.6	5.3	9.0	321
j) The project has improved our international standing and excellence	23.8	42.6	23.8	3.4	2.2	4.1	319
k) Through the project new research areas of significant importance for our future research/innovation activities have been explored	30.0	45.7	16.1	3.2	1.6	3.5	317
l) The project has led to/contributed to innovation (improved product, process or organisational method)	16.5	25.9	22.4	5.9	4.4	24.9	321
m) The project has contributed to solving social challenges (samfunnsutfordringer)	11.3	32.0	23.5	4.1	6.9	22.3	319

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers. These questions/ items were posed only to researchers who received RCN funding in the period 2003-2011.

Most of the statements in Table 4.3, about the outcomes of RCN funded projects, are supported by a majority of the respondents: overall research capabilities are thought to have improved (item a: 86 per cent fully or partly agree); new research areas important for future research/innovation activities have been explored (item k: 76 per cent fully or partly agree); increased publication output (item h: 68 per cent fully or partly agree); improved international standing and excellence (item j: 66 per cent fully or partly agree); improved overall innovation capabilities (item b: 65 per cent fully or partly agree); improved management skills (item c: 63 per cent fully or partly agree); long-term international cooperation links are considerably extended (item e2: 61 per cent fully or partly agree); a new research group was established (item d: 51 per cent fully or partly agree); research activities are changed towards larger collaborative projects (item e: 50 per cent fully or partly agree); positive impact on research career (item i: 50 per cent fully or partly agree).

On the other hand, respondents are less positive concerning the impact on their ability to compete for international funding (item g: 33 per cent fully or partly agree) and impact on their way of doing research (item d2: 32 per cent fully or partly agree).

There is a high level of *indifferent* responses (neither nor/not relevant) on the statements about projects' contributions to innovation or contributions to solving social challenges (items l and m in Table 4.3).

Studying the variation in views about project outcomes by intuitional affiliation, we find interesting results concerning the following items in particular (Table 7.42 in Appendix B):

- a) My/my group's overall research capabilities have been significantly improved as a result of the project: higher levels of 'fully agree' at the universities (52 per cent) and specialised university institutions (55 per cent) than at the independent institutes (44 per cent).
- e2) Long term international cooperation links have been considerably extended as a result of the project: Lower levels of 'fully agree' at the independent institutes (26 per cent) than at the universities (33 per cent).
- l) The project has led to/contributed to innovation (improved product, process or organisational method): Higher levels of 'fully agree' at the independent institutes (32 per cent) than at the universities (10 per cent).

Several of the statements in Table 4.3 were also used in a survey sent to Norwegian participants in the EU 6<sup>th</sup> Framework programme in 2009. With two exceptions, the outcomes of RCN projects are rated more highly than the outcomes of Norwegian researchers' FP6 projects: the RCN projects are somewhat less frequently considered to lead to long-term international cooperation links, and somewhat less frequently thought to contribute to innovation (items e2 and l in the table below).

Table 4.4 Norwegian researchers' assessments of the outcome from their own RCN projects and FP6 projects. Percentages.

15. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning this particular project?*	% 'Agree fully' or 'Agree partly'	
	RCN 2012 survey	FP6 2009 survey
a) My/my group's overall research capabilities have been significantly improved as a result of the project	85.6	66.2
b) My/my group's overall innovation capabilities have been significantly improved as a result of the project	65.0	49.6
c) Research and innovation management skills have been significantly improved as a result of the project	62.9	55.2
d2) The project has changed our way of doing research	31.8	26.6
e2) Long term international cooperation links have been considerably extended as a result of the project	61.1	78.3
h) The project led to significantly increased publication output in my unit	67.9	42.7
k) Through the project new research areas of significant importance for our future research/innovation activities have been explored	75.7	60.0
l) The project has led to/contributed to innovation (improved product, process or organisational method)	42.4	51.9

Sources: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers (previous table).

FP6 2009 survey: Godø H, L Langfeldt, A Kaloudis (2009), *In need of a better framework for success. An evaluation of the Norwegian participation in the EU 6th Framework Programme (2003–2006) and the first part of the EU 7th Framework Programme (2007–2008)*. Oslo, NIFU STEP Rapport 22/2009, page 111).

\*Question formulations in the survey sent to Norwegian participants in FP6 were as follows:

'Estimate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about this particular EU project:'

- a) 'Our overall research capabilities have been significantly improved as a result of the EU project'
- b) 'Our overall innovation capabilities have been significantly improved as a result of the EU project'
- c) 'Research and innovation management skills have been significantly improved as a result of the EU project'
- d2) 'The EU project has changed our way of doing research and innovation in the organisation /project unit'
- e2) 'Long term international cooperation links have been considerably extended as a result of the EU project'
- h) 'The EU project lead to significantly increased publication output in my unit'
- k) 'Through the EU project new research areas of significant importance for our future research/innovation activities have been explored'
- l) 'The EU project leads/contributes to innovation'.

The researchers were also asked to compare the characteristics of their RCN project with their other projects. On all aspects studied, the RCN projects come out better than the respondents' other projects. Around half (52 per cent) reply that their RCN project is more oriented towards basic research, while only 15 per cent reply that their other projects are more oriented towards basic research. Similarly, a larger proportion state that their RCN project is more strategically important to their organisation, provides more new scientific results, has the highest scientific quality, is more internationally oriented, more long-term and more multidisciplinary, than their other projects (see

table 4.5 below). The lowest scores for RCN projects are obtained on high-risk research, but even here the balance remains clearly in favour of the RCN projects compared to others: 28 per cent reply that their RCN project is more scientifically/technologically risky, while 14 per cent reply that their other projects are more scientifically/technologically risky, and 59 per cent that there is no difference. Results by research sector/type of institution are shown in Table 7.44 in Appendix B.

Table 4.5 RCN project characteristics compared to other projects. RCN project beneficiaries' assessment. Percentages.

Please compare the nature of this particular project funded by the Research Council of Norway (RCN) with your other R&D projects/research not funded by RCN and indicate which projects	The RCN project	No difference	My other projects	Total
are most strategically important to your organisation?	50.8	34.2	15.0	313
are most oriented towards basic research?	51.5	33.9	14.7	307
provide most new scientific results?	48.9	36.9	14.2	309
are most scientifically/technologically risky?	27.9	58.5	13.6	301
have the highest scientific quality?	44.3	44.6	11.1	305
are most long-term?	48.7	29.4	21.9	306
are most multidisciplinary?	35.9	46.4	17.6	306
are most internationally oriented?	41.5	39.2	19.3	306

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers. These questions/ items were posed only to researchers who were awarded RCN grants in the period 2003-2011.

However, it is important to note that there are substantial variations on views of RCN project characteristics, depending on the type of RCN projects; different project types are ranked quite differently (Table 7.43 in Appendix B). For example, RCN large-scale programmes and centres of excellence are considered to be the most strategically important to their research organisation. RCN large-scale programmes are also considered more important for providing new scientific results and high scientific quality.

The questions in Table 4.5 were also included in the previously mentioned survey sent to Norwegian participants in FP6. With the exception of the characteristic of multidisciplinary, RCN projects are more frequently rated highly than the respondents' other projects, than FP6 projects compared to researchers' other projects (table below).

Table 4.6 RCN and FP6 project characteristics, compared to researchers' other projects. Project beneficiaries' assessment. Percentages.

Please compare the nature of this particular project funded by the Research Council of Norway (RCN) with your other R&D projects/research not funded by RCN / of your EU project(s) with your other R&D projects / and indicate which projects:	RCN survey: % 'The RCN project'	6FP survey: % 'The EU projects'
a) are most strategically important to your organisation?	50.8	32.8
b) are most oriented towards basic research?	51.5	22.2
c) provide most new scientific results?	48.9	22.0
d) are most scientifically/technologically risky?	27.9	22.7
e) have the highest scientific quality?	44.3	23.2
f) are most long-term?	48.7	36.1
g) are most multidisciplinary?	35.9	43.2

Sources: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers (previous table).

FP6 2009 survey: (Godø H, L Langfeldt, A Kaloudis (2009), *In need of a better framework for success. An evaluation of the Norwegian participation in the EU 6th Framework Programme (2003–2006) and the first part of the EU 7th Framework Programme (2007–2008)*. Oslo, NIFU STEP Rapport 22/2009, page 111).

## 5. Support for internationalisation

Nearly three quarters (71 per cent) of the researchers surveyed report that they have engaged in some kind of international research project collaboration during the last 3 years (Table 5.1). A somewhat higher proportion of the researchers at the universities (76 per cent) and at independent institutes (73) have taken part in such collaboration compared to those at other kinds of research organisations, and women have done so slightly more often than men (73 per cent compared to 70 per cent, Table 5.1). Splitting results by research area, we find the lowest proportion of researchers reporting international research project collaboration in the humanities (64 per cent) and the highest in the natural sciences (79 per cent).

Table 5.1 Survey replies: ‘Have you engaged in any international research project collaboration during the last 3 years?’ By sector and gender. Percentages.

Sector	Women			Men			Total		
	No	Yes	N	No	Yes	N	No	Yes	N
Universities	23.7	76.3	131	25.2	74.8	238	24.5	75.5	375
Specialised university institutions	30.8	69.2	13	33.3	66.7	30	32.6	67.4	43
University colleges	32.0	68.0	25	44.3	55.7	61	40.2	59.8	87
Institute sector	23.0	77.0	100	29.7	70.3	195	27.5	72.5	295
University hospitals	63.6	36.4	22	43.8	56.3	32	49.1	50.9	57
<b>Total</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>72.5</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>30.4</b>	<b>69.6</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>29.2</b>	<b>70.8</b>	<b>857</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers. 857 of the 1183 respondents replied to the questions about international research project collaboration.

Respondents were also asked to indicate their research collaboration by country/region. On average, 58 per cent of the reported collaboration is with organisations located in Norway, 10 per cent with organisations in other Nordic countries and 17 per cent with other areas in Europe. Moreover, 7 per cent of researchers (across all institution types) report collaboration with North America (Table 5.2).

Table 5.2 Research project collaboration by country/region. Average of percentages reported by sector.

In the last three years, what proportion of your overall research collaboration occurred with organisations located in the following regions?	Universities	Specialised university institutions	University colleges	Institute sector	University hospitals	*Total
Norway	54	61	54	60	72	58
Nordic countries apart from Norway	10	13	10	9	8	10
Europe apart for Nordic countries	19	14	14	18	7	17
Russia	1	1	1	1	1	1
North America	8	5	5	5	6	7
South America			2	1		1
Africa	2	1	2	1		2
Australia	1	1			1	1
Asia	2	2	3	2	1	2
<b>N (number of replies included in the calculations)</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>812</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers.

\* The researchers were asked to give an estimate. The sum of all percentages in the table adds up to 96, not 100, as in many cases the estimates did not add up to 100 per cent. One case of 880 per cent was corrected to 80 (which was the obvious intended value as 10 per cent was entered for two other regions). Other cases where the sum of percentages was above or below 100 were not adjusted or corrected.

In contrast to these relatively strong patterns of international collaboration, familiarity with the RCN’s own schemes to support internationalisation is mixed. A high proportion of researchers report that they know little about these RCN’s schemes, although those who have engaged in international collaboration during the last 3 years are somewhat more familiar with them. Many researchers report that they don’t know about Project Establishment Support (PES): just under half (46 per cent) of those engaged in international collaboration and 61 per cent of those not engaged, report that they do not

know about this (Table 5.3). The other schemes included in Table 5.3 are even less well known: 63 per cent reply that they do not know about grant schemes for collaboration with US/Africa/Asia South and Central America. Still these schemes emerge as the second most popular schemes for internationalisation which the respondents have applied for: 14 per cent have applied for PES and 8 per cent have applied to schemes for collaboration with US/Africa/Asia South and Central America.

Table 5.3 Acquaintance with RCN schemes for internationalisation, by respondents' international research project collaboration during the last 3 years. Percentages.

Are you acquainted with and have you used any of the following support schemes of the Research Council of Norway (RCN)?	International collaboration last 3 years	Don't know it	Know it, but have not applied for it	Know it, and have applied for it	Know it and have applied successfully for it	N
Project Establishment Support - PES (to help get EU projects)	No	61.1	27.6	5.4	5.9	221
	Yes	45.7	39.6	3.0	11.8	576
	Total	49.9	36.3	3.6	10.2	797
Top-up funding for Marie Curie grants (norsk toppfinansiering)	No	66.2	32.4	0.5	0.9	219
	Yes	48.5	48.7	1.9	0.9	575
	Total	53.4	44.2	1.5	0.9	794
Funding of Starting Grant applicants (norsk finansiering av støtteverdige søknader)	No	75.2	23.9	0.9	0.0	218
	Yes	56.0	41.6	2.3	0.2	575
	Total	61.3	36.7	1.9	0.1	793
Grant schemes for collaboration with US/Africa/Asia South and Central America	No	77.4	19.8	1.4	1.4	217
	Yes	58.1	31.6	3.8	6.5	573
	Total	63.4	28.4	3.2	5.1	790

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers.

Asked about the usefulness of these internationalisation schemes, PES is considered to be the most useful, both among the researchers and leaders. All four schemes are considered more useful by the leaders than by researchers; the researchers generally reply that they do not know. PES is considered to be 'very useful' or 'useful' by 56 per cent of leaders and 25 per cent of researchers. Funding of ERC Starting Grant applicants is seen as the next most useful initiative: 45 per cent of the leaders and 11 per cent of the researchers consider the Norwegian funding of the nearly successful applications as 'very useful' or 'useful'. A majority of those who have an opinion also consider the top-up funding for Marie Curie grants and the grant schemes for collaboration with US/Africa/Asia South and Central America to be helpful. However, these initiatives also show the largest proportions of respondents rating them as 'not helpful': 12 per cent of leaders and 7 per cent of researchers say the top-up funding for Marie Curie grants is not helpful; and, 10 per cent of leaders and 6 per cent of researcher say the schemes for collaboration with US/Africa/Asia South and Central America not helpful (Table 5.4).

Table 5.4 Researchers' and leaders' views on the usefulness of RCN schemes for internationalisation. Percentages.

How useful are the following support schemes of the Research Council of Norway (RCN) for your unit's research activities?	Reply from:	Very useful	Useful	Slightly useful	Not useful	Cannot say	N
Project Establishment Support - PES (to help get EU projects)	Researchers	12.2	13.1	5.3	4.4	64.9	787
	Leaders	28.0	28.0	14.0	4.7	25.3	150
	Total	14.7	15.5	6.7	4.5	58.6	937
Top-up funding for Marie Curie grants (norsk toppfinansiering)	Researchers	3.3	5.0	3.7	7.3	80.7	782
	Leaders	9.4	20.1	8.1	12.1	50.3	149
	Total	4.3	7.4	4.4	8.1	75.8	931
Funding of Starting Grant applicants (norsk finansiering av støtteverdige ERC søknader)	Researchers	5.4	5.9	2.8	5.5	80.3	778
	Leaders	19.3	26.0	12.7	6.0	36.0	150
	Total	7.7	9.2	4.4	5.6	73.2	928
Grant schemes for collaboration with US/Africa/Asia South and Central America	Researchers	6.3	8.3	4.9	5.6	74.9	781
	Leaders	7.4	15.5	17.6	10.1	49.3	148
	Total	6.5	9.5	6.9	6.4	70.8	929

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers and survey of leaders at research institutions.

Asked about their opinions on the RCN's support for internationalisation, the respondents are most positive concerning RCN support for international mobility for helping the career development of individual researchers (37 per cent fully or partly agree), and least positive concerning the accessibility

of information on how various RCN schemes may be used for internationalisation (only 16 per cent fully or partly agree) (see items c and f in Table 5.5). The question on accessible information is the only item in Table 5.5 where a larger proportion disagrees than agrees (more disagree than agree by 2.4 percentage points). Many researchers report that they are unsure about these issues (answering 'cannot say'), but when ranked in order of the positive balance between the proportion that agree and disagree, the list is as follows (balance in brackets):

- c) RCN support for international mobility helps the career development of individual researchers (28.5)
- b) RCN provide adequate support for international mobility (18.7)
- d) RCN schemes are useful in terms of attracting foreign talent to Norway (18.1)
- a) RCN provide adequate support for international research collaboration (16.9)
- i) RCN internationalisation policies support research excellence in Norway (16.1)
- h) The RCN support for collaboration with partners outside the EU is inadequate (8.0)
- e) RCN provide adequate support for access to, and coordination of, international research infrastructures (6.9)
- g) The RCN support schemes for international research collaboration are not adequate for my needs (6.0)
- f) Information on how various RCN schemes may be used for internationalisation purposes is easily accessible (-2.4)

On all items, the leaders are more positive than the researchers. If we include only leaders' responses, the balance between the proportion that agrees and disagrees is also positive for the statement about accessible information (item f: -4 for researcher and +6 for the leaders).

Table 5.5 'To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the Research Council's (RCN) support for the internationalisation of research?' Percentages.

Replies from:	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Cannot say	N
<b>a) RCN provide adequate support for international research collaboration</b>							
Researchers	8.3	23.5	18.2	11.7	3.6	34.7	770
Leaders	8.7	30.9	19.5	15.4	5.4	20.1	149
Total	8.4	24.7	18.4	12.3	3.9	32.3	919
<b>b) RCN provide adequate support for international mobility</b>							
Researchers	8.0	24.2	17.2	10.5	3.8	36.3	763
Leaders	4.7	32.2	22.8	12.1	2.7	25.5	149
Total	7.5	25.5	18.1	10.7	3.6	34.5	912
<b>c) RCN support for international mobility helps the career development of individual researchers</b>							
Researchers	13.0	22.9	17.3	5.7	3.2	37.9	759
Leaders	9.5	35.1	21.6	7.4	1.4	25.0	148
Total	12.5	24.9	18.0	6.0	2.9	35.8	907
<b>d) RCN schemes are useful in terms of attracting foreign talent to Norway</b>							
Researchers	8.7	18.4	20.0	5.5	3.7	43.8	761
Leaders	6.7	26.2	23.5	11.4	2.7	29.5	149
Total	8.4	19.7	20.5	6.5	3.5	41.4	910
<b>e) RCN provide adequate support for access to, and coordination of, international research infrastructures</b>							
Researchers	4.2	14.2	21.6	8.7	3.8	47.4	755
Leaders	2.0	20.4	29.9	9.5	.7	37.4	147
Total	3.9	15.2	22.9	8.9	3.3	45.8	902
<b>f) Information on how various RCN schemes may be used for internationalisation purposes is easily accessible</b>							
Researchers	2.8	11.2	23.5	12.9	5.2	44.4	750
Leaders	4.1	23.1	25.9	17.7	3.4	25.9	147
Total	3.0	13.2	23.9	13.7	4.9	41.4	897
<b>g) The RCN support schemes for international research collaboration are not adequate for my needs</b>							
Researchers	5.1	15.3	20.7	10.6	4.5	43.8	752
Leaders	11.0	21.9	19.9	14.4	8.9	24.0	146
Total	6.0	16.4	20.6	11.2	5.2	40.5	898
<b>h) The RCN support for collaboration with partners outside the EU is inadequate</b>							
Researchers	5.9	12.2	18.6	7.6	3.7	52.0	748
Leaders	6.2	22.6	20.5	8.9	5.5	36.3	146
Total	5.9	13.9	18.9	7.8	4.0	49.4	894
<b>i) RCN internationalisation policies support research excellence in Norway</b>							
Researchers	5.1	18.3	21.2	6.0	2.9	46.5	749
Leaders	11.0	27.6	24.8	11.0	2.8	22.8	145
Total	6.0	19.8	21.8	6.8	2.9	42.6	894

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers and survey of leaders at research institutions.

Some respondents also commented on internationalisation of research in the free text space at the end of the survey. Some claimed that the RCN's funding schemes did not encourage international cooperation:

- *There is no funding for [international] collaboration.*
- *RCN schemes are particularly poor in terms of opportunities to fund comparative social science research, since partners from other countries can only receive a minimal funding.*
- *RCN research focus is extremely Europe centric and mostly ignores, or makes it hard, to cooperate with US researchers.*

When asked about their opinions on internationalisation more generally, the leaders' views deviate somewhat from the researchers. Among the researchers, the statement which draws the highest proportion of 'fully agree' responses is 'the future success of Norwegian research rests on the ability to keep highly skilled people from leaving Norway' (Table 5.6, item c). Among the leaders, the highest proportion of 'fully agree' responses are for the statement 'the future success of Norwegian research rests on the ability to attract foreign talent to Norway' Table 5.6, item b). Both researchers and leaders generally disagree that 'international activities weaken domestic cooperation' and that 'the costs of international activities outweigh the benefits' (Table 5.6, items a and d). Moreover, 79 per cent of the leaders and 60 per cent of the researchers fully or partly agree that 'Norway's participation in the EU framework programme is very important for the internationalisation of Norwegian research'.

Table 5.6 ‘Thinking about Norway, and your unit in particular, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the internationalisation of research’ Percentages.

Replies from:	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Cannot say	N
<b>a) International activities weaken domestic cooperation</b>							
Researchers	1.2	11.0	12.9	23.6	43.4	7.8	806
Leaders	4.7	10.0	10.7	24.7	46.0	4.0	150
Total	1.8	10.9	12.6	23.7	43.8	7.2	956
<b>b) The future success of Norwegian research rests on the ability to attract foreign talent to Norway</b>							
Researchers	14.6	38.4	21.2	16.8	3.4	5.6	802
Leaders	20.8	36.9	20.8	15.4	2.7	3.4	149
Total	15.6	38.2	21.1	16.6	3.3	5.3	951
<b>c) The future success of Norwegian research rests on the ability to keep highly skilled people from leaving Norway</b>							
Researchers	19.6	44.5	16.0	10.9	3.2	5.7	806
Leaders	15.3	44.7	18.0	13.3	6.0	2.7	150
Total	18.9	44.6	16.3	11.3	3.7	5.2	956
<b>d) Overall, the costs of international activities outweigh the benefits</b>							
Researchers	7.2	12.3	17.7	20.3	30.9	11.6	803
Leaders	7.4	17.4	12.8	31.5	26.8	4.0	149
Total	7.2	13.1	16.9	22.1	30.3	10.4	952
<b>e) Norway’s participation in the EU framework programme is very important for the internationalisation of Norwegian research</b>							
Researchers	27.7	32.7	15.5	8.0	2.6	13.5	801
Leaders	46.0	33.3	8.0	7.3	.7	4.7	150
Total	30.6	32.8	14.3	7.9	2.3	12.1	951

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers and survey of leaders at research institutions.

In the free comments space for these questions in the leaders’ survey, the importance of the EU Framework Programme (EU FP) was emphasised, as well as some scepticism being expressed towards the EU FP. Concerns include: the view that EU programme calls do not align with Norwegian interests; RCN policies are not thought to match the EU FP in some areas; and a mismatch is perceived between RCN programme policy and RCN internationalisation strategy. Some also suggested improvement in Norwegian policy for internationalisation.

- *In practice, we must participate in EU research. Otherwise we will be completely isolated. (Translated from Norwegian)*
- *The most active/useful European research networks are established in the frame of the FP7 Marie Curie programs. RCN have some means to support/co-finance such initiatives but they could be better. The support systems for building other international networks (outside Europe) are not that effective for us.*
- *RCN has started a new policy within the BIA-programme (and possibly other programmes), where international funding (cash and in-kind) cannot release RCN-funding. This new practise is in strong conflict with RCN’s new internationalization strategy, and contributes to reduced participation of international industry partners (e.g. customers of Norwegian producers) in RCN-funded projects. This highly unfortunate practise should be reviewed and stopped. If this practise is reasoned by too high funding of international companies, one should instead set a limit of how much (e.g. 20%) of the international funding that will release RCN funds. In most (hopefully all) cases, the international companies have an important contribution to the project, supporting the goal of the Norwegian project owner.*
- *The arts have a lively exchange and international profile. When artistic research becomes included in the EU framework, it certainly will be important to participate.*
- *Hard to finance PhD education through EU projects. The possible scope of EU projects/calls/programmes are not always in line with the interests of Norwegian industry and how to make us more competitive (research agenda defined by other large European industrial players).*
- *With one exception, RCN programmes match the main topics of EU Framework Programmes, allowing for important synergies. The exception is transport, where the RCN funding is fragmented and inadequately small.*
- *I consider the EU Framework Programme as the most important instrument for internationalisation. For Norwegian (technical-industrial) research institutes, coordinating or participating in EU projects implies a financial loss. This is not the case in other countries. This should be resolved so that the institutes do not lose financially when participating in EU research. (Translated from Norwegian)*
- *I must emphasise that Norwegian research must cooperate internationally, and we do so but most often not in the EU-framework programs. If more money was spent directly [on getting] Norwegian institutes to*



*cooperate internationally I suppose the effect would be better than send it through EU. Small is more efficient.*

- *EU-projects tend to reduce national cooperation, because of limitation in partners from one nation.*
- *Re point a): EU project applications weaken domestic cooperation because there is not room for complementary national expertise in a single project. This is damaging in particular for cross-disciplinary activities which would benefit most from geographical proximity.*

## 6. Organisation, strategy, institutional interaction and framework conditions

### 6.1 RCN organisation and strategy

Asked about the effects of the 2010 reorganisation of RCN divisions, 80 per cent of the leaders at the research institutions in this study did not have an opinion on whether this has led to an improved efficiency or effectiveness (Table 6.1). It is interesting that the share of leaders who answered 'don't know', or who disagreed with this, was slightly higher among those leaders who are/had been member of either the RCN Executive Board/Division Research Board/Programme Board, compared to those leaders who had not (Table 7.50 in Appendix B).

- The majority of the leaders agreed that the quality and leanness of the RCN funding processes is in line with international good practice, and that RCN ensures gender equality in research funding (the latter response being more positive in universities and the institute sector, than in the university colleges, see Table 7.47 in Appendix B).
- The response was more mixed (u-shaped association) in the views about whether RCN strategies and funding mechanisms are well equipped to face future changes/challenges, i.e. whether RCN strategies are effective in anticipating changes in science priorities and dynamics; whether RCN strategies and funding mechanisms ensure that Norway is able to fund research in disruptive technologies; and, whether RCN strategies and funding mechanisms ensure that Norway is able to fund research in disruptive technologies (although leaders from the institute sector were quite positive about this, see Table 7.47 in Appendix B).
- Two statements, both related to funding (composition and size) were met with a clearly negative reception: the balance between 'free' and programmed resources, and most notably, the adequacy of the volume of the funding.
- We analysed the results in Table 6.1 based on which division of the Research Council funded the leaders' units most often, assuming this division is the one they have most contact with (see Table 7.49 in Appendix B). The results did not differ much by division, but two interesting exceptions emerged. The Division for Science came out notably worse off when leaders considered the quality and 'leanness' of the RCN funding process, and whether there was an appropriate balance between 'free' and programmed resources in the RCN instrument portfolio. In the case of this latter issue, the Division for Strategic Priorities scored considerably better than both the Division for Innovation and Division for Science.
-

Table 6.1 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (I). Research institution leaders' opinions. Percentages.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
a) The 2010 reorganisation of RCN divisions has improved the Council's efficiency and effectiveness	3.8	12.2	26.3	3.8	0.0	53.8	156
b) The quality and 'leanness' of the RCN funding processes is in line with international good practice	18.2	27.9	21.4	7.8	2.6	22.1	154
c) There is an appropriate balance between 'free' and programmed resources in the RCN instrument portfolio	9.6	16.6	15.3	29.3	16.6	12.7	157
d) The volume of funding associated with each instrument is adequate for the need it is intended to address	0.6	11.6	12.9	32.3	22.6	20.0	155
e) RCN ensures gender equality in research funding	21.3	23.2	25.8	4.5	3.2	21.9	155
f) RCN strategies are effective in anticipating changes in science priorities or dynamics	4.5	21.8	34.6	16.0	2.6	20.5	156
g) RCN funding mechanisms are sufficiently flexible to accommodate changes in science priorities or dynamics	3.8	28.2	26.3	20.5	4.5	16.7	156
h) RCN strategies and funding mechanisms ensure that Norway is able to fund research in disruptive technologies	3.2	12.2	26.9	16.7	5.1	35.9	156

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of leaders of Norwegian researcher institutions.

Table 6.2 reports the opinions of respondents, from all three surveys<sup>12</sup>, concerning RCN funding and strategy.

<sup>12</sup> In the meeting place survey, only those who indicated that had been members of RCN boards/committees/panels, or individual reviewer, were asked this question.

Table 6.2 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). Percentages.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
a) RCN funds the best research	6.4	35.7	22.8	16.0	3.9	15.3	1537
b) The degree of competition associated with RCN grants is a driver for quality	13.7	39.6	15.9	14.4	5.1	11.3	1525
c) There is adequate coordination between the various funding sources at the Research Council (Managed by different RCN divisions)	3.0	14.2	24.9	18.0	4.7	35.3	1517
d) The different RCN funding schemes complement each other	2.4	22.9	26.7	15.1	3.7	29.1	1513
e) RCN funding schemes complement other Norwegian funding sources	4.7	25.8	23.3	14.2	4.2	27.8	1505
f) RCN funding schemes complement alternative international funding sources	4.1	28.5	24.9	10.3	3.3	28.9	1509
g) RCN successfully creates synergies across sectoral missions/areas (health, environment, economy, education)	3.1	24.6	30.0	17.4	5.4	19.5	553
h) RCN strategies are in line with the development needs of the research communities	3.1	23.7	21.6	25.1	8.1	18.4	1502
i) RCN strategies are in line with the needs of industry in Norway	3.6	20.8	19.6	14.9	4.0	37.1	1507
j) RCN strategies are in line with the needs of society in Norway	3.0	27.2	23.5	19.4	5.0	21.9	1509
k) RCN funds facilitates the international networking needed for my research institution	4.5	25.0	22.3	16.6	9.0	22.6	979
l) RCN strategies do not adequately address research relevance and user needs	8.1	22.7	24.6	17.5	6.4	20.7	979

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders of Norwegian researcher institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places. Questions k-l only posed to researchers and leaders at research institutions. Question g only posed to meeting participants.

A large share of the respondents believes that the RCN funds the best research (42 per cent agree either fully or partly, while 20 per cent disagree fully or partly). The most positive responses, based on sector, are seen within trade and industry and government/public sector, while the specialised university institutions are the most negative group (Table 7.51 in Appendix B). Comparing the respondents by academic field, the least satisfied respondents are found within humanities and social sciences, while the other fields are much more in line with each other (Table 7.52 in Appendix B). There are no differences worth any further discussion when we compare respondents based on which RCN Division that they consider most important (Table 7.53 in Appendix B). Researchers disagree with the statement ‘RCN funds the best research’ more than research institution leaders, while other respondents<sup>13</sup> most often agree that the RCN funds the best research (Table 7.54 in Appendix B). Again, it is interesting that those respondents who are/have been a member of RCN boards are less positive than those who have not been involved in this way (Table 7.55 in Appendix B).

- Most statements about the RCN in Table 6.2 are met with a ‘middle ground/slightly confirmative’ response, i.e. the majority of responses are found in the area ‘Agree partly’ and ‘Neither agree nor disagree’. The only exceptions to this worth mentioning, is that 53 per cent of the respondents fully or partly agree that the competition associated with RCN grants is a driver for quality; there are also two statements where the share who fully disagree is about twice the share who fully agree, as in the statements ‘RCN strategies are in line with the development needs of the research communities’ (8 per cent fully disagree) and ‘RCN funds facilitates the international networking needed for my research institution’ (9 per cent disagree).
- Analysing the results across sector (see Table 7.51 in Appendix B), three trends are spotted. Firstly, respondents from the specialised university institutions are less positive than respondents from other sectors. Secondly, respondents from trade and industry and government/public sectors are

<sup>13</sup> Including respondents in the meeting place survey not affiliated to a research institution.

more positive. Thirdly, respondents from the university hospitals have difficulties answering the questions, with high rates of 'don't know'.

- Comparing the respondents based on which RCN division that is most important to them, the overall picture is a less positive response for those who are attached to the Division for Science than for the other two divisions (Innovation and Strategic Priorities) (see Table 7.53 in Appendix B).
- For every statement, the response is less positive among researchers than the two other groups surveyed (see Table 7.54 in Appendix B) either due to their having a lower share who fully/partly agree, or the highest share who fully/partly disagree.
- For all statements, except 'RCN strategies do not adequately address research relevance and user needs', those who have not been a member of RCN boards are more positive than those who are/have been members (see Table 7.55 in Appendix B).
- When we removed the 'don't know' category, the mean values for responses to the statements (with 1 being the best score and 5 the lowest) showed that 'the degree of competition associated with RCN grants is a driver for quality' received the most positive score on aggregate (2.5), while the respondents generally did not believe 'there is adequate coordination between the various funding sources at the Research Council' or that 'RCN strategies are in line with the development needs of the research community' (both scoring 3.1). For nine out of the eleven questions, researchers were the least positive respondent group (there were higher average values for respondents in the leaders' survey and meeting place survey). The respondents who identified the Division for Strategic Priorities as their most important division, were most positive (based on mean values) in ten out of eleven questions. It was also notable that respondents from the humanities were least positive about almost every question, while engineering sciences in general stood out as the most positive academic field. By sector, the most positive respondents by far were those from trade and industry followed by government/public sector. The least positive group was respondents from specialised university institutions.

As mentioned above, 20 per cent of the respondents disagree (partly or fully) that RCN funds the best research. In the free text comments provided, a general reason for disagreement with this statement appear to be that they think funding decisions are influenced by several concerns unrelated to the quality of applications (cited in Chapter 3 and Appendix C, Table C.2).

Another issue emphasised in the free text comments, was that RCN priorities were too politicised, and that the RCN did not act as an advisor to the governments on research issues, but instead were strongly steered by government, to give priority to projects that are either 'hot topics' at the given moment or were requested by government agencies:

- *Priorities [are] too politicised.*
- *To me, it seems that RCN programmes are too much driven by buzzwords and the whims of policymakers. Not enough money for high-quality, basic, curiosity-driven research targeted at top-journals with high impact.*
- *I suspect the decisions are rather political than based on the reviews.*
- *The politicians exert too much control over RCN, often using it as a tool for their own special interests (e.g. 'distriktpolitikk') rather than allowing the Research Council to follow its own policies of supporting the highest quality research.*
- *RCN should be more courageous towards politicians and the state administration, be less political in prioritising funding. ... Scientific quality and innovation potential loses against what is politically correct. This is obviously a balance because RCN must listen to the politicians but RCN could fight more for more fundamental R&D values.*
- *One of the biggest problems with selecting research for funding is the preoccupation with relevance criteria. This is merely a political beauty contest and does not advance the quality of research in Norway.*
- *The problem is that RCN is too political. Everyone knows that (i) chances of funding increases drastically with a female project leader, and (ii) an interdisciplinary focus. So applicants make sure that both (i) and (ii) are fulfilled before they apply, and this arrangement comes at the cost of quality of the research. It is better for purposes of funding to have a mediocre woman as a leader, and a false pretension of interdisciplinary focus, than a high quality male leader, and a strict disciplinary focus. It is just sad.*

- *Too much focus on the ‘popular’ topics and on cost-savings for individual industry partners, not for society.*
- *RCN should focus more on societal needs and less on ‘political correctness’.*

A large proportion of the respondents asked for more money for basic research and for free projects outside established programmes (this concern was especially prominent among respondents from the humanities and social sciences), which might be expected. There were many who claim that too much money is tied up on applied, short-term projects:

- *Long-term funding of research activities is essential to achieve excellence in a field. Here RCN fails.*
- *Programs initiated by ministries and political considerations dominate to the detriment of freestanding, researcher initiated projects.*
- *RCN is, in my opinion, too much leaned towards applied research for solving problems today, while leaving highly inadequate funding for basic research for future challenges.*
- *RCN focus too much on large applied research programs. And too much focus on cooperation with industry, that often has too low an academic interest. There should be more ‘free research’ projects in all research fields.*
- *RCN has an important role to play as policy-maker for national research and could be more proactive towards politicians and ministries on long term challenges and the need for long term funding across ministries (national priorities). This has to be for periods longer than four years and cannot change due to changes in ‘the colour’ of the government. There is a need for understanding in the Norwegian society that research is high risk activity, demanding patience, predictable funding schemes and that the outcome cannot be measured in short term payback (financially speaking).*

Although most respondents wanted more funds for free research, not tied up in programmes, there were quite a few respondents who wanted better coordination of the programmes, with more of a focus on establishing fewer, larger programmes:

- *RCN is spreading their activities too much. Norway should develop leading scientific competence in fewer areas where we have advantage and responsibility internationally.*
- *Not enough money to do excellent research. Should focus more in Norway’s comparative advantages.*
- *Norway is a small country in terms of human resources. It is important to focus on some really important topics, instead of spreading money on everything.*

## 6.2 Interaction with research institutions

In their survey, leaders were asked about the relationship between the RCN and the research institutions. A large proportion of leaders respond that RCN schemes constitute an integral component of their units’ strategic activities (73 per cent fully or partly agree, table below). The specialised university institutions and the university colleges less often agree that RCN schemes constitute an integral component of their strategic activities (53 per cent fully or partly agree and 25 per cent fully or partly disagree, Table 7.57 in Appendix B). These institutions also disagree more often with the statement that RCN funding mechanisms are sufficiently flexible/appropriate for their unit (only 25 per cent fully or partly agree, compared to 41 per cent at the universities and 40 per cent at the institutes, Table 7.57 in Appendix B). Overall, 36 per cent of the leaders fully or partly disagree that RCN funding mechanisms are sufficiently flexible for them to choose the instruments that are most appropriate for their unit’s objectives.

A large proportion of the leaders agree that RCN evaluations are valuable, and this view is especially clear among those at the universities (table below and Table 7.57 in Appendix B); in this group, 81 per cent fully or partly agree that ‘the research evaluations organised by RCN (of research fields and institutions) have been valuable to my unit’ and 91 per cent fully or partly agree that the evaluations ‘have been valuable to the Norwegian research community’. Equivalent figures for the research institutes are 57 per cent on the value for their own unit and 72 per cent on value for the Norwegian research community; figures for the specialised university institutions and university colleges are 46 per cent on value for own unit and 58 per cent on value for the Norwegian research community. The minority of respondents who are critical to the RCN’s evaluation can be illustrated by the few free text comments on this topic in the survey, including one leader at a research institute who comments that research evaluations performed by RCN do not evaluate research institutes with respect to their role,

and that the foreign members of the review panels typically have no knowledge about the role of Norwegian research institutes; one university researcher was also disappointed that the (researcher) survey contained no questions about the RCN's evaluation of the universities, faculties, and commented that these evaluations had 'many shortcomings' (without giving any further details).

The leaders find the questions about the performance-based component of core funding (PBRF) difficult to answer (32 to 44 per cent respond 'cannot say'). Nonetheless, 37 per cent fully or partly agree that PBRF adds distinct value and performs a role that is differentiated from project funding, whereas 29 per cent fully or partly agree that there is a clear distinction between the objectives, tasks and criteria for the RCN instruments and the PBRFs (Table 6.3, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> statements). The leaders at the institutes more often agree to both statements (Table 7.57 in Appendix B).

The majority of the leaders disagree with the idea that RCN funding is a threat to the autonomy of the research institutions: 55 per cent fully or partly disagree that RCN's role in funding recruitment positions is a threat to the autonomy of the research institutions; and, 50 per cent fully or partly disagree that RCN's role in allocating research funds is a threat to the autonomy of the research institutions. However, opinions are divided on these points, as 32 per cent of leaders at *universities* fully or partly *agree* that RCN's role in allocating research funds is a threat to the autonomy of the research institutions, and 23 per cent think that RCN's role in funding recruitment positions is a threat to the autonomy of the research institutions (Table 7.57 in Appendix B). The critical views on this topic are also illustrated by a leader in the institute sector who comments that the RCN is in command of nearly all aspects of research and that this may 'undermine the ability of the institution to act strategically' and that the RCN is 'increasingly seeking to instruct institutions on strategic issues (i.e. who to collaborate with; what to focus on)'. Moreover, in the researcher survey, a head of a university department commented that 'the latest funding scheme, 'fellesløftet', takes away a lot of the strategic room from the units'.

Table 6.3 Leaders at research institutions: views on institutional interaction with RCN. Percentages.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Cannot say	N
RCN schemes constitute an integral component of my units' strategic activities	36.7	36.7	8.2	7.5	6.1	4.8	147
RCN funding mechanisms are sufficiently flexible for us to choose the instruments that are most appropriate for my unit's objectives	9.5	25.9	22.4	25.2	10.9	6.1	147
The performance-based component of core funding (PBRF) adds distinct value and performs a role that is differentiated from project funding	12.4	24.8	20.7	7.6	2.1	32.4	145
There is a clear distinction between the objectives, tasks and criteria for the RCN instruments and the PBRFs	11.8	16.0	20.8	6.3	0.7	44.4	144
Greater autonomy for Norwegian research institutions means that the policy dialogue with the RCN has increased in importance for my institution	13.1	26.2	26.2	11.0	8.3	15.2	145
The RCN's role in allocating research funds is a threat to the autonomy of the research institutions	9.0	13.8	17.9	26.9	22.8	9.7	145
The RCN's role in funding recruitment positions is a threat to the autonomy of the research institutions	4.2	12.5	18.1	27.8	27.1	10.4	144
The research evaluations organised by RCN (of research fields and institutions) have been valuable to my unit	24.5	34.3	14.0	9.1	3.5	14.7	143
The research evaluations organised by RCN (of research fields and institutions) have been valuable to the Norwegian research community	27.6	44.1	12.4	3.4	0.0	12.4	145

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of leaders at research institutions.

### 6.3 Framework conditions

The questionnaire to the leaders also contained a list of statements about changes in framework conditions over the last 10 years. A large proportion of the leaders fully or partly agree to these statements (table below). More than a quarter (27 per cent) fully agree that the procedures for obtaining national research funding have become more bureaucratic and time consuming, and 21 per

cent think that research priorities are increasingly decided at the national level. Moreover, a large proportion fully or partly agrees that researchers in publicly funded institutions have become overworked and underpaid. A majority of the leaders at the universities agree (fully or partly) with this statement (53 per cent), whereas more leaders in the institute sector disagree than agree.

Furthermore, a large proportion fully or partly agrees that Norway has not attracted enough foreign researchers, that research priorities are increasingly decided at the institutional level, that research priorities are increasingly decided at the international level, that research priorities have become more sensitive to broader social issues and more sensitive to market demands. The only statement where a majority disagrees is on increased autonomy to the individual researcher: 66 per cent fully or partly disagree that research priorities are increasingly decided at the individual level. Differences between sectors are shown in Table 7.58 in Appendix B.

Table 6.4 Leaders at research institutions: perceived changes in framework conditions during the last ten years. Percentages.

<b>If you consider the ten last years in Norway, would you say that:</b>	<b>Agree fully</b>	<b>Agree partly</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree partly</b>	<b>Disagree fully</b>	<b>Cannot say</b>	<b>N</b>
Researchers in publicly funded institutions have become overworked and underpaid	14.2	27.0	20.3	18.9	14.2	5.4	148
Norway has not attracted enough foreign researchers	10.7	34.9	23.5	18.8	6.7	5.4	149
The procedures for obtaining national research funding have become more bureaucratic and time consuming	27.0	30.4	16.9	18.9	4.7	2.0	148
Research priorities are increasingly decided at the individual level	0.7	6.1	23.6	41.9	23.6	4.1	148
Research priorities are increasingly decided at the institutional level	11.4	51.0	20.8	13.4	2.0	1.3	149
Research priorities are increasingly decided at the national level	20.9	54.1	15.5	6.8	0.7	2.0	148
Research priorities are increasingly decided at the international level	14.9	49.3	23.0	8.1	1.4	3.4	148
Research priorities have become more sensitive to broader social issues	11.6	40.1	27.9	13.6	0.7	6.1	147
Research priorities have become more sensitive to market demands	17.4	42.3	22.1	12.8	0.0	5.4	149

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of leaders at research institutions.

Several of the statements concerning changed framework conditions were repeated from the researcher survey carried out for the 2001 evaluation of the RCN. Some interesting differences are found between opinions of researcher in 2001 and those of the research institution leaders in 2012 (table below). Generally, the leaders are somewhat less negative about the framework conditions in 2012 than the researchers were in 2001; a lower proportion agree (fully or partly) that researchers have become overworked and underpaid, or that procedures for obtaining national research funding have become more bureaucratic and time consuming. Concerning what influences research priorities, the results are mixed. The proportions fully or partly agreeing that priorities are increasingly decided at the institutional and national level<sup>14</sup> are clearly higher than in 2001, and the proportion fully or partly agreeing that priorities are increasingly decided at the individual level is substantially smaller, in 2012. On the other hand, the proportions of respondents who find that priorities have become more sensitive to broader social issues or market demands are smaller in 2012 than in 2001.

<sup>14</sup> The 2001 survey did not contain the question about the international level.



Table 6.5 Opinions about framework conditions over the last ten years, researchers and leaders. Percentages.

If you consider the ten last years in Norway, would you say that:	% Agree fully/Agree partly	
	2001 Researchers*	2012 leaders
Researchers in publicly funded institutions have become overworked and underpaid	78.2	41.2
The procedures for obtaining national research funding have become more bureaucratic and time consuming	77.9	57.4
Research priorities are increasingly decided at the individual level	20.4	6.8
Research priorities are increasingly decided at the institutional level	45.6	62.4
Research priorities are increasingly decided at the national level	53.1	75.0
Research priorities have become more sensitive to broader social issues	60.6	51.7
Research priorities have become more sensitive to market demands	76.7	59.7

Sources: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of leaders at research institutions. N= 147-149. NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2001 – survey of researchers. N= 580-594.  
 \*\*Cannot say' was not an option in 2001.

## 7. RCN meeting places

In general, meeting participants (including research institution leaders) provide a positive picture of RCN meeting places as an arena for communication and dissemination, as well as creating partnerships (Table 7.1). Although a large share of respondents have no opinion (neither agree nor disagree) on these issues, the overall balance of opinion is fairly positive: 45 per cent agree fully or partly that the RCN maintains best practice activities in science communication; and, 50 per cent believe (fully or partly) that RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships with the research/higher education sector and industry, although only 37 per cent believe this applies in reference to the public service sector. Another 47 per cent believe (fully or partly) that the RCN facilitates the development and strengthening of strategic intelligence among research performers, national and regional authorities and RCN itself. It is important to note that the shares that fully disagree with all of these statements are very low, and that the shares who disagree partly or fully are only around ten per cent (for all four statements).

- Comparing the results by sector, the main differences are found between the institute sector and university colleges (least positive) and universities and specialised university institutions (most positive) (see Table 7.59 in Appendix B).
- In general, respondents from the social sciences stand out as the least positive academic field, while natural sciences and engineering sciences are most positive (see Table 7.60 in Appendix B). There was, however, no distinct cleft between ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ sciences, as the respondents from humanities in general were more in line with natural and engineering sciences than with the social sciences.
- Researchers are more willing to agree with the statements in Table 7.1 than leaders (see Table 7.62 in Appendix B). Those who are neither researchers nor leaders, formed the group who agreed most strongly with the statement ‘RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and industry’.
- Those who are not member of any RCN board are more positive about these statements than those who are (see Table 7.63 in Appendix B).

Table 7.1 RCN Meeting place function (I): views on RCN activities within communication and dissemination. Percentages.

Considering RCN’s activities within communication and dissemination of research results, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Cannot say	N
a) RCN maintains best practice activities in science communication	8.3	36.5	28.7	10.2	1.3	15.0	707
b) RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and industry	11.7	37.8	21.4	9.3	1.7	18.1	709
c) RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and the public service sector	5.5	31.8	28.1	9.4	2.3	22.9	704
d) RCN facilitates the development and strengthening of strategic intelligence among research performers, national and regional authorities and RCN itself	8.1	39.0	24.3	7.0	1.8	19.8	703

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders of Norwegian researcher institutions, and participants in RCN meeting places

We asked those who had participated in one or more RCN meeting giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes, about the outcome (both personal and in general) of these meetings (Table 7.2). While the shares indicating personal gains from participating were reasonably

high, the outcomes of these meetings concerning input to, and changes in, RCN policies/funding schemes/processes were thought to be limited, as is especially clear in answers to the statements ‘input to RCN for changes in funding schemes’, ‘input to RCN for changes in management/procedures’ and ‘changes in RCN policy or processes’; for all these statements 47-50 per cent of respondents reported there being a limited effect or no effect at all, with these views especially evident among those from the humanities and specialised university institutions.

Researchers reported much lower positive values than did leaders and other respondents (Table 7.68 in Appendix B). This was most clearly apparent regarding *changes in RCN policy or processes*, where only 3.5 per cent of researchers indicated that the meetings ‘to a large extent’ had had such an effect (no one indicated ‘to a very large extent’). Responses from other groups were still fairly negative, but less strongly so: only 19 per cent of the leaders and 8 per cent of other respondents indicated ‘to a large or very large extent’ on this statement. Those respondents who had been a member of an RCN board also reported far less positive experiences from the meetings compared to those who had not been a member (Table 7.69 in Appendix B).

Table 7.2 RCN Meeting place function (II): views on results from participation in RCN ‘strategy meetings’. Percentages.

<b>You have indicated that you have participated in one or more RCN boards and/or other meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes. To what extent did your participation in these meetings result in any of the following</b>	<b>To a very large extent</b>	<b>To a large extent</b>	<b>To a moderate extent</b>	<b>To a limited extent</b>	<b>Not at all</b>	<b>Cannot say</b>	<b>N</b>
a) Your improved understanding of the rationale for RCN policies and strategies	9.4	36.4	34.1	11.8	2.0	6.3	651
b) Your improved insight into a wider set of research areas	6.4	35.3	33.9	14.6	3.6	6.3	638
c) Input to RCN for changes in policies/strategies	3.6	22.5	36.3	18.8	8.1	10.8	640
d) Input to RCN for changes in funding schemes	2.2	10.3	30.6	23.7	17.1	16.1	633
e) Input to RCN for changes in management/procedures	0.9	8.5	23.6	25.6	22.9	18.5	542
f) Changes in RCN policy or processes	0.6	7.1	22.9	26.5	23.7	19.2	634

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders of Norwegian researcher institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places.

Table 7.3 RCN Meeting place function (III): views on the impacts from participation in RCN ‘dissemination meetings’. Percentages.

You have indicated that you have participated in meetings disseminating results from RCN programmes. To what extent did this participation result in any of the following:	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To a moderate extent	To a limited extent	Not at all	Cannot say	N
a) Your enhanced knowledge of international developments in your field of research	3.2	20.1	40.0	21.0	8.8	6.9	708
b) Your enhanced knowledge of new research fields	3.7	24.6	42.3	19.8	4.9	4.8	712
c) Your enhanced knowledge of new science and technology methods	1.1	16.4	37.5	24.3	11.8	8.9	709
d) The creation of strategic partnerships with (other) institutions in the research or higher education sector	3.3	15.4	34.1	23.6	15.6	8.1	707
e) The creation of strategic partnerships with industry	1.3	8.8	17.8	17.2	38.1	16.8	703
f) The creation of strategic partnerships with the public services sector	1.0	7.4	20.1	24.8	31.7	15.1	703
g) Your improved understanding of user needs	3.1	17.3	33.8	21.5	15.6	8.6	710
h) Your improved understanding of industry needs	2.3	12.9	21.5	19.9	26.4	17.0	707
i) Commercialisation of research results	0.6	10.3	28.7	20.8	23.9	15.7	331
j) Innovation in the public services sector	0.6	7.6	22.3	24.7	23.8	21.0	328
k) Change in the focus of your research unit	1.0	7.2	25.8	27.1	30.9	8.0	388
l) Your improved understanding of innovation needs in the public service sector	1.8	12.2	29.5	24.9	17.3	14.3	329

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders of Norwegian researcher institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places. Question ‘k’ was only asked in the leader and researcher surveys. Questions ‘i’, ‘j’ and ‘l’ were only asked in the survey to participants in RCN meeting places.

The pattern found among those attending meetings focusing on strategy and development work is not the same as for the meetings disseminating results from RCN programmes (Table 7.4). Again, a fair share of the respondents report positive personal gains in terms of enhanced knowledge (questions a-c, g), but with lower shares than those observed in relation to the strategy meetings (Table 7.3), and in two cases (a and c) are exceeded by the share who report there being limited or no result at all. Improved understanding of industry needs was the category with the lowest share of positive values, especially among researchers.

According to the respondents, these meetings were, to a limited degree, followed by the creation of partnerships with other institutions in the research or higher education sector (24 per cent answering ‘to a limited extent’, 16 ‘not at all’ and 19 per cent ‘to a large/very large extent’), or with industry (17 per cent ‘to a limited extent’, 38 per cent ‘not at all’ and 10 per cent ‘to a large/very large extent’), or with the public services sector (25 per cent ‘to a limited extent’ and 32 per cent ‘not at all’ and 8 per cent ‘to a large/very large extent’).

The shares who reported that the meetings led to commercialisation of research results, innovation in the public service sector, or change in the respondents’ research units, were low (questions i-k): 44.7 per cent reported that the meetings to ‘a limited extent’ or ‘not at all’ lead to commercialisation of research results, while 44.8 per cent reported such a limited or non-effect in terms of innovation in the public service sector. As in results from Table 7.2, we observe a larger proportion of ‘cannot say’ responses among researchers compared to the leaders (see Table 7.74 in Appendix B), and among those who have participated in an RCN Board compared to those who have not (see Table 7.75 in Appendix B).

In general, the respondents from social sciences report the lowest scores for the usefulness/outcome of the meetings, while the respondents from humanities show some surprising results: this group agrees most frequently that meeting participation led to commercialisation of research results. Again, respondents representing trade and industry and the government/public sector are most optimistic about the outcomes of the meetings.

In the free-text comments, many respondents described RCN’s meeting activities as involving an ‘inner circle’, and a narrow group of participating institutions:

- Dissemination events by RCN struggle to attract an audience beyond the inner circle (companies and researchers directly involved).
- RCN meeting places could be put to research centres, to sites of industrial innovation in the relevant field and otherwise to places of easy and cheaper travel for the participants (who are not all from Oslo).
- It is often very demanding to know when activities take place, and to know when to be engaged. I think that a few actors who have the time/resources get a very strong voice as opposed to for instance small/medium businesses who have to prioritize business rather than participation in meetings etc. Maybe the input phase could be organised differently in order to better involve SMEs who are actually operational and depend on their own revenues. This sector is largely missing out now.
- As a medium R&D-intensive enterprise, we have limited resources to engage in all these meeting places/processes.
- The main challenge is to find time to participate. It is very difficult to use 4-6 days + travel time over one year for this activity. It would be a good idea to compress the industry representatives time – ex 1-2 days a year is easier to fit in.

Another issue that some meeting participants focused on was limited outcome of the meetings, particularly the sense that little emerges in terms of synergies and partnerships:

- They are good at arranging huge seminars, but the creation of partnerships is not their business.
- I can't see that they're so good in making partnership, most often the industry and the public sector aren't participating.
- RCN is not an important meeting place for discussion of Norwegian innovation policy, it should be!!! It should take into account the new European strategy STAIR from CEN/CENELEC on integrating European standardisation, research and innovation. RCN has no focus on standardisation neither for dissemination of results, nor as a knowledge base when funding new R&D projects.
- It would be helpful for SMEs if the RC could arrange more informal meetings between SMEs with the purpose to identify synergies and potential collaboration.
- The public services e.g. government bureaucrats (with decision-making powers), central IT service decision makers, politicians, public education (elementary schools, college) etc. seems to never be present at venues where RCN-based research central to Norwegian society are presented. This is particularly in the field of ICT (my field of experience). This makes me concerned that top quality research with a potential impact for society never fulfils its potential. Reducing the barrier between public services and government-funded research, I think would benefit both sides. At this point, there is a strong focus on industry collaboration, while some of the biggest ICT contracts are signed by the government.
- Regarding dissemination of results findings, the Research Council has meetings where grant recipients provide an overview of their research findings as part of their final report. These are interesting but small meetings. However, I am not sure how much they contribute to new synergies and potential collaborations between the participants. This is partly because not all participants can stay the whole time. Maybe the presence of Board members would make the meetings a bit more formal and where Board members can assist in discussions of experiences the grant recipients had during the study and the potential for future development of the products. Although the disciplines attending may be different, experience and challenges (both positive and negative) are of interest to all since there will likely be common threads in the lengthy and complicated process towards commercialisation.

Table 7.4 RCN Meeting place function (IV). Percentages.

Compared with the meeting places provided by other Norwegian institutions*, how important is RCN for you/your organisation for the following issues:	The most important national meeting place	Among the important national meeting places	A less important national meeting place	The least important national meeting place	Cannot say	N
a) As a meeting place for research dissemination/communication	9.4	53.6	22.4	4.3	10.3	562
b) As a meeting place for discussion of Norwegian research policy	14.6	53.6	12.9	2.3	16.6	560
c) As a meeting place for discussion of Norwegian innovation policy	5.7	41.5	22.2	3.8	26.8	559

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys to participants in RCN meeting places.

\*Such as other government bodies or ministries, large research/higher education institutions and interest organisations.

Few of the meeting participants consider the RCN to be the most important national meeting place, but a large majority of the respondents consider RCN to be 'among the important national meeting places'. The RCN is in particular considered to be an important meeting place for discussion of Norwegian research policy, but it is thought to be less important as a meeting place for discussion of Norwegian innovation policy and as a meeting place for research dissemination/communication (Table 7.4). Respondents from trade and industry, and from the government/public sector, consider the RCN to be a more important meeting place than respondents from the research sector, when it comes to the discussion of innovation policy, while this pattern is reversed in relation to discussion of research policy (see Table 7.77 in Appendix B). Researchers were more supportive about the meetings' importance in terms of discussion of Norwegian research policy, while leaders and other respondents were more supportive when asked about the meetings as a place for dissemination/communication of results as well as a place for discussion of Norwegian innovation policy (see Table 7.80 in Appendix B). Generally, researchers (in particular those representing medical sciences) disagreed most strongly with the idea that the meetings were important for research dissemination/ communication, arguably because they have other venues for such activities. On the other hand, it is the respondents from government/public service who are most positive about the importance of RCN meeting places.

## Appendix A Samples, survey details and overview of respondents

This appendix provides additional information on the sample, survey details and respondent characteristics for the three surveys. See section 1.2 for information on response rates.

### A.1 Samples and survey details

#### A.1.1 Survey to researchers

A random proportional sample of 2500 individual researchers was drawn from NIFU's Register of research personnel. The sample was proportional to the total population of researchers in the register concerning gender and institution: 16.7 per cent of female and male researchers for each of the institutional categories (University; Specialised university institution; University college; Health trust with university functions/university hospital). Of the original sample of 2500 researchers, 2062 researchers remained when persons for whom we could not find an email address (252) and persons who were included in the sample for the other surveys (186) were removed.

The questionnaire was sent to 2062 researchers on the 23<sup>rd</sup> January 2012. Four reminders were sent out. When the survey stopped on the 27<sup>th</sup> February, 1183 replies were obtained (including partial replies, of these 944 had completed the questionnaire).

Table 7.5 Survey to Norwegian researchers: Replies as percentage of total population by sector and gender. Percentages.

Sector	Gender	*Total population	Drawn sample (16.7% of population)	Replies	Replies as percentage of population
Universities	Women	1 927	322	177	9.2
	Men	4 010	669	331	8.3
Specialised university institutions	Women	269	45	20	7.4
	Men	612	102	45	7.4
University colleges	Women	555	93	48	8.6
	Men	970	162	78	8.0
Institute sector	Women	1 488	248	134	9.0
	Men	3 190	533	269	8.4
Health trust with university functions (University hospitals)	Women	715	119	33	4.6
	Men	1 239	207	48	3.9
Total		14 975	2 500	1183	7.9

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers.

\*Number of researchers in NIFU's Register of Research personnel. The total population for the higher education sector includes: full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, head of department, postdoctoral fellow, researcher with a doctoral degree. For the institute sector the following roles are included: researcher and postdoctoral fellows. For the health trusts/university hospitals the following roles are included: physicians and psychologists participating in R&D, researchers with a doctoral degree and postdoctoral fellows.

#### A.1.2 Survey of research institution leaders

All accredited<sup>15</sup> universities (8), specialised university institutions (9) and university colleges (36), and all independent research institutes (93) in the Institute Catalogue<sup>16</sup> were included; in total 260 leaders were identified and invited to participate. As a starting point for finding contact details, we used a list of rectors and deans received from the RCN, and the information in the Institute Catalogue. The list was checked against updated information at the institutions webpages. The sample included all identified rectors and deans at higher education institution and all directors of independent research institutes.

<sup>15</sup> Lists are found at <http://www.nokut.no/en/NOKUT-Knowledge/Surveys-and-databases/Accredited-Institutions/>

<sup>16</sup> All units in the Catalogue of non-university research institutions [www.nifu.no](http://www.nifu.no), except museums and archives and small units without employed researchers, were included.

The questionnaire was sent to 260 leaders on the 12<sup>th</sup> January 2012. Four reminders were sent out. When the survey stopped on the 8<sup>th</sup> of February, 213 replies were obtained (including partial replies, of these 171 had completed the questionnaire).

#### A.1.3 Survey of participants in RCN meeting places

The questionnaire was sent to 1305 participants on the 24<sup>th</sup> January 2012. Three reminders were sent out. When the survey stopped on the 27<sup>th</sup> February, 662 replies were obtained (including partial replies, of these 569 had completed the questionnaire).

Two different sources obtained from the RCN were used to draw the sample. Sample A comprises 372 members of RCN Programme Boards, the Executive Board and Research Boards and other committees in the period 2009 to 2011, whereas sample B comprises 933 persons listed as participants in one or more open meetings/conferences in 2011.

#### Sample of members of the RCN boards/committees

From the RCN we obtained a list of 3414 past and present participations in RCN boards and committees. Once we had excluded duplicates (including one participation per person), participations prior to 2009, persons located outside Norway, observers and substitute representatives, RCN employees, and participations with missing email addresses, 477 persons remained on the list. We then removed persons who were already on the list for one of the other surveys, and the remaining 372 persons were invited to participate in the meeting place survey.

#### Sample of participants in RCN meetings/conferences

We asked the RCN for an overview of their meetings and conferences, and received a list of 272 meetings/conferences in 2010 and 2011. From the list of 272 meetings/conferences we ask the RCN to select large meetings with a broad set of participant groups, meetings/conferences communicating results from RCN programmes and/or giving input to new programmes, and dialogue and debate meetings, and exclude research conferences (as we did not need an additional sample of researchers for the survey). We received a shortlist of 26 meetings/conferences in 2011. From this list, we asked for participant lists with email addresses for 16 relevant meetings/conferences, which RCN was able to provide for 12 of the 16. From these lists, participants from industry, government/public service/politicians and NGOs/unions and similar were selected for the survey sample. The 12 meetings/conferences included a total of 976 participants in this category. From this sample, persons already included in the sample for one of the other surveys were excluded, and the remaining 933 persons formed the sample of the meeting place survey. The table below shows the number of invited respondents and response rate per meeting.

Table 7.6 Survey to participants in RCN meeting places: Sample and response rate by meeting/conference. Percentages.

RCN meeting/conference	N (total sample)	Response rate
Bioenergi på Kongsgården 30.8.11	49	40.8
Danseløve eller veggpyrd - Forskningsrådets næringslivsdag 2011	346	53.5
Dialogmøte om energiforskning	30	66.7
Energikonferansen 2011	204	30.9
Humanitarian Politics, Workshop 5 May 2011	12	16.7
Innblikk i forskning om sykefravær, utstøting og frafall fra arbeidslivet	67	31.3
Innovasjonsdrevet forskning i næringsmiddelindustrien - hvorfor og hvordan?	55	43.6
Sluttkonferanse polaråret	11	54.5
Sluttkonferanse SAMRISK	37	40.5
The NORGLOBAL dissemination seminar 25 October 2011	11	63.6
Verdifull natur - Miljø 2015-konferansen III	64	45.3
VRI-samlingen 21-22. september 2011 (Trondheim)	47	66.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>933</b>	<b>45.3</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of meeting place participants. Response rates are calculated from the sample of 933 participants in meeting/conference invited to the survey. Respondents were directed to different sets of questions depending on their interactions with RCN. Respondents could skip questions they did not want to reply to. Hence, numbers of replies varies between questions.



## A.2 Overview of respondent characteristics

### A.2.1 Researchers

The tables in this section show the distribution of the respondents in the researcher survey by age, gender, research institution sector, research area, funding sources, interaction and relations to the RCN.

The majority (60 per cent) of the respondents are between 40 and 59 years old. 18 per cent are younger than 40, and 22 per cent are 60 years or older. There is a larger proportion of female researchers among the younger respondents than among the older (Table 7.7). Overall, 35 per cent are women.

Table 7.7 Respondents in the survey to researchers, by age and gender. Percentages.

Age	Female	Male	Total
Below 30	0.5	0.3	0.3
30-39	20.7	16.0	17.7
40-49	32.4	30.2	31.0
50-59	28.5	29.8	29.3
60 or above	17.8	23.8	21.7
<b>N</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>739</b>	<b>1149</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to researchers. 1149 of the 1183 respondents replied to the question about age.

The large part of the respondents are affiliated to universities (43 per cent) or independent research institutes (30 per cent, Table 7.8). 11 per cent are at university colleges, 7 per cent at university hospitals and 6 per cent at specialised university institutions ('vitenskapelige høyskoler').

Table 7.8 Respondents in the survey to researchers, by sector and gender. Percentages.

Current institutional affiliation	Female	Male	Total
Universities	43.0	42.8	42.9
Specialised university institutions	4.9	5.8	5.5
University colleges	11.7	10.2	10.7
Institute sector	32.5	34.9	34.1
University hospitals	8.0	6.2	6.8
<b>N</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>771</b>	<b>1183</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to researchers.

A large proportion of the respondents are in the social sciences (21 per cent), the natural sciences (20 per cent), or the medical sciences (18 per cent). The largest proportion of female respondents are found in the medical sciences (26 per cent of the female respondents). The largest proportion of male respondents are found in the natural sciences (23 per cent of the female respondents, Table 7.9).

Table 7.9 Respondents in the survey to researchers, by research area and gender. Percentages.

Please state your area of research	Female	Male	Total
Humanities (incl. theology)	15.7	12.8	13.8
Natural science (incl. mathematics)	14.1	22.6	19.6
Medicine (all types)	25.8	14.1	18.2
Social science (incl. law)	24.2	19.8	21.3
Technological disciplines/engineering	7.3	18.9	14.8
Agriculture/fishery-related fields	6.6	7.4	7.1
Centre, group, institute etc. with high degree of cross-disciplinarity	6.3	4.4	5.1
<b>N</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>729</b>	<b>1125</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to researchers. 1125 of the 1183 respondents replied to the question about research area using the predefined categories. Moreover, 77 respondents filled in 'other' areas.

On average, the respondents receive 19 per cent of their research funding from the RCN, 46 per cent from basic funding. In all sectors except the university hospital, RCN is the largest external funding source (Table .107).

Table 7.10 Respondents' research funding in 2011. Average percentages of funding by sources.

Sector	Universities	Specialised university institutions	University colleges	Institute sector	University hospitals	Total
Basic funding (own institution)	54	76	63	23	59	46
Funding from RCN schemes	20	8	10	26		19
Funding from Norwegian ministries	4	2	4	13	7	7
Funding from programmes administered by Innovation Norway and/or SIVA				1	1	1
Funding from other Norwegian public sources	6	3	6	9	21	8
Funding from international sources (all kinds)	6	3	4	9	3	6
Funding from private foundations (Norwegian)	4	2	1	3	5	4
Funding from industry	4	3	2	14	1	7
<b>N</b>	<b>438</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>1000</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to researchers. 1000 of the 1183 respondents replied to questions about funding sources.

Question in full: Please give an estimate of how your research was financed in 2011.

26 per cent of the respondents report that their RCN funding has decreased in the period 2005 to 2011, whereas 22 per cent report that it has increased (Table 7.11). As much as 28 per cent report that their funding from international sources has increased.

Table 7.11 Respondents' research funding. Change in funding sources 2005 to 2011. Per cent Decreased/Unchanged/ Increased by source.

Sector	Decreased	Unchanged	Increased	N
Basic funding (own institution)	20.6	61.6	17.9	773
Funding from RCN schemes	<b>25.6</b>	52.3	22.1	507
Funding from Norwegian ministries	14.2	67.2	18.6	338
Funding from programmes administered by Innovation Norway and/or SIVA	10.1	85.5	4.3	207
Funding from other Norwegian public sources	17.8	67.0	15.2	348
Funding from international sources (all kinds)	14.7	57.4	<b>27.9</b>	319
Funding from private foundations (Norwegian)	10.1	74.5	15.4	267
Funding from industry	16.4	62.9	20.8	318

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to researchers. 267 to 773 of the 1183 respondents replied to questions about decrease/increase in funding sources.

Question in full: Please give an estimate of how your research was financed in 2011. How have the shares of the respective funding sources evolved since 2005?

Splitting by RCN division, a large proportion of the respondents (28 per cent) receive most of their RCN funding from the Division for Science or the Division for Strategic Priorities (20 per cent), whereas only 5 per cent of the respondents receive most of their RCN funding from the Division for Innovation (Table 7.12). A large proportion of the respondents (47 per cent) answer 'Don't know' or 'Not applicable' on this question.

Table 7.12 Respondents in the survey to researchers, by sector and RCN division. Percentages.

Which Division of the Research Council of Norway has funded your research most often (2003-2011)?	Universities	Specialised university institutions	University colleges	Institute sector	University hospitals	Total
Division for Science (vitenskap, 2002-)	34.3	17.8	24.5	26.2	14.9	28.3
Division for Strategic Priorities (store satsinger 2002-2010)*	15.6	24.4	13.8	28.5	4.5	19.7
Division for Innovation (innovasjon, 2002-)	1.2	2.2	7.4	10.5	4.5	5.4
Don't know	26.3	37.8	25.5	22.1	19.4	24.8
NA	22.6	17.8	28.7	12.8	56.7	21.9
<b>N</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>961</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to researchers. 1000 of the 1183 respondents replied to questions about decrease/increase in funding sources.

\*Include also Division for Energy, resources and the Environment (energi, ressurser og miljø, 2010-) and the Division for society and Health (samfunn og helse, 2010-) here.

23 per cent of the respondents have not applied for RCN grants in the period 2003 to 2011, 46 per cent have been project leader for a RCN funded project, whereas 58 per cent have had at least one application for RCN programme grant rejected, and 36 per cent have had at least one application for RCN independent project grant rejected in this period (Table 7.13).

Table 7.13 Respondents in the survey to researchers: interaction with RCN. Percentages.

<b>Which of the following contact have you had with the Research Council of Norway, in the period 2003-2011? Please include all cases where you personally or your closest subordinates (e.g. doctoral students, research assistants) have been involved)</b>	<b>No, never</b>	<b>1-3 times</b>	<b>4-9 times</b>	<b>10 times or more</b>	<b>Don't remember /NA</b>	<b>N</b>
I have applied for RCN grants	22.8	41.1	27.9	5.7	2.4	985
I have been a project leader for RCN funded project	50.4	39.1	6.1	0.8	3.6	932
My application for Independent project grants (fri prosjektstøtte/FRIPRO) has been rejected	40.0	30.3	5.1	0.1	24.5	808
My application for RCN programme funds has been rejected	29.9	44.0	13.4	1.0	11.8	830
I have received Independent project grants (fri prosjektstøtte/FRIPRO)	72.6	12.3	0.5	0.3	14.3	795
I have received funding from User-directed innovation programmes (Brukerstyrte programforskningsmidler)	66.1	18.9	1.4	0.6	13.0	808
I have received funding from large scale programmes (Store programmer)	62.3	23.7	1.2	0.4	12.4	807
I have received funding from Basic research programmes (Grunnforskningsprogrammer)	74.2	11.1	0.6	0.1	14.0	786
I have received funding for Centre for Excellence (SFF) or Centre for Research-based innovation (SFI) or FME	78.8	9.3	0.4		11.5	797
I have received funding from Policy-oriented programmes (Handlingsrettede programmer)	74.2	9.5	0.9		15.4	792
I have received funding for networking measures (courses, conferences, events, awards, network agreements, collaborative measures or international networking measures).	63.8	23.4	1.7		11.1	813
I have received funds outside of regular calls for proposals	78.5	8.8	0.1	0.3	12.3	783
My doctoral students have been funded by the RCN	53.2	28.9	4.2	0.5	13.2	816
I have assessed applications for the RCN (as individual reviewer)	77.3	10.4	2.5	0.5	9.3	805
I have participated in meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes (e.g meetings in boards/committees specified in the question below)	65.7	22.2	4.2	1.0	7.0	891
I have participated in meetings disseminating research results/results from RCN programmes	52.3	28.5	9.3	3.2	6.7	902

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to researchers. 805 to 985 of the 1183 respondents replied to the questions about their interaction with the RCN.

27 per cent of the respondents have participated in meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes and 41 have participated in meetings disseminating research results/results from RCN programmes (Table 1.10). Only 5 per cent of this respondent group have been a member of a RCN programme Board, 0.5 per cent have been a member of the RCN Executive Board, 1 per cent have been a member of a RCN Division Research Board, 5 per cent have been a member of RCN review panels/groups, and 4 per cent have been a member of other RCN committees or steering groups (Table 7.14).

Table 7.14 Respondents in the survey to researchers: relations to the RCN. Percentages.

<b>Which of the following kinds of relations have you had with the Research Council of Norway, in the period 2003-2011?</b>	<b>No, never</b>	<b>For 1-4 years</b>	<b>For 5 years or more</b>	<b>N</b>
I have been/am member of the RCN Executive Board	99.5	.2	.3	942
I have been/am member of the RCN Division Research Board	99.0	.6	.3	941
I have been/am member of a RCN programme Board	94.8	3.8	1.4	948
I have been/am member of RCN review panels/groups	95.4	4.0	.5	943
I have been a member of other RCN committees or steering groups	96.0	3.4	.6	943

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to researchers. 941 to 949 of the 1183 respondents replied to the questions about their relations to the RCN.

### A.2.2 Research institution leaders

The tables in this section show the distribution of the respondents in the survey research institution leaders by position, gender, type of research institution, research area, and interaction and relations to the RCN.

39 per cent of the respondents are leaders at independent research institutes, 37 per cent at university colleges, 20 per cent at universities and 4 per cent at specialised university institutions (Table 7.15).

The largest proportion of the female leaders are found at the university colleges (46 per cent), whereas the largest proportion of the male leaders are found at the independent research institutes (41 per cent). Overall 33 per cent of the leaders in the survey are female.

Table 7.15 Respondents in the survey to research institution leaders, by sector and research area. Percentages.

Sector	Female	Male	Total
Universities	14.1	23.2	20.2
Specialised university institutions	2.8	4.2	3.8
University colleges	46.5	31.7	36.6
Institute sector	36.6	40.8	39.4
<b>N</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>213</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to research institution leaders.

Table 7.16 shows the leader respondents by research area and position. Respondents were asked to indicate the research areas of their unit. A large part of the respondents (36 per cent) are included in the category ‘Multiple areas’, as they ticked several research areas (the note to the table indicate total number per research area). Of those who only indicated one research area, social sciences is the largest group (21 per cent of the total). 16 per cent of the respondents are rectors, 41 per cent are deans and 37 per cent are directors of a research institute. Moreover, report to be in charge of their whole institution, 30 per cent of a faculty and 24 per cent of a department/faculty or similar (Table 7.17).

Table 7.16 Respondents in the survey to research institution leaders, by position and research area. Percentages.

Research area of respondents unit	Rector/pro-rector/vice rector	Dean/vice dean	Director of research institute	***Research director or similar	***Other	Total
Humanities	14.7	11.6	2.6	11.1		8.7
Natural sciences**		1.2	6.6			2.9
Medical sciences		11.6	7.9			7.7
Social sciences	8.8	16.3	28.9	33.3	33.3	20.7
Technological disciplines/engineering		8.1	10.5			7.2
Agriculture and fishery		3.5	9.2	11.1		5.3
Institution with high degree of cross-disciplinarity	2.9	5.8	3.9	11.1		4.8
Other	5.9	11.6	1.3	11.1		6.7
Multiple areas*	67.6	30.2	28.9	22.2	66.7	36.1
<b>N</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>208</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to research institution leaders. 208 of the 213 respondents replied to questions about research area and position.

\*A large part of the respondents ticked several research areas. These respondents are included in the category ‘Multiple areas’. In sum, Humanities was selected by 49, Natural sciences by 42, Medical sciences by 36, Social sciences by 88, Technological disciplines/engineering by 52, Agriculture and fishery by 24, Institution with high degree of cross-disciplinarity by 42, and Other by 23.

\*\* This category includes 6 respondents who only ticked natural sciences, and only one dean. In addition, 36 respondents ticked natural sciences in combinations with other areas (including 13 deans) – these respondents are included under ‘Multiple areas’.

\*\*\*Only persons we had listed as Rector, Dean or Director of research institute were invited to participate in this survey. To account for changed positions, the questionnaire also included categories for other positions, and in total 12 respondents selected these categories.

Table 7.17 Respondents in the survey to research institution leaders, by level and research area. Percentages.

Research area	Unit in charge of			Total
	The whole institution	A faculty	A department/centre or similar	
Humanities	6.4	12.7	5.9	8.8
Natural sciences	4.6	1.3	.0	2.9
Medical sciences	4.6	11.4	11.8	7.8
Social sciences	21.1	17.7	23.5	20.0
Technological disciplines/engineering	6.4	8.9	5.9	7.3
Agriculture and fishery	5.5	2.5	11.8	4.9
Institution with high degree of cross-disciplinarity	4.6	6.3	.0	4.9
Other	3.7	8.9	17.6	6.8
Multiple areas	43.1	30.4	23.5	36.6
N	109	79	17	205

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to research institution leaders. 205 of the 213 respondents replied to questions about research area and position.

38 per cent of the leaders are in charge of a unit with below 50 researchers, 41 per cent a unit with 50 to 200 researchers and 13 per cent a unit with 200 to 500 researchers. Moreover, a few of the leaders (8 per cent) are in charge of institutions with more than 500 researchers (7.18)

Table 7.18 Respondents in the survey to research institution leaders, by gender and size of research unit/institution. Percentages.

Number of researchers employed at the research unit	Female	Male	Total
Below 50	47.9	33.1	38.0
50-200	29.6	46.5	40.8
201-500	15.5	12.0	13.1
501-1000	5.6	4.9	5.2
Above 1000	1.4	3.5	2.8
N	71	142	213

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to research institution leaders. Question in full: 'Please indicate the approximate number of researchers (including doctoral students) that are employed at your research unit'.

33 per cent report that the RCN Division for Strategic Priorities most often has funded their unit, whereas 29 per cent reply Division for Science and 17 per cent reply Division for Innovation. Splitting by type of institution, the universities and the specialised university institutions most often relate to the Division for Science (54 and 68 per cent respectively), and the university colleges and the independent institutes most often relate to the Division for Strategic Priorities (29 and 44 per cent respectively, Table 7.19).

Table 7.19 Respondents in the survey to research institution leaders, by sector and RCN division. Percentages.

Which Division of the Research Council of Norway has funded your unit most often (2003-2011)?	Universities	Specialised university institutions	University colleges	Institute sector	Total
Division for Innovation (innovasjon 2002-)	7.3		12.9	26.6	16.8
Division for Science (vitenskap 2002-)	53.7	66.7	17.1	22.8	28.6
Division for Strategic Priorities (store satsinger 2002-2010)*	19.5	16.7	28.6	44.3	32.7
Don't know	14.6	16.7	27.1	2.5	14.3
NA	4.9		14.3	3.8	7.7
N	41	6	70	79	196

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to research institution leaders. 196 of the 213 respondents replied to questions about sector and RCN division.

\*Include also Division for Energy, resources and the Environment (energi, ressurser og miljø, 2010-) and the Division for society and Health (samfunn og helse, 2010-) here.

20 per cent of the leaders have been a member of a RCN programme Board, 4 per cent have been a member of the RCN Executive Board, 5 per cent have been a member of a RCN Division Research

Board, 14 per cent have been a member of RCN review panels/groups, and 20 per cent have been a member of other RCN committees or steering groups (Table 7.20).

Table 7.20 Respondents in the survey to research institution leaders: relations to the RCN. Percentages.

Which of the following kinds of relations have you had with the Research Council of Norway, in the period 2003-2011?	No, never	For 1-4 years	For 5 years or more	N
I have been/am member of the RCN Executive Board	96.2	2.7	1.1	184
I have been/am member of the RCN Division Research Board	95.1	3.3	1.6	183
I have been/am member of a RCN programme Board	80.2	10.4	9.4	192
I have been/am member of RCN review panels/groups	86.2	11.2	2.7	188
I have been a member of other RCN committees or steering groups	80.2	16.0	3.7	187

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to research institution leaders. 187 of the 213 respondents replied to questions about relations with the RCN.

59 per cent of the respondents have participated in meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes and 57 have participated in meetings disseminating research results/results from RCN programmes. Moreover, 57 per cent have assessed applications for the RCN (Table 7.21).

Table 7.21 Respondents in the survey to research institution leaders: interaction with RCN. Percentages.

Which of the following contact have you had with the Research Council of Norway, in the period 2003-2011?	No, never	1-3 times	4-9 times	10 times or more	N
I have assessed applications for the RCN (as individual reviewer)	71.6	16.0	8.8	3.6	194
I have participated in meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes	40.8	28.9	18.9	11.4	201
I have participated in meetings disseminating research results/results from RCN programmes	43.1	32.5	15.2	9.1	197

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to research institution leaders. 197 of the 213 respondents replied to questions about contact with the RCN.

### A.2.3 Participants in RCN meeting places

The tables in this section show the distribution of the respondents in the RCN meeting places survey by position, institutional affiliation, sector, research area, and interaction and relations to the RCN.

19 per cent of the respondents indicate that they have a research position, the majority full professor, research director or similar. 68 per cent indicate an administrative position. Even when researchers were not intentionally selected for Sample B (participants in meetings organised by the RCN) a few of these respondents (4 per cent) in this group indicate a research position (Table 7.22).

Table 7.22 Participants in RCN meeting places: Respondents' positions by sample category. Percentages.

Please indicate your current position	Sample A (boards)	Sample B (meetings)	Total
a) Full professor, research director or similar (professor/forsker 1/forskningsleder)	41.8	0.7	15.6
b) Associate professor/senior researcher or similar (1.amanuensis/forsker 2)	4.2	2.1	2.9
c) Assistant professor/researcher or similar (amanuensis/forsker 3)	0.4	1.2	0.9
d) Top level administrative leader position (director, secretary general and similar)	13.0	17.7	16.0
e) Intermediate administrative leader position (head of department, head of section or similar)	16.7	17.3	17.1
f) Senior executive officer / executive officer /senior advisor / advisor and similar	16.3	45.4	34.9
g) Other (please specify below)	5.9	11.8	9.7
No reply	1.7	3.8	3.0
<b>N</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>662</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to participants in RCN meeting places.

34 per cent of the respondents indicate trade and industry as their institutional affiliation, 23 per cent indicate a research institution (University; Specialised University Institution; University College;

Independent research institute/University Hospital) and 24 indicate Norwegian government/public administration (Norwegian ministry; Directorate/other state government body; Local/regional public government). Only 3 per cent indicate NGOs/civic society.

Table 7.23 Participants in RCN meeting places: Respondents' institutional affiliation by sample category. Percentages.

Please indicate your current institutional affiliation	Sample A (boards)	Sample B (meetings)	Total
University	36.0	0.9	13.6
Specialised University Institution	2.1	0.2	.9
University College	4.2	0.7	2.0
Independent research institute	8.8	3.5	5.4
University Hospital	2.5		.9
Parliament/political party	0.4	0.2	.3
Norwegian ministry	5.0	8.7	7.4
Directorate/other state government body	12.1	14.7	13.7
Local/regional public government	1.7	5.0	3.8
Nordic or European body		0.2	.2
Trade & Industry (næringsliv)	17.6	43.5	34.1
NGOs/ civic society	0.8	3.5	2.6
News media/specialised press	0.4	.5	.5
Other (please specify)	2.9	11.8	8.6
No reply	5.4	6.4	6.0
<b>N</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>662</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to participants in RCN meeting places.

38 per cent of the respondents indicate that the RCN Division for Innovation is of most interest for their organisation, 32 per cent reply Division for Strategic Priorities and 20 per cent Division for Science. Not unexpectedly, those within trade and industry most often reply Division for Innovation, those within Public Government more often reply Division for Strategic Priorities, and those within higher education most often reply Division for Science (Table 7.24).

Table 7.24 Participants in RCN meeting places: 'Which division of the Research Council is of most interest to you/your organisation?' Per cent by sector.

Sector	Division for Science (vitenskap, 2002-)	Division for Strategic Priorities* (store satsinger 2002-2010)	Division for Innovation (innovasjon, 2002-)	Don't know	Not applicable	N
Universities	58.0	21.6	12.5	3.4	4.5	88
Specialised university institutions	66.7	33.3				6
University colleges	58.3	16.7	25.0			12
Institute sector	13.9	47.2	36.1	2.8		36
University hospitals	100.0					6
Trade and industry	6.5	30.7	52.1	7.9	2.8	215
Government/Public service	17.4	41.3	29.0	8.4	3.9	155
Other	5.7	21.4	58.6	8.6	5.7	70
<b>Total</b>	<b>20.1</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>38.3</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>588</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to participants in RCN meeting places. 588 of the 662 respondents replied to questions about sector and RCN division.

Table 7.25 shows the respondents by their sector of activity. They were asked to tick all sectors at which their work is directed, hence the percentages sum to more than 100. 47 indicate research, 43 per cent indicate innovation, and 22 per cent indicate education. Moreover, 20 per cent indicate environment and 22 per cent energy, whereas only 3 per cent indicate culture, media or sport and only 5 per cent finance trade.

Table 7.25 Participants in RCN meeting places: Respondents by sector of activity and sample category. Percentages.

Please state your/your unit's sectors of activity and/or responsibility (tick all sectors at which your work is directed)	Sample A (boards)	Sample B (meetings)	Total
a) Research	65.7	36.6	47.1
b) Education	41.8	10.9	22.1
c) Innovation / industrial production /technology	26.8	52.7	43.4
d) Finance / trade	4.6	5.7	5.3
e) Agriculture / fishery /food	8.8	13.0	11.5
f) Environment	16.7	22.2	20.2
g) Energy	13.8	26.7	22.1
h) Transport / communications /infrastructures	5.9	9.2	8.0
i) Health / welfare /equality / integration	22.2	14.7	17.4
j) Culture / media / sport	3.3	3.8	3.6
k) Foreign policy / defence	2.1	3.1	2.7
l) General politics/many sectors	7.9	11.3	10.1
m) Other	5.0	8.5	7.3
<i>Sum percentages</i>	<i>224.6</i>	<i>218.4</i>	<i>220.8</i>
<b>N</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>662</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to participants in RCN meeting places.

The researchers in the sample were asked to indicate their research area. 32 per cent indicated Technological disciplines/Engineering only, compared to 3 per cent humanities and 5 per cent natural sciences. 24 per cent indicated multiple areas (Table 7.26).

Table 7.26 Participants in RCN meeting places: Respondents by research area and sample category. Percentages.

Research area	Sample A (boards)	Sample B (meetings)	Total
Humanities	5.7	0.4	2.8
Natural sciences	6.8	2.7	4.5
Medical sciences	12.5	8.5	10.3
Social sciences	14.2	5.4	9.3
Technological disciplines / Engineering	21.0	40.8	32.1
Agriculture and fishery	4.0	6.7	5.5
Institution with high degree of cross-disciplinarity	5.7	3.1	4.3
Other	3.4	11.2	7.8
Multiple areas**	26.7	21.1	23.6
<b>N*</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>399</b>

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to participants in RCN meeting places.

\* Only researchers were asked to indicate research area - 399 of the 662 respondents replied to the question.

\*\*\*A substantial part of the respondents ticked several research areas, these respondents are included in the category 'Multiple areas'.

42 per cent of the respondents have been member of a RCN Programme Board, 4 per cent have been a member of the RCN Executive Board, 6 per cent have been a member of a RCN Division Research Board, 27 per cent have been a member of RCN review panels/groups, and 26 per cent have been a member of other RCN committees or steering groups (Table 7.27). As expected, these memberships are more frequent in sample A than in sample B (Table 7.28).

Table 7.27 Respondents in the survey to participants in RCN meeting places: interaction with RCN. Percentages.

Which of the following kinds of relations have you had with the Research Council of Norway, in the period 2003-2011?	No, never	For 1-4 years	For 5 years or more	N
I have been/am member of the RCN Executive Board	96.3	2.2	1.5	409
I have been/am member of the RCN Division Research Board	94.4	3.9	1.7	410
I have been/am member of a RCN programme Board	58.2	23.1	18.7	536
I have been/am member of RCN review panels/groups	72.9	21.7	5.5	457
I have been a member of other RCN committees or steering groups	74.2	18.3	7.5	442

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to participants in RCN meeting places. 409 to 442 of the 662 respondents replied to the questions about relations with the RCN.



Table 7.28 Respondents in the survey to participants in RCN meeting places: interaction with RCN. Percentages.

<b>Which of the following kinds of relations have you had with the Research Council of Norway, in the period 2003-2011?</b>	<b>No, never</b>	<b>For 1-4 years</b>	<b>For 5 years or more</b>	<b>N</b>
I have been/am member of the RCN Executive Board	96.3	2.2	1.5	409
Sample A (boards)	83.9	9.2	6.9	87
Sample B (meetings)	99.7	0.3		322
I have been/am member of the RCN Division Research Board	94.4	3.9	1.7	410
Sample A (boards)	77.2	15.2	7.6	92
Sample B (meetings)	99.4	0.6		318
I have been/am member of a RCN programme Board	58.2	23.1	18.7	536
Sample A (boards)	8.2	48.3	43.5	207
Sample B (meetings)	89.7	7.3	3.0	329
I have been/am member of RCN review panels/groups	72.9	21.7	5.5	457
Sample A (boards)	46.3	41.7	12.0	108
Sample B (meetings)	81.1	15.5	3.4	349
I have been a member of other RCN committees or steering groups	74.2	18.3	7.5	442
Sample A (boards)	37.5	40.2	22.3	112
Sample B (meetings)	86.7	10.9	2.4	330

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to participants in RCN meeting places. 409 to 442 of the 662 respondents replied to the questions about relations with the RCN.

67 per cent of the respondents have participated in meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes and 67 have participated in meetings disseminating research results/results from RCN programmes. Moreover, 33 per cent have assessed applications for the RCN (Table 7.29).

Table 7.29 Respondents in the survey to participants in RCN meeting places: interaction with RCN. Percentages.

<b>Which of the following contact have you had with the Research Council of Norway, in the period 2003-2011?</b>	<b>No, never</b>	<b>1-3 times</b>	<b>4-9 times</b>	<b>10 times or more</b>	<b>N</b>
I have assessed applications for the RCN (as individual reviewer)	66.6	19.8	8.7	4.9	494
I have participated in meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes	33.5	33.1	17.8	15.7	568
I have participated in meetings disseminating research results/results from RCN programmes	33.4	34.3	21.6	10.7	542

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey to participants in RCN meeting places. 494 to 568 of the 662 respondents replied to questions about contact with the RCN.

## Appendix B Tables

### B.1 Tables relating to Chapter 2

Table 7.30 Researchers' motives to apply for RCN grants by sector. Percentages.

<b>In general, how important are the following motives when you apply for grants from the Research Council of Norway (RCN)?</b>						
Sector	Important motive to apply for RCN grants	Partly/sometimes a motive to apply for RCN grants	No, this is not important in my research projects	No, no RCN scheme would be helpful in achieving this	Cannot say	N
<b>a) Get funding for my own research activities</b>						
Universities	78.5	13.9	3.6	1.3	2.6	302
Specialised university inst.	67.7	22.6	3.2	.0	6.5	31
University colleges	71.7	21.7	5.0	.0	1.7	60
Institute sector	81.0	11.6	4.3	.8	2.3	258
University hospitals	77.8	11.1	5.6	.0	5.6	18
Total	78.3	14.1	4.0	.9	2.7	669
<b>b) Get funding for recruitment positions to my institution</b>						
Universities	59.4	27.6	4.4	3.4	5.1	293
Specialised university inst.	56.7	23.3	13.3	.0	6.7	30
University colleges	58.2	27.3	7.3	1.8	5.5	55
Institute sector	42.0	35.8	12.5	3.5	6.2	257
University hospitals	66.7	22.2	5.6	.0	5.6	18
Total	52.5	30.5	8.3	3.1	5.7	653
<b>c) Gain access to complementary expertise</b>						
Universities	18.2	38.9	24.9	6.7	11.2	285
Specialised university inst.	20.0	23.3	23.3	13.3	20.0	30
University colleges	34.0	37.7	17.0	3.8	7.5	53
Institute sector	24.8	43.7	18.5	3.5	9.4	254
University hospitals	12.5		37.5	12.5	37.5	16
Total	22.1	39.0	21.9	5.6	11.3	638
<b>d) Gain access to scientific excellence</b>						
Universities	22.4	35.3	20.6	9.4	12.2	286
Specialised university inst.	26.7	23.3	13.3	16.7	20.0	30
University colleges	28.8	42.3	17.3	3.8	7.7	52
Institute sector	26.3	40.2	14.7	7.6	11.2	251
University hospitals	18.8	6.3	31.3	12.5	31.3	16
Total	24.6	36.5	18.0	8.7	12.3	635
<b>e) Create new national research networks</b>						
Universities	28.5	41.2	17.9	4.5	7.9	291
Specialised university inst.	23.3	33.3	13.3	10.0	20.0	30
University colleges	29.6	46.3	9.3	7.4	7.4	54
Institute sector	32.5	47.1	11.0	3.1	6.3	255
University hospitals	12.5	37.5	31.3	.0	18.8	16
Total	29.6	43.5	14.6	4.3	8.0	646
<b>f) Create new international research networks</b>						
Universities	40.6	36.9	11.6	4.4	6.5	293
Specialised university inst.	29.0	32.3	12.9	9.7	16.1	31
University colleges	37.9	43.1	5.2	10.3	3.4	58
Institute sector	36.5	42.4	9.4	3.1	8.6	255
University hospitals	18.8	37.5	18.8	6.3	18.8	16
Total	37.7	39.4	10.4	4.7	7.8	653
<b>g) Strengthen existing national research networks</b>						
Universities	33.2	39.1	17.3	2.1	8.3	289
Specialised university inst.	25.8	38.7	9.7	6.5	19.4	31
University colleges	27.3	49.1	7.3	7.3	9.1	55
Institute sector	36.0	47.8	9.5	1.2	5.5	253
University hospitals	11.8	52.9	17.6	.0	17.6	17
Total	32.9	43.7	13.0	2.3	8.1	645

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers.

Table 7.31 Researchers' motives to apply for RCN grants by sector. Percentages. (continued)

Sector	Important motive to apply for RCN grants	Partly/sometimes a motive to apply for RCN grants	No, this is not important in my research projects	No, no RCN scheme would be helpful in achieving this	Cannot say	N
<b>h) Strengthen existing international research networks</b>						
Universities	42.0	39.5	9.8	2.4	6.3	286
Specialised university institutions	32.3	35.5	12.9	6.5	12.9	31
University colleges	30.4	53.6	7.1	5.4	3.6	56
Institute sector	31.9	45.4	12.0	3.6	7.2	251
University hospitals	25.0	12.5	31.3	6.3	25.0	16
Total	36.1	42.2	11.1	3.4	7.2	640
<b>i) Create or strengthen collaboration with industry</b>						
Universities	7.6	20.7	47.5	10.9	13.4	276
Specialised university institutions	10.0	16.7	50.0	10.0	13.3	30
University colleges	14.8	18.5	35.2	16.7	14.8	54
Institute sector	30.0	27.6	28.8	4.4	9.2	250
University hospitals	6.3	18.8	31.3	12.5	31.3	16
Total	17.3	23.0	38.7	8.8	12.3	626
<b>j) Broaden our field of expertise</b>						
Universities	35.9	37.7	14.4	5.3	6.7	284
Specialised university institutions	30.0	33.3	16.7	10.0	10.0	30
University colleges	42.6	37.0	14.8	3.7	1.9	54
Institute sector	48.0	36.3	9.3	1.6	4.8	248
University hospitals	18.8	25.0	18.8	6.3	31.3	16
Total	40.5	36.6	12.7	4.0	6.3	632
<b>k) Conduct scientifically/technologically risky research</b>						
Universities	17.4	17.0	39.1	13.4	13.0	276
Specialised university institutions	16.7	13.3	30.0	20.0	20.0	30
University colleges	7.5	13.2	56.6	11.3	11.3	53
Institute sector	29.4	20.6	33.1	6.5	10.5	248
University hospitals	6.3	31.3	18.8	12.5	31.3	16
Total	21.0	18.3	37.2	10.8	12.7	623
<b>l) Conduct cross-sector research</b>						
Universities	16.2	28.1	35.6	6.8	13.3	278
Specialised university institutions	13.3	30.0	20.0	13.3	23.3	30
University colleges	20.8	26.4	41.5	7.5	3.8	53
Institute sector	20.9	38.6	27.7	4.8	8.0	249
University hospitals	.0	25.0	31.3	6.3	37.5	16
Total	17.9	32.1	32.1	6.4	11.5	626
<b>m) Conduct interdisciplinary research</b>						
Universities	32.1	38.0	19.5	3.1	7.3	287
Specialised university institutions	26.7	40.0	10.0	13.3	10.0	30
University colleges	23.1	46.2	21.2	5.8	3.8	52
Institute sector	29.0	48.8	13.7	3.6	4.8	248
University hospitals	11.8	41.2	17.6	5.9	23.5	17
Total	29.3	43.1	16.9	4.1	6.6	634
<b>n) Conduct research in collaboration with key international institutions</b>						
Universities	34.3	37.1	17.1	2.9	8.6	280
Specialised university institutions	33.3	33.3	13.3	6.7	13.3	30
University colleges	37.0	40.7	14.8	5.6	1.9	54
Institute sector	36.3	41.9	11.7	4.0	6.0	248
University hospitals	11.8	52.9	11.8	.0	23.5	17
Total	34.7	39.6	14.5	3.7	7.6	629
<b>o) Prepare for participation in international funding programmes</b>						
Universities	19.9	37.0	24.2	5.0	13.9	281
Specialised university institutions	13.3	33.3	23.3	10.0	20.0	30
University colleges	19.2	32.7	34.6	5.8	7.7	52
Institute sector	19.8	43.1	25.4	4.0	7.7	248
University hospitals	.0	50.0	18.8	.0	31.3	16
Total	19.0	39.2	25.4	4.8	11.6	627

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers.

Table 7.32 Leaders at research institutions: recommendations regarding RCN grants by sector. Percentages.

Depending on the particular objectives of a project, which kind of funding scheme would you recommend your colleagues/ researchers at your unit to apply for, in order to:						
Sector	Would recommend			Cannot say/ NA	N	
	RCN scheme	Partly RCN scheme/ partly other schemes	Other funding schemes			
<b>Gain access to complementary expertise</b>						
Universities	22.6	25.8	12.9	38.7	31	
Specialised university institutions/univ.colleges	30.4	25.0	12.5	32.1	56	
Institute sector	17.6	50.0	11.8	20.6	68	
Total	23.2	36.1	12.3	28.4	155	
<b>Gain access to scientific excellence</b>						
Universities	38.2	38.2	2.9	20.6	34	
Specialised university institutions/univ.colleges	34.5	23.6	5.5	36.4	55	
Institute sector	20.9	56.7	4.5	17.9	67	
Total	29.5	41.0	4.5	25.0	156	
<b>Create new national research networks</b>						
Universities	45.5	33.3	6.1	15.2	33	
Specialised university institutions/univ.colleges	32.1	33.9	5.4	28.6	56	
Institute sector	41.8	38.8	7.5	11.9	67	
Total	39.1	35.9	6.4	18.6	156	
<b>Create new international research networks</b>						
Universities	14.7	35.3	35.3	14.7	34	
Specialised university institutions/univ.colleges	17.9	37.5	14.3	30.4	56	
Institute sector	13.2	44.1	30.9	11.8	68	
Total	15.2	39.9	25.9	19.0	158	
<b>Strengthen existing national research networks</b>						
Universities	40.0	40.0	5.7	14.3	35	
Specialised university institutions/univ.colleges	31.5	35.2	5.6	27.8	54	
Institute sector	41.2	41.2	4.4	13.2	68	
Total	37.6	38.9	5.1	18.5	157	
<b>Strengthen existing international research networks</b>						
Universities	12.5	40.6	31.3	15.6	32	
Specialised university institutions/univ.colleges	14.3	37.5	16.1	32.1	56	
Institute sector	15.2	43.9	27.3	13.6	66	
Total	14.3	40.9	24.0	20.8	154	
<b>Create or strengthen collaboration with industry</b>						
Universities	17.1	42.9	5.7	34.3	35	
Specialised university institutions/univ.colleges	14.5	29.1	16.4	40.0	55	
Institute sector	15.2	37.9	18.2	28.8	66	
Total	15.4	35.9	14.7	34.0	156	
<b>Broaden our field of expertise</b>						
Universities	28.1	43.8	9.4	18.8	32	
Specialised university institutions/univ.colleges	29.1	27.3	10.9	32.7	55	
Institute sector	22.7	43.9	12.1	21.2	66	
Total	26.1	37.9	11.1	24.8	153	
<b>Conduct scientifically /technologic ally risky research</b>						
Universities	18.2	33.3	18.2	30.3	33	
Specialised university institutions/univ.colleges	17.0	13.2	9.4	60.4	53	
Institute sector	29.2	23.1	15.4	32.3	65	
Total	22.5	21.9	13.9	41.7	151	
<b>Conduct cross-sector research</b>						
Universities	15.2	63.6	3.0	18.2	33	
Specialised university institutions/univ.colleges	14.5	36.4	16.4	32.7	55	
Institute sector	27.7	38.5	10.8	23.1	65	
Total	20.3	43.1	11.1	25.5	153	
<b>Conduct interdisciplinary research</b>						
Universities	25.0	56.3	3.1	15.6	32	
Specialised university institutions/univ.colleges	26.8	35.7	10.7	26.8	56	
Institute sector	28.8	50.0	7.6	13.6	66	
Total	27.3	46.1	7.8	18.8	154	
<b>Conduct research in collaboration with key international institutions</b>						
Universities	2.9	41.2	32.4	23.5	34	
Specialised univ. inst./ colleges	22.8	36.8	12.3	28.1	57	
Institute sector	16.4	47.8	25.4	10.4	67	
Total	15.8	42.4	22.2	19.6	158	
<b>Preparing for participation in international funding programmes</b>						
Universities	24.2	51.5	6.1	18.2	33	
Specialised university institutions/univ.colleges	32.1	26.8	8.9	32.1	56	
Institute sector	43.9	33.3	12.1	10.6	66	
Total	35.5	34.8	9.7	20.0	155	

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of leaders at research institutions. Specialised univ. inst./ colleges includes specialised university institutions, university colleges and colleges.

Table 7.33 Researchers' reasons for not to apply for RCN grants. Percentages.

<b>How important have the following reasons not to apply for RCN grants (Forskningsrådsmidler) been for you?</b>				
Sector	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	N
<b>I/my unit had sufficient funding from other sources</b>				
Universities	37.7	34.4	27.9	61
Specialised university institutions	18.2	36.4	45.5	11
University colleges	15.8	52.6	31.6	19
Institute sector	38.1	26.2	35.7	42
University hospitals	36.4	31.8	31.8	22
Total	33.5	34.2	32.3	155
<b>It was not worth it because each grant is too small</b>				
Universities	8.8	10.5	80.7	57
Specialised university institutions	11.1	11.1	77.8	9
University colleges	5.6	22.2	72.2	18
Institute sector	8.6	40.0	51.4	35
University hospitals	5.9	17.6	76.5	17
Total	8.1	20.6	71.3	136
<b>The rejection rate is too high to warrant an application</b>				
Universities	35.0	28.3	36.7	60
Specialised university institutions	55.6	33.3	11.1	9
University colleges	47.4	36.8	15.8	19
Institute sector	28.6	25.7	45.7	35
University hospitals	43.5	30.4	26.1	23
Total	37.7	29.5	32.9	146
<b>There is no funding scheme that fits my needs</b>				
Universities	37.7	27.9	34.4	61
Specialised university institutions	54.5	27.3	18.2	11
University colleges	16.7	38.9	44.4	18
Institute sector	29.7	35.1	35.1	37
University hospitals	25.0	30.0	45.0	20
Total	32.7	31.3	36.1	147

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers. This question was posed only the researchers who indicated that they had not applied for RCN grant in the period 2003 to 2011 (question number 7, Appendix D).

Table 7.34 Survey replies: 'In your view, how attractive are the following RCN funding schemes, as a funding source for your unit's research activities?' Per cent by sector.

Sector	Very attractive	Somewhat attractive	Neither attractive nor unattractive	Somewhat unattractive	Very unattractive	NA	N
<b>Independent projects (FRIPRO)</b>							
Universities	59.8	19.9	9.9	1.9	2.6	5.9	423
Special. univ.inst.	52.8	24.5	7.5	3.8	3.8	7.5	53
University colleges	37.6	30.1	11.3	3.8	3.0	14.3	133
Institute sector	39.7	23.8	13.2	3.8	4.9	14.6	370
University hospitals	34.0	19.1	8.5	4.3	2.1	31.9	47
Total	48.1	22.8	11.1	3.0	3.5	11.4	1026
<b>Large-scale programmes (Store programmer)</b>							
Universities	28.1	31.0	18.0	8.1	6.4	8.4	406
Special. univ.inst.	22.9	18.8	27.1	12.5	4.2	14.6	48
University colleges	26.7	28.2	15.3	9.9	4.6	15.3	131
Institute sector	44.0	30.0	10.7	2.9	2.4	9.9	373
University hospitals	20.0	15.0	20.0	7.5	5.0	32.5	40
Total	33.3	29.1	15.4	6.6	4.5	11.1	998
<b>Policy-oriented programmes (Handlingsrettede programmer)</b>							
Universities	11.3	24.4	26.9	12.1	9.3	16.1	398
Special. univ.inst.	4.2	25.0	29.2	18.8	8.3	14.6	48
University colleges	27.1	27.1	17.8	8.5	5.4	14.0	129
Institute sector	23.7	31.3	19.1	6.5	2.4	17.0	371
University hospitals	8.3	8.3	19.4	8.3	8.3	47.2	36
Total	17.6	26.8	22.6	9.7	6.1	17.2	982
<b>User-directed innovation programmes (Brukerstyrte innovasjonsprogrammer)</b>							
Universities	8.5	24.4	26.9	12.8	8.7	18.7	390
Special. univ.inst.	4.3	17.0	36.2	12.8	12.8	17.0	47
University colleges	20.8	27.7	20.0	9.2	7.7	14.6	130
Institute sector	32.7	26.5	17.6	7.8	3.8	11.6	370
University hospitals	2.6	15.8	21.1	10.5	5.3	44.7	38
Total	18.9	24.9	22.7	10.4	6.8	16.4	975
<b>Basic research programmes (Grunnforskningsprogrammer)</b>							
Universities	43.1	23.3	16.9	3.2	2.2	11.3	408
Special. univ.inst.	42.9	22.4	14.3	2.0	4.1	14.3	49
University colleges	22.3	25.4	17.7	13.1	6.2	15.4	130
Institute sector	30.8	28.4	17.0	7.8	2.4	13.5	370
University hospitals	14.0	14.0	18.6	4.7	7.0	41.9	43
Total	34.6	25.0	17.0	6.2	3.1	14.1	1000
<b>Centres of Excellence (SFF)</b>							
Universities	29.3	28.1	21.0	6.1	5.6	9.8	409
Special. univ.inst.	32.7	24.5	18.4	4.1	6.1	14.3	49
University colleges	12.1	21.0	25.8	5.6	10.5	25.0	124
Institute sector	31.1	27.3	19.3	5.4	2.4	14.5	373
University hospitals	20.0	5.0	17.5	5.0	7.5	45.0	40
Total	27.6	25.8	20.7	5.6	5.1	15.1	995
<b>Centres for Research-based Innovation (SFI)</b>							
Universities	13.5	17.0	30.0	10.9	8.1	20.4	393
Special. univ.inst.	10.9	13.0	34.8	8.7	8.7	23.9	46
University colleges	8.0	16.8	24.8	10.4	10.4	29.6	125
Institute sector	22.3	24.2	22.6	8.2	3.3	19.6	368
University hospitals	5.0	12.5	22.5	10.0	10.0	40.0	40
Total	15.6	19.3	26.4	9.7	6.7	22.2	972
<b>Centres for Environment-friendly Energy research (FME)</b>							
Universities	5.4	11.0	29.8	11.5	12.2	30.1	392
Special. univ.inst.	4.3	4.3	25.5	12.8	12.8	40.4	47
University colleges	2.4	11.1	22.2	15.1	11.9	37.3	126
Institute sector	17.7	16.6	23.9	7.9	7.1	26.9	368
University hospitals	0.0	2.7	24.3	8.1	13.5	51.4	37
Total	9.4	12.5	26.2	10.5	10.3	31.1	970
<b>Networking measures (nettverkstiltak)</b>							
Universities	16.9	34.8	24.2	5.5	4.3	14.4	397
Special. univ.inst.	14.9	42.6	17.0	2.1	4.3	19.1	47
University colleges	19.8	29.8	18.3	6.9	2.3	22.9	131
Institute sector	18.9	35.1	26.2	3.2	2.4	14.1	370
University hospitals	2.5	20.0	12.5	10.0	10.0	45.0	40
Total	17.4	34.0	23.4	4.9	3.6	16.9	985

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers and survey of leaders at research institutions.

Table 7.35 Survey replies: 'In general, when comparing RCN funding schemes with relevant international funding sources (such as the EU framework programme), are the RCN schemes poorer, about the same or better, concerning:' Per cent by sector.

Sector	Better	About the same	Poorer	Cannot say	N
<b>Opportunities offered for doing unique/original research?</b>					
Universities	18.8	28.1	14.4	38.6	409
Specialised university inst.	18.4	22.4	16.3	42.9	49
University colleges	9.4	25.2	10.2	55.1	127
Institute sector	22.7	31.1	16.2	30.0	370
University hospitals	14.9	17.0	4.3	63.8	47
Total	18.9	28.0	14.2	38.9	1002
<b>Opportunities offered for addressing high-risk topics?</b>					
Universities	6.9	23.1	15.1	54.8	403
Specialised university inst.	16.3	12.2	14.3	57.1	49
University colleges	4.9	17.1	11.4	66.7	123
Institute sector	16.5	24.1	17.3	42.0	369
University hospitals	9.3	2.3	14.0	74.4	43
Total	10.8	21.3	15.4	52.5	987
<b>Support for new projects without requiring preliminary research?</b>					
Universities	9.9	26.9	12.8	50.4	405
Specialised university inst.	16.3	20.4	6.1	57.1	49
University colleges	8.8	18.4	11.2	61.6	125
Institute sector	16.5	31.4	14.6	37.4	369
University hospitals	9.1	13.6	2.3	75.0	44
Total	12.5	26.6	12.5	48.4	992
<b>Opportunities offered for doing interdisciplinary research?</b>					
Universities	6.4	35.3	12.3	45.9	405
Specialised university inst.	6.1	36.7	14.3	42.9	49
University colleges	4.8	27.2	12.8	55.2	125
Institute sector	10.1	42.4	12.8	34.8	368
University hospitals	6.8	15.9	6.8	70.5	44
Total	7.6	36.1	12.4	43.9	991
<b>Opportunities offered for broadening your field of expertise?</b>					
Universities	7.7	34.2	12.2	45.9	401
Specialised university inst.	8.2	32.7	16.3	42.9	49
University colleges	9.8	25.2	12.2	52.8	123
Institute sector	13.6	38.2	16.3	32.0	369
University hospitals	2.4	11.9	11.9	73.8	42
Total	10.0	33.5	13.9	42.6	984
<b>Amount of funding?</b>					
Universities	13.8	20.0	22.7	43.5	405
Specialised university inst.	18.4	16.3	18.4	46.9	49
University colleges	11.2	14.4	20.8	53.6	125
Institute sector	27.7	18.2	26.1	28.0	368
University hospitals	11.4	9.1	11.4	68.2	44
Total	18.8	18.0	23.0	40.3	991
<b>Flexibility of use of funds?</b>					
Universities	23.0	21.7	7.9	47.4	405
Specialised university inst.	22.4	22.4	4.1	51.0	49
University colleges	16.9	16.1	10.5	56.5	124
Institute sector	36.7	22.0	9.8	31.5	368
University hospitals	9.3	7.0	7.0	76.7	43
Total	26.7	20.5	8.7	44.1	989
<b>Support for young scientists?</b>					
Universities	14.0	25.2	14.2	46.6	401
Specialised university inst.	10.2	20.4	10.2	59.2	49
University colleges	8.9	19.4	11.3	60.5	124
Institute sector	20.9	29.3	7.9	41.8	368
University hospitals	4.5	11.4	6.8	77.3	44
Total	15.3	25.2	11.0	48.6	986

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers and survey of leaders at research institutions.

Table 7.36 Survey replies: 'In general, when comparing RCN funding schemes with relevant international funding sources (such as the EU framework programme), are the RCN schemes poorer, about the same or better, concerning:' Per cent by sector. (continued)

<b>Impact on the prestige and career of the awarded investigators?</b>					
<b>Sector</b>	<b>Better</b>	<b>About the same</b>	<b>Poorer</b>	<b>Cannot say</b>	<b>N</b>
Universities	4.5	18.6	32.2	44.8	404
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	24.5	28.6	46.9	49
University colleges	8.1	20.2	17.7	54.0	124
Institute sector	6.8	29.0	27.9	36.3	366
University hospitals	2.3	7.0	14.0	76.7	43
Total	5.5	22.4	27.8	44.3	986
<b>Opportunities for building new international scholarly networks?</b>					
Universities	5.5	19.6	32.0	42.9	403
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	24.5	28.6	46.9	49
University colleges	4.9	17.9	21.1	56.1	123
Institute sector	5.7	24.6	35.9	33.8	370
University hospitals	2.3	4.7	18.6	74.4	43
Total	5.1	20.9	31.4	42.7	988

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers and survey of leaders at research institutions.

## B.2 Tables relating to Chapter 3

Table 7.37 Researchers' satisfaction with RCN processes. Percentages.

<b>Considering your experiences the last 3 years, to what extent were the following characteristics of the Research Council of Norway's (RCN) funding processes satisfactory?</b>	<b>5 To a great extent</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1 Not at all</b>	<b>Cannot say/NA</b>	<b>N</b>
Access to relevant background information for the call	17.5	37.8	22.0	8.2	1.8	12.7	622
Clarity and easy to understand information about the call	16.8	36.2	24.4	9.9	1.5	11.3	619
Clarity of the distinction between application types	15.3	30.7	28.4	9.1	2.0	14.5	613
User-friendliness of the online application form	16.0	36.1	22.5	9.9	2.1	13.4	618
Support during the application process	9.1	26.9	21.7	7.7	6.4	28.3	614
Time from application to project startup	9.1	26.6	27.4	10.8	3.8	22.3	613
Fairness of the proposal assessment process	4.7	18.7	24.9	18.0	9.4	24.2	615
Thoroughness of the proposal assessment	5.4	22.0	26.4	16.9	7.7	21.6	610
Transparency regarding funding decisions	4.2	13.4	24.4	21.3	16.4	20.2	614
Clarity and completeness of the feedback to applicants	5.4	21.8	25.9	21.6	9.4	15.8	606
Administrative obligations in the application, reporting and payment processes	10.1	28.5	23.3	6.3	2.6	29.2	606
User-friendliness of the Reporting System	11.3	27.3	19.3	7.4	2.9	31.8	611
The overall cost efficiency of the application process	4.6	20.9	26.4	17.1	10.7	20.4	609

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers. These questions/ items were posed only to researchers who have applied for RCN grants in the period 2003-2011.



Table 7.38 Research institution leaders' satisfaction with RCN processes. Percentages.

Considering your experiences the last 3 years, to what extent were the following characteristics of the Research Council of Norway's (RCN) funding processes satisfactory?	5	4	3	2	1	Cannot say/NA	N
	To a great extent				Not at all		
Access to relevant background information for the call	34.9	38.2	11.8	.7	1.3	13.2	152
Clarity and easy to understand information about the call	27.6	37.5	18.4	2.6	1.3	12.5	152
Clarity of the distinction between application types	21.7	40.8	17.8	5.3		14.5	152
User-friendliness of the online application form	24.5	33.8	19.2	5.3		17.2	151
Support during the application process	21.1	27.6	18.4	6.6	1.3	25.0	152
Time from application to project startup	8.6	30.3	30.3	10.5	.7	19.7	152
Fairness of the proposal assessment process	8.6	21.9	25.2	14.6	7.3	22.5	151
Thoroughness of the proposal assessment	11.4	26.2	31.5	8.1	2.0	20.8	149
Transparency regarding funding decisions	8.6	19.1	22.4	25.7	7.9	16.4	152
Clarity and completeness of the feedback to applicants	11.9	29.8	23.8	16.6	4.0	13.9	151
Administrative obligations in the application, reporting and payment processes	22.4	32.2	20.4	5.9		19.1	152
User-friendliness of the Reporting System	12.5	38.8	20.4	7.2		21.1	152
The overall cost efficiency of the application process	6.0	26.0	24.7	12.0	7.3	24.0	150

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of leaders of Norwegian research institutions.

Table 7.39 FRIPRO applicants' satisfaction with the application and review process. Average of applicants replies (1= Not at all; 5= To a high extent) by result of application.

Considering your FRIPRO applications in general, to what extent were the following RCN (funding) processes satisfactory?	Obtained FRIPRO funding		Total average	N
	Yes	No		
Access to relevant background information for the call (utlysningen)	4.2	3.8	3.9	876
Clarity and easy to understand information about the call (utlysningen)	4.1	3.7	3.8	893
User-friendliness of the online application system	3.8	3.6	3.6	902
Support during the application process	3.7	3.0	3.2	719
The types of applications and size of projects accepted (in the call for applications)	3.5	3.0	3.1	718
The competence of the review committee (fagkomiteen)	3.7	2.9	3.1	733
Transparency regarding funding decisions	3.0	2.3	2.5	829
Clarity and completeness of the feedback to applicants	3.4	2.7	2.9	888
The overall cost efficiency of the application process	3.2	2.4	2.6	769
User-friendliness of the reporting system (framdrifts- og sluttrapporteringsystem)	3.5	3.3	3.4	621

Source: Survey to FRIPRO applicants 2005-2007. (Langfeldt, L, I Ramberg, G Sivertsen, C Bloch and DS Olsen (2012). Evaluation of the Norwegian scheme for independent research projects (FRIPRO). Oslo: NIFU Report 8/2012, page 69.)

Table 7.40 Satisfaction with RCN processes by type of programme. Averages for replies of researchers and leaders at research institutions (1=Not at all; 5=To a high extent).

To what extent were the following characteristics of the RCN funding processes satisfactory?	Large-scale programme	User-directed programme	Basic research programme / FRIPRO	Other RCN funding	Policy-oriented programme	RCN centre scheme funding	Total	N
Access to relevant background information for the call (utlysningen)	3.9	4.0	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	275
Clarity and easy to understand information about the call (utlysningen)	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	275
Clarity of the distinction between application types	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.4	3.8	4.0	3.7	266
User-friendliness of the online application form	3.8	3.9	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.7	275
Support during the application process	3.6	3.6	3.2	3.7	3.6	4.0	3.6	230
Time from application to project startup	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.5	268
Fairness of the proposal assessment process	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	241
Thoroughness of the proposal assessment	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.2	255
Transparency regarding funding decisions	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.9	2.7	261
Clarity and completeness of the feedback to applicants	3.0	3.1	2.9	3.1	2.9	3.4	3.0	268
Administrative obligations in the application, reporting and payment processes	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.6	4.0	3.7	258
User-friendliness of the Reporting System (fremdrifts- og sluttrapporteringsystem)	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.7	265
The overall cost efficiency of the application process	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.2	2.8	3.5	3.1	272

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers and survey of leaders at research institutions. These questions/ items were posed only to researchers who have applied for RCN grants in the period 2003-2011 and to leaders at research institutions. Respondents answering ‘cannot say’ are not included in the calculation.

### B.3 Tables relating to Chapter 4

Table 7.41 RCN Project beneficiaries valuation of project outcome of most recent project funded by the Research Council of Norway which the researcher is able to indicate results.

<b>a) My/my group's overall research capabilities have been significantly improved as a result of the project</b>							
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Not relevant	N
Large-scale programme	55.1	33.3	8.7		1.4	1.4	69
User-directed programme	43.9	39.0	17.1				41
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	50.8	35.4	13.8				65
Other RCN funding	40.5	42.9	7.1	2.4	2.4	4.8	42
Policy-oriented programme	41.4	51.7	3.4	3.4			58
RCN centre scheme funding	42.1	42.1	10.5	5.3			19
Total	46.9	40.1	9.9	1.4	.7	1.0	294
<b>b) My/my group's overall innovation capabilities have been significantly improved as a result of the project</b>							
Large-scale programme	34.3	31.3	23.9	1.5	1.5	7.5	67
User-directed programme	41.5	39.0	19.5				41
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	26.2	32.3	18.5	3.1		20.0	65
Other RCN funding	21.4	45.2	16.7	7.1	2.4	7.1	42
Policy-oriented programme	19.3	45.6	19.3	5.3		10.5	57
RCN centre scheme funding	31.6	42.1	15.8			10.5	19
Total	28.5	38.1	19.6	3.1	.7	10.0	291
<b>c) Research and innovation management skills have been significantly improved as a result of the project</b>							
Large-scale programme	23.5	50.0	17.6	4.4	1.5	2.9	68
User-directed programme	26.8	29.3	36.6	4.9		2.4	41
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	25.0	28.1	28.1	6.3	1.6	10.9	64
Other RCN funding	17.1	48.8	22.0	7.3		4.9	41

Policy-oriented programme	21.1	45.6	24.6	3.5	1.8	3.5	57
RCN centre scheme funding	26.3	36.8	21.1	5.3		10.5	19
Total	23.1	40.3	24.8	5.2	1.0	5.5	290
<b>d) A new research group was established as a result of the project</b>							
Large-scale programme	29.4	27.9	16.2	10.3	5.9	10.3	68
User-directed programme	11.9	14.3	23.8	14.3	28.6	7.1	42
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	26.2	29.2	7.7	6.2	20.0	10.8	65
Other RCN funding	16.7	35.7	19.0	4.8	9.5	14.3	42
Policy-oriented programme	26.3	29.8	15.8	3.5	10.5	14.0	57
RCN centre scheme funding	15.8	21.1	26.3	5.3	15.8	15.8	19
Total	22.9	27.3	16.4	7.5	14.3	11.6	293
<b>e) The project has changed our research activities towards larger collaborative projects</b>							
Large-scale programme	19.1	44.1	17.6	10.3	4.4	4.4	68
User-directed programme	14.3	16.7	42.9	7.1	16.7	2.4	42
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	20.0	27.7	27.7	6.2	10.8	7.7	65
Other RCN funding	14.3	40.5	26.2	2.4	7.1	9.5	42
Policy-oriented programme	17.9	30.4	32.1	10.7	8.9		56
RCN centre scheme funding	22.2	27.8	38.9	5.6	5.6		18
Total	17.9	32.3	28.9	7.6	8.9	4.5	291
<b>d) The project has changed our way of doing research</b>							
Large-scale programme	10.3	27.9	33.8	14.7	7.4	5.9	68
User-directed programme	2.4	19.0	31.0	19.0	26.2	2.4	42
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	10.9	23.4	26.6	17.2	18.8	3.1	64
Other RCN funding	7.1	21.4	40.5	11.9	11.9	7.1	42
Policy-oriented programme	5.3	28.1	43.9	7.0	15.8		57
RCN centre scheme funding	5.6	27.8	33.3	16.7	5.6	11.1	18
Total	7.6	24.7	34.7	14.1	14.8	4.1	291
<b>e) Long term international cooperation links have been considerably extended as a result of the project</b>							
Large-scale programme	27.9	35.3	16.2	13.2	4.4	2.9	68
User-directed programme	26.2	23.8	11.9	14.3	16.7	7.1	42
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	30.8	36.9	20.0	4.6	6.2	1.5	65
Other RCN funding	31.0	28.6	26.2	7.1	2.4	4.8	42
Policy-oriented programme	22.8	36.8	21.1	8.8	10.5		57
RCN centre scheme funding	31.6	31.6	10.5	10.5	10.5	5.3	19
Total	28.0	33.1	18.4	9.6	7.8	3.1	293
<b>f) The project has enabled us to successfully compete for funding from other external national sources</b>							
Large-scale programme	14.7	32.4	17.6	10.3	14.7	10.3	68
User-directed programme	19.5	12.2	39.0	12.2	9.8	7.3	41
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	9.2	30.8	20.0	12.3	9.2	18.5	65
Other RCN funding	14.3	26.2	21.4	9.5	9.5	19.0	42
Policy-oriented programme	16.4	32.7	18.2	7.3	14.5	10.9	55
RCN centre scheme funding	22.2	27.8	16.7	5.6	5.6	22.2	18
Total	14.9	28.0	21.8	10.0	11.4	13.8	289
<b>g) The project has enabled us to successfully compete for international funding (within or outside of the EU Framework Programme)</b>							
	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree or disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Not relevant	N
Large-scale programme	7.4	29.4	22.1	10.3	13.2	17.6	68
User-directed programme	9.8	14.6	41.5	12.2	9.8	12.2	41
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	7.7	24.6	16.9	9.2	15.4	26.2	65
Other RCN funding	9.5	21.4	23.8	7.1	14.3	23.8	42
Policy-oriented programme	9.1	21.8	30.9	10.9	14.5	12.7	55
RCN centre scheme funding	15.8	42.1	15.8	10.5	5.3	10.5	19
Total	9.0	24.5	25.2	10.0	13.1	18.3	290
<b>h) The project led to significantly increased publication output in my unit</b>							
Large-scale programme	29.4	47.1	20.6		1.5	1.5	68
User-directed programme	19.5	51.2	14.6	4.9	4.9	4.9	41
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	26.6	46.9	17.2	4.7	3.1	1.6	64
Other RCN funding	16.7	35.7	23.8	14.3		9.5	42
Policy-oriented programme	23.2	46.4	16.1	12.5		1.8	56
RCN centre scheme funding	36.8	21.1	26.3	10.5		5.3	19
Total	24.8	44.1	19.0	6.9	1.7	3.4	290
<b>i) The project had a positive impact on my research career (new research position/promotion based on research resulting from the project)</b>							
Large-scale programme	26.5	25.0	30.9	7.4	2.9	7.4	68
User-directed programme	17.1	22.0	41.5	4.9	4.9	9.8	41
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	29.2	23.1	26.2	3.1	9.2	9.2	65
Other RCN funding	19.0	33.3	31.0	4.8	4.8	7.1	42
Policy-oriented programme	14.3	37.5	26.8	5.4	7.1	8.9	56
RCN centre scheme funding	27.8	22.2	33.3	16.7			18

Total	22.4	27.6	30.7	5.9	5.5	7.9	290
<b>j) The project has improved our international standing and excellence</b>							
Large-scale programme	27.9	52.9	13.2	2.9	1.5	1.5	68
User-directed programme	31.7	26.8	34.1	7.3			41
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	25.0	40.6	25.0	4.7	3.1	1.6	64
Other RCN funding	19.0	40.5	23.8	7.1	2.4	7.1	42
Policy-oriented programme	16.4	43.6	32.7		3.6	3.6	55
RCN centre scheme funding	26.3	52.6	15.8			5.3	19
Total	24.2	42.9	24.2	3.8	2.1	2.8	289
<b>k) Through the project new research areas of significant importance for our future research/innovation activities have been explored</b>							
Large-scale programme	35.8	41.8	16.4	3.0	1.5	1.5	67
User-directed programme	26.8	43.9	19.5	7.3		2.4	41
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	31.3	50.0	12.5	3.1	1.6	1.6	64
Other RCN funding	26.2	50.0	16.7		2.4	4.8	42
Policy-oriented programme	27.3	41.8	23.6	3.6	1.8	1.8	55
RCN centre scheme funding	27.8	61.1	11.1				18
Total	30.0	46.3	17.1	3.1	1.4	2.1	287
<b>l) The project has led to/contributed to innovation (improved product, process or organisational method)</b>							
Large-scale programme	19.1	29.4	22.1	7.4		22.1	68
User-directed programme	34.1	51.2	12.2	2.4			41
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	7.7	18.5	15.4	3.1	9.2	46.2	65
Other RCN funding	14.3	19.0	33.3	7.1	9.5	16.7	42
Policy-oriented programme	12.5	14.3	28.6	8.9	7.1	28.6	56
RCN centre scheme funding	27.8	44.4	16.7			11.1	18
Total	17.2	26.6	21.7	5.5	4.8	24.1	290
<b>m) The project has contributed to solving social challenges (samfunnsutfordringer)</b>							
Large-scale programme	14.9	38.8	26.9	4.5	1.5	13.4	67
User-directed programme	19.5	24.4	24.4		7.3	24.4	41
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	4.6	32.3	16.9	1.5	13.8	30.8	65
Other RCN funding	9.5	21.4	28.6	7.1	7.1	26.2	42
Policy-oriented programme	8.9	39.3	26.8	5.4	8.9	10.7	56
RCN centre scheme funding	11.1	50.0	16.7		5.6	16.7	18
Total	11.1	33.6	23.9	3.5	7.6	20.4	289

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers. These questions/ items were posed only to researchers who received RCN funding in the period 2003-2011.

Table 7.42 RCN Project beneficiaries valuation of project outcome of most recent project funded by the Research Council of Norway which the researcher is able to indicate results.

<b>15. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements concerning this particular project?</b>								
<b>a) My/my group's overall research capabilities have been significantly improved as a result of the project</b>								
Sector	Fully agree	Partly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Partly disagree	Fully disagree	Not relevant	Total	N
Universities	51.6	32.8	10.2	1.6	1.6	2.3	100.0	128
Specialised univ. instit.	54.5	45.5					100.0	11
University colleges	25.9	48.1	14.8	3.7		7.4	100.0	27
Institute sector	43.9	43.9	8.3	1.3	.6	1.9	100.0	157
University hospitals	66.7		33.3				100.0	3
Total	46.0	39.6	9.5	1.5	.9	2.5	100.0	326
<b>b) My/my group's overall innovation capabilities have been significantly improved as a result of the project</b>								
Universities	31.0	33.3	19.8	3.2	.8	11.9	100.0	126
Specialised univ. instit.	18.2	63.6	18.2				100.0	11
University colleges	11.1	51.9	25.9	3.7		7.4	100.0	27
Institute sector	29.0	35.5	20.6	2.6	.6	11.6	100.0	155
University hospitals	33.3	33.3				33.3	100.0	3
Total	28.0	37.0	20.5	2.8	.6	11.2	100.0	322
<b>c) Research and innovation management skills have been significantly improved as a result of the project</b>								
Universities	19.0	40.5	24.6	3.2	2.4	10.3	100.0	126
Specialised univ. instit.	18.2	54.5	27.3				100.0	11
University colleges	26.9	38.5	15.4	11.5		7.7	100.0	26
Institute sector	24.5	39.4	25.2	5.8	.6	4.5	100.0	155
University hospitals	66.7	33.3					100.0	3
Total	22.7	40.2	24.0	5.0	1.2	6.9	100.0	321
<b>d) A new research group was established as a result of the project</b>								
Universities	25.2	26.0	15.7	5.5	13.4	14.2	100.0	127
Specialised univ. instit.	9.1	45.5	18.2		27.3		100.0	11
University colleges	34.6	19.2	19.2	3.8	3.8	19.2	100.0	26
Institute sector	19.1	29.9	15.3	9.6	14.0	12.1	100.0	157
University hospitals	33.3	33.3			33.3		100.0	3
Total	22.5	28.1	15.7	7.1	13.6	13.0	100.0	324
<b>e) The project has changed our research activities towards larger collaborative projects</b>								
Universities	19.8	41.3	19.0	6.3	6.3	7.1	100.0	126
Specialised univ. instit.	18.2	45.5	18.2	9.1	9.1		100.0	11
University colleges	28.0	20.0	28.0	8.0	4.0	12.0	100.0	25
Institute sector	15.3	26.1	35.7	7.0	11.5	4.5	100.0	157
University hospitals		33.3	66.7				100.0	3
Total	18.0	32.3	28.3	6.8	8.7	5.9	100.0	322
<b>d) The project has changed our way of doing research</b>								
Universities	11.9	22.2	32.5	16.7	11.1	5.6	100.0	126
Specialised univ. instit.	9.1	18.2	36.4	27.3	9.1		100.0	11
University colleges	40.0	32.0	8.0	8.0	12.0		100.0	25
Institute sector	5.1	23.7	37.2	11.5	17.3	5.1	100.0	156
University hospitals		33.3	33.3		33.3		100.0	3
Total	7.5	24.3	34.9	13.7	14.0	5.6	100.0	321
<b>e) Long term international cooperation links have been considerably extended as a result of the project</b>								
Universities	33.1	37.8	15.7	4.7	3.9	4.7	100.0	127
Specialised univ. instit.	18.2	45.5	27.3		9.1		100.0	11
University colleges	20.0	28.0	12.0	16.0	16.0	8.0	100.0	25
Institute sector	25.6	29.5	19.9	12.2	9.0	3.8	100.0	156
University hospitals		66.7				33.3	100.0	3
Total	27.6	33.5	17.7	9.0	7.5	4.7	100.0	322
<b>f) The project has enabled us to successfully compete for funding from other external national sources</b>								
Universities	13.5	29.4	19.8	7.9	11.9	17.5	100.0	126
Specialised univ. instit.	18.2	18.2	45.5	9.1		9.1	100.0	11
University colleges	8.3	37.5	8.3	12.5	12.5	20.8	100.0	24
Institute sector	15.9	26.8	24.8	10.8	8.9	12.7	100.0	157
University hospitals	33.3				33.3	33.3	100.0	3
Total	14.6	28.0	22.1	9.7	10.3	15.3	100.0	321
<b>g) The project has enabled us to successfully compete for international funding (within or outside of the EU Framework Programme)</b>								
Universities	8.7	21.4	25.4	8.7	14.3	21.4	100.0	126
Specialised univ. instit.	9.1	36.4	36.4		9.1	9.1	100.0	11
University colleges	24.0	20.0	12.0	16.0	28.0		100.0	25
Institute sector	10.9	25.6	25.0	10.3	10.9	17.3	100.0	156
University hospitals			33.3	33.3		33.3	100.0	3

Total	9.0	24.0	25.2	9.7	12.5	19.6	100.0	321
<b>h) The project led to significantly increased publication output in my unit</b>								
Universities	27.8	42.1	19.0	5.6	2.4	3.2	100.0	126
Specialised univ. instit.	18.2	72.7		9.1			100.0	11
University colleges	26.9	42.3	15.4	3.8		11.5	100.0	26
Institute sector	20.6	43.9	19.4	8.4	2.6	5.2	100.0	155
University hospitals	66.7		33.3				100.0	3
Total	24.3	43.6	18.4	6.9	2.2	4.7	100.0	321
<b>i) The project had a positive impact on my research career (new research position/promotion based on research resulting from the project)</b>								
Universities	23.0	27.8	31.7	4.0	6.3	7.1	100.0	126
Specialised univ. instit.	36.4	9.1	36.4	18.2			100.0	11
University colleges	20.0	24.0	36.0		8.0	12.0	100.0	25
Institute sector	21.2	27.6	28.8	7.1	4.5	10.9	100.0	156
University hospitals	66.7	33.3					100.0	3
Total	22.7	26.8	30.5	5.6	5.3	9.0	100.0	321
<b>j) The project has improved our international standing and excellence</b>								
Universities	24.8	44.8	21.6	3.2	1.6	4.0	100.0	125
Specialised univ. instit.	27.3	36.4	27.3	9.1			100.0	11
University colleges	11.5	50.0	26.9	3.8		7.7	100.0	26
Institute sector	24.7	40.3	24.7	3.2	3.2	3.9	100.0	154
University hospitals	33.3	33.3	33.3				100.0	3
Total	23.8	42.6	23.8	3.4	2.2	4.1	100.0	319
<b>k) Through the project new research areas of significant importance for our future research/innovation activities have been explored</b>								
Universities	28.2	50.8	12.9	3.2	1.6	3.2	100.0	124
Specialised univ. instit.	18.2	72.7	9.1				100.0	11
University colleges	20.8	37.5	29.2	4.2		8.3	100.0	24
Institute sector	33.5	40.6	17.4	3.2	1.9	3.2	100.0	155
University hospitals	33.3	66.7					100.0	3
Total	30.0	45.7	16.1	3.2	1.6	3.5	100.0	317
<b>l) The project has led to/contributed to innovation (improved product, process or organisational method)</b>								
Universities	9.5	23.0	27.0	5.6	4.0	31.0	100.0	126
Specialised univ. instit.	18.2	27.3	27.3	9.1		18.2	100.0	11
University colleges	12.0	20.0	36.0	8.0	4.0	20.0	100.0	25
Institute sector	22.4	29.5	16.7	5.8	5.1	20.5	100.0	156
University hospitals	33.3					66.7	100.0	3
Total	16.5	25.9	22.4	5.9	4.4	24.9	100.0	321
<b>m) The project has contributed to solving social challenges (samfunnsutfordringer)</b>								
Universities	8.7	29.4	26.2	4.8	4.8	26.2	100.0	126
Specialised univ. instit.	18.2	18.2	27.3		36.4		100.0	11
University colleges	4.0	40.0	32.0	8.0		16.0	100.0	25
Institute sector	13.6	33.8	20.1	3.2	7.8	21.4	100.0	154
University hospitals	33.3	33.3				33.3	100.0	3
Total	11.3	32.0	23.5	4.1	6.9	22.3	100.0	319

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers. These questions/ items were posed only to researchers who were awarded RCN grants in the period 2003-2011.

Table 7.43 RCN project characteristics compared to other projects. RCN project beneficiaries' valuation. Per cent by type of RCN project.

<b>Please compare the nature of this particular project funded by the Research Council of Norway (RCN) with your other R&amp;D projects/research not funded by RCN and indicate which projects...</b>				
	<b>The RCN project</b>	<b>No difference</b>	<b>My other projects</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>are most strategically important to your organisation?</b>				
Large-scale programme	61.2	25.4	13.4	67
User-directed programme	46.3	36.6	17.1	41
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	45.3	32.8	21.9	64
Other RCN funding	41.0	46.2	12.8	39
Policy-oriented programme	51.9	33.3	14.8	54
RCN centre scheme funding	61.1	22.2	16.7	18
Total	50.9	32.9	16.3	283
<b>are most oriented towards basic research?</b>				
Large-scale programme	60.6	25.8	13.6	66
User-directed programme	47.5	25.0	27.5	40
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	60.9	29.7	9.4	64
Other RCN funding	28.9	60.5	10.5	38
Policy-oriented programme	50.0	33.3	16.7	54
RCN centre scheme funding	50.0	33.3	16.7	18
Total	51.8	33.2	15.0	280
<b>provide most new scientific results?</b>				
Large-scale programme	64.6	21.5	13.8	65
User-directed programme	50.0	25.0	25.0	40
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	50.0	37.5	12.5	64
Other RCN funding	28.9	60.5	10.5	38
Policy-oriented programme	38.9	48.1	13.0	54
RCN centre scheme funding	57.9	26.3	15.8	19
Total	48.9	36.4	14.6	280
<b>are most scientifically/technologically risky?</b>				
Large-scale programme	32.8	51.6	15.6	64
User-directed programme	32.5	45.0	22.5	40
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	29.0	53.2	17.7	62
Other RCN funding	18.4	76.3	5.3	38
Policy-oriented programme	24.5	66.0	9.4	53
RCN centre scheme funding	44.4	50.0	5.6	18
Total	29.1	57.1	13.8	275
<b>have the highest scientific quality?</b>				
Large-scale programme	52.3	33.8	13.8	65
User-directed programme	45.0	40.0	15.0	40
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	40.6	51.6	7.8	64
Other RCN funding	21.1	65.8	13.2	38
Policy-oriented programme	50.9	41.5	7.5	53
RCN centre scheme funding	66.7	22.2	11.1	18
Total	45.0	43.9	11.2	278
<b>are most long-term?</b>				
Large-scale programme	50.8	27.7	21.5	65
User-directed programme	52.5	20.0	27.5	40
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	50.8	36.5	12.7	63
Other RCN funding	26.3	44.7	28.9	38
Policy-oriented programme	46.3	24.1	29.6	54
RCN centre scheme funding	88.9		11.1	18
Total	49.3	28.4	22.3	278
<b>are most multidisciplinary?</b>				
Large-scale programme	36.9	46.2	16.9	65
User-directed programme	37.5	35.0	27.5	40
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	29.7	53.1	17.2	64
Other RCN funding	27.0	59.5	13.5	37
Policy-oriented programme	42.6	44.4	13.0	54
RCN centre scheme funding	61.1	27.8	11.1	18
Total	36.7	46.4	16.9	278
<b>are most internationally oriented?</b>				
Large-scale programme	38.5	40.0	21.5	65
User-directed programme	43.6	28.2	28.2	39
Basic research programme /FRIPRO	42.2	35.9	21.9	64
Other RCN funding	39.5	50.0	10.5	38
Policy-oriented programme	42.6	37.0	20.4	54
RCN centre scheme funding	52.6	31.6	15.8	19
Total	41.9	37.6	20.4	279

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers. These questions/ items were posed only to researchers who were awarded RCN grants in the period 2003-2011.

Table 7.44 RCN project characteristics compared to other projects. RCN project beneficiaries' valuation. Per cent by Sector.

<b>Please compare the nature of this particular project funded by the Research Council of Norway (RCN) with your other R&amp;D projects/research not funded by RCN and indicate which projects...</b>					
	The RCN project	No difference	My other projects	Total	N
<b>...which projects are most strategically important to your organisation?</b>					
Universities	55.4	33.9	10.7	100.0	121
Specialised university institutions	45.5	45.5	9.1	100.0	11
University colleges	58.3	37.5	4.2	100.0	24
Institute sector	46.1	33.8	20.1	100.0	154
University hospitals	66.7		33.3	100.0	3
Total	50.8	34.2	15.0	100.0	313
<b>...which projects are most oriented towards basic research?</b>					
Universities	44.9	40.7	14.4	100.0	118
Specialised university institutions	54.5	36.4	9.1	100.0	11
University colleges	30.4	52.2	17.4	100.0	23
Institute sector	59.2	25.7	15.1	100.0	152
University hospitals	66.7	33.3		100.0	3
Total	51.5	33.9	14.7	100.0	307
<b>...which projects provide most new scientific results?</b>					
Universities	43.6	45.3	11.1	100.0	117
Specialised university institutions	63.6	36.4		100.0	11
University colleges	44.0	44.0	12.0	100.0	25
Institute sector	52.9	28.8	18.3	100.0	153
University hospitals	33.3	66.7		100.0	3
Total	48.9	36.9	14.2	100.0	309
<b>...which projects are most scientifically/technologically risky?</b>					
Universities	23.5	66.1	10.4	100.0	115
Specialised university institutions	27.3	72.7		100.0	11
University colleges	16.7	66.7	16.7	100.0	24
Institute sector	33.8	50.0	16.2	100.0	148
University hospitals		66.7	33.3	100.0	3
Total	27.9	58.5	13.6	100.0	301
<b>...which projects have the highest scientific quality?</b>					
Universities	38.8	50.9	10.3	100.0	116
Specialised university institutions	36.4	63.6		100.0	11
University colleges	43.5	43.5	13.0	100.0	23
Institute sector	49.3	38.2	12.5	100.0	152
University hospitals	33.3	66.7		100.0	3
Total	44.3	44.6	11.1	100.0	305
<b>...which projects are most long-term?</b>					
Universities	38.8	40.5	20.7	100.0	116
Specialised university institutions	45.5	45.5	9.1	100.0	11
University colleges	43.5	26.1	30.4	100.0	23
Institute sector	56.9	20.3	22.9	100.0	153
University hospitals	66.7	33.3		100.0	3
Total	48.7	29.4	21.9	100.0	306
<b>...which projects are most multidisciplinary?</b>					
Universities	29.3	50.9	19.8	100.0	116
Specialised university institutions	45.5	45.5	9.1	100.0	11
University colleges	62.5	33.3	4.2	100.0	24
Institute sector	36.2	45.4	18.4	100.0	152
University hospitals	33.3	33.3	33.3	100.0	3
Total	35.9	46.4	17.6	100.0	306
<b>...which projects are most internationally oriented?</b>					
Universities	37.6	45.3	17.1	100.0	117
Specialised university institutions	36.4	63.6		100.0	11
University colleges	43.5	34.8	21.7	100.0	23
Institute sector	44.1	33.6	22.4	100.0	152
University hospitals	66.7	33.3		100.0	3
Total	41.5	39.2	19.3	100.0	306

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers. These questions/ items were posed only to researchers who were awarded RCN grants in the period 2003-2011.



## B.4 Tables relating to Chapter 5

Table 7.45 'To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the Research Council's (RCN) support for the internationalisation of research?' Percentages.

Sector	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Cannot say	N
<b>a) RCN provide adequate support for international research collaboration</b>							
Universities	7.5	25.8	19.4	11.3	3.8	32.3	372
Specialised university inst.	4.3	34.8	13.0	6.5	4.3	37.0	46
University colleges	6.1	19.1	15.7	9.6	2.6	47.0	115
Institute sector	11.1	26.6	20.2	15.8	4.4	21.9	342
University hospitals	4.5	4.5	9.1	6.8	4.5	70.5	44
Total	8.4	24.7	18.4	12.3	3.9	32.3	919
<b>b) RCN provide adequate support for international mobility</b>							
Universities	7.0	26.2	17.6	12.2	4.9	32.2	370
Specialised university inst.	6.5	32.6	26.1	4.3	2.2	28.3	46
University colleges	7.1	17.7	20.4	6.2	2.7	46.0	113
Institute sector	8.2	29.3	17.6	12.6	2.9	29.3	341
University hospitals	7.1	2.4	11.9	2.4	2.4	73.8	42
Total	7.5	25.5	18.1	10.7	3.6	34.5	912
<b>c) RCN support for international mobility helps the career development of individual researchers</b>							
Universities	12.5	26.6	17.4	6.0	3.5	34.0	368
Specialised university inst.	13.0	26.1	19.6	4.3	4.3	32.6	46
University colleges	8.0	17.0	19.6	5.4	1.8	48.2	112
Institute sector	14.2	27.7	18.9	7.1	2.1	30.1	339
University hospitals	9.5	7.1	9.5	.0	4.8	69.0	42
Total	12.5	24.9	18.0	6.0	2.9	35.8	907
<b>d) RCN schemes are useful in terms of attracting foreign talent to Norway</b>							
Universities	8.7	18.3	23.2	6.8	4.6	38.4	367
Specialised university inst.	2.2	13.0	30.4	2.2	8.7	43.5	46
University colleges	7.8	8.7	21.7	7.0	.9	53.9	115
Institute sector	9.4	27.6	18.2	6.5	2.6	35.6	340
University hospitals	4.8	4.8	2.4	7.1	2.4	78.6	42
Total	8.4	19.7	20.5	6.5	3.5	41.4	910
<b>e) RCN provide adequate support for access to, and coordination of, international research infrastructures</b>							
Universities	4.7	14.0	22.2	6.6	3.8	48.8	365
Specialised university inst.	2.2	23.9	19.6	13.0	2.2	39.1	46
University colleges	3.5	7.9	26.3	7.0	1.8	53.5	114
Institute sector	3.3	19.1	25.1	12.2	3.3	37.0	335
University hospitals	4.8	4.8	7.1	2.4	4.8	76.2	42
Total	3.9	15.2	22.9	8.9	3.3	45.8	902
<b>f) Information on how various RCN schemes may be used for internationalisation purposes is easily accessible</b>							
Universities	2.8	14.6	22.6	12.9	5.0	42.1	363
Specialised university inst.	.0	15.6	26.7	6.7	13.3	37.8	45
University colleges	2.7	11.5	23.9	8.8	3.5	49.6	113
Institute sector	4.2	12.6	27.5	17.4	4.5	33.8	334
University hospitals	.0	7.1	2.4	11.9	2.4	76.2	42
Total	3.0	13.2	23.9	13.7	4.9	41.4	897
<b>g) The RCN support schemes for international research collaboration are not adequate for my needs</b>							
Universities	4.9	12.1	22.8	12.9	5.8	41.5	364
Specialised university inst.	4.3	15.2	19.6	17.4	6.5	37.0	46
University colleges	7.1	10.7	17.9	8.9	3.6	51.8	112
Institute sector	7.5	23.6	20.9	10.7	5.1	32.2	335
University hospitals	2.4	12.2	7.3	.0	4.9	73.2	41
Total	6.0	16.4	20.6	11.2	5.2	40.5	898
<b>h) The RCN support for collaboration with partners outside the EU is inadequate</b>							
Universities	5.8	11.3	19.3	9.7	3.9	50.0	362
Specialised university inst.	6.5	6.5	26.1	13.0	4.3	43.5	46
University colleges	4.5	8.1	19.8	3.6	2.7	61.3	111
Institute sector	6.9	20.4	19.2	7.5	4.5	41.4	333
University hospitals	2.4	7.1	2.4	.0	4.8	83.3	42
Total	5.9	13.9	18.9	7.8	4.0	49.4	894
<b>i) RCN internationalisation policies support research excellence in Norway</b>							
Universities	5.5	21.5	21.8	6.9	2.8	41.4	362
Specialised university inst.	6.5	19.6	23.9	6.5	8.7	34.8	46
University colleges	3.6	17.1	18.9	5.4	3.6	51.4	111
Institute sector	8.1	20.7	24.6	8.1	1.8	36.6	333
University hospitals	.0	4.8	4.8	.0	4.8	85.7	42
Total	6.0	19.8	21.8	6.8	2.9	42.6	894

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers and survey of leaders at research institutions.

Table 7.46 'Thinking about Norway, and your unit in particular, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the internationalisation of research?' Percentages.

Sector	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Cannot say	N
<b>a) International activities weaken domestic cooperation</b>							
Universities	1.3	10.1	12.7	24.3	44.2	7.5	387
Specialised university inst.	.0	10.4	12.5	25.0	52.1	.0	48
University colleges	2.5	6.6	12.4	27.3	41.3	9.9	121
Institute sector	2.3	14.0	13.4	21.9	42.7	5.7	351
University hospitals	2.0	6.1	6.1	22.4	46.9	16.3	49
Total	1.8	10.9	12.6	23.7	43.8	7.2	956
<b>b) The future success of Norwegian research rests on the ability to attract foreign talent to Norway</b>							
Universities	14.1	42.9	17.5	15.9	4.1	5.4	389
Specialised university inst.	25.0	29.2	27.1	12.5	4.2	2.1	48
University colleges	16.0	36.1	21.0	16.0	2.5	8.4	119
Institute sector	15.5	35.6	24.7	17.8	2.6	3.7	348
University hospitals	17.0	31.9	19.1	19.1	2.1	10.6	47
Total	15.6	38.2	21.1	16.6	3.3	5.3	951
<b>c) The future success of Norwegian research rests on the ability to keep highly skilled people from leaving Norway</b>							
Universities	20.3	48.3	15.4	7.7	2.8	5.4	389
Specialised university inst.	27.1	31.3	14.6	22.9	2.1	2.1	48
University colleges	13.9	45.9	16.4	11.5	4.1	8.2	122
Institute sector	17.7	40.6	18.6	14.6	4.9	3.7	350
University hospitals	21.3	53.2	8.5	4.3	2.1	10.6	47
Total	18.9	44.6	16.3	11.3	3.7	5.2	956
<b>d) Overall, the costs of international activities outweigh the benefits</b>							
Universities	7.5	10.3	12.7	23.5	34.4	11.6	387
Specialised university inst.	2.1	25.0	14.6	20.8	31.3	6.3	48
University colleges	4.1	19.0	21.5	26.4	19.0	9.9	121
Institute sector	8.3	12.9	19.8	19.5	30.7	8.9	349
University hospitals	10.6	10.6	21.3	19.1	21.3	17.0	47
Total	7.2	13.1	16.9	22.1	30.3	10.4	952
<b>e) Norway's participation in the EU framework programme is very important for the internationalisation of Norwegian research</b>							
Universities	28.6	31.4	16.2	7.2	3.4	13.1	388
Specialised university inst.	16.7	43.8	22.9	4.2	.0	12.5	48
University colleges	27.3	37.2	11.6	9.1	.8	14.0	121
Institute sector	36.2	30.5	12.9	9.5	2.0	8.9	348
University hospitals	28.3	39.1	6.5	2.2	2.2	21.7	46
Total	30.6	32.8	14.3	7.9	2.3	12.1	951

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of Norwegian researchers and survey of leaders at research institutions.

## B.5 Tables relating to Chapter 6

Table 7.47 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (I). Research institution leaders' opinions. By sector. Percentages.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
<b>The 2010 reorganisation of RCN divisions has improved the Council's efficiency and effectiveness</b>							
Universities	6.1	6.1	33.3	0.0	0.0	54.5	33
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	14.3	28.6	0.0	0.0	57.1	7
University colleges	2.1	8.5	14.9	4.3	0.0	70.2	47
Institute sector	4.3	17.4	30.4	5.8	0.0	42.0	69
Total	3.8	12.2	26.3	3.8	0.0	53.8	156
<b>The quality and 'leanness' of the RCN funding processes is in line with international good practice</b>							
Universities	27.3	24.2	15.2	15.2	0.0	18.2	33
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	71.4	14.3	0.0	0.0	14.3	7
University colleges	17.0	19.1	23.4	2.1	2.1	36.2	47
Institute sector	16.4	31.3	23.9	9.0	4.5	14.9	67
Total	18.2	27.9	21.4	7.8	2.6	22.1	154
<b>There is an appropriate balance between 'free' and programmed resources in the RCN instrument portfolio</b>							
Universities	3.0	9.1	15.2	42.4	30.3	0.0	33
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	0.0	14.3	57.1	28.6	0.0	7
University colleges	10.4	18.8	16.7	12.5	12.5	29.2	48
Institute sector	13.0	20.3	14.5	31.9	11.6	8.7	69
Total	9.6	16.6	15.3	29.3	16.6	12.7	157
<b>The volume of funding associated with each instrument is adequate for the need it is intended to address</b>							
Universities	0.0	6.1	12.1	39.4	33.3	9.1	33
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	16.7	16.7	16.7	50.0	0.0	6
University colleges	2.1	10.6	14.9	21.3	10.6	40.4	47
Institute sector	0.0	14.5	11.6	37.7	23.2	13.0	69
Total	0.6	11.6	12.9	32.3	22.6	20.0	155
<b>RCN ensures gender equality in research funding</b>							
Universities	27.3	30.3	18.2	3.0	6.1	15.2	33
Special. univ.inst.	33.3	33.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	6
University colleges	8.5	12.8	23.4	10.6	2.1	42.6	47
Institute sector	26.1	26.1	31.9	1.4	2.9	11.6	69
Total	21.3	23.2	25.8	4.5	3.2	21.9	155
<b>RCN strategies are effective in anticipating changes in science priorities or dynamics</b>							
Universities	6.1	24.2	36.4	21.2	0.0	12.1	33
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	42.9	28.6	28.6	0.0	0.0	7
University colleges	2.1	8.5	36.2	8.5	6.4	38.3	47
Institute sector	5.8	27.5	33.3	17.4	1.4	14.5	69
Total	4.5	21.8	34.6	16.0	2.6	20.5	156
<b>RCN funding mechanisms are sufficiently flexible to accommodate changes in science priorities or dynamics</b>							
Universities	3.0	39.4	27.3	18.2	9.1	3.0	33
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	14.3	28.6	42.9	14.3	0.0	7
University colleges	0.0	21.3	29.8	12.8	0.0	36.2	47
Institute sector	7.2	29.0	23.2	24.6	4.3	11.6	69
Total	3.8	28.2	26.3	20.5	4.5	16.7	156
<b>RCN strategies and funding mechanisms ensure that Norway is able to fund research in disruptive technologies</b>							
Universities	0.0	12.1	27.3	21.2	6.1	33.3	33
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	0.0	14.3	28.6	14.3	42.9	7
University colleges	0.0	4.3	36.2	8.5	4.3	46.8	47
Institute sector	7.2	18.8	21.7	18.8	4.3	29.0	69
Total	3.2	12.2	26.9	16.7	5.1	35.9	156

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of leaders at research institutions.

Table 7.48 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). Research institution leaders' opinions. By research area. Percentages.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
<b>The 2010 reorganisation of RCN divisions has improved the Council's efficiency and effectiveness</b>							
Humanities	10.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	10
Natural sciences	0.0	16.7	16.7	16.7	0.0	50.0	6
Medical sciences	0.0	20.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	10
Social sciences	3.1	12.5	25.0	6.3	0.0	53.1	32
Engineering sciences	0.0	16.7	25.0	8.3	0.0	50.0	12
Agriculture and fishery	0.0	12.5	62.5	12.5	0.0	12.5	8
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	5.3	10.5	21.1	1.3	0.0	61.8	76
Total	3.9	11.7	26.6	3.9	0.0	53.9	154
<b>The quality and 'leanness' of the RCN funding processes is in line with international good practice</b>							

Humanities	0.0	40.0	10.0	30.0	0.0	20.0	10
Natural sciences	16.7	0.0	33.3	16.7	16.7	16.7	6
Medical sciences	10.0	40.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10
Social sciences	16.7	30.0	20.0	3.3	3.3	26.7	30
Engineering sciences	8.3	41.7	8.3	8.3	0.0	33.3	12
Agriculture and fishery	25.0	37.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	8
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	23.7	23.7	19.7	7.9	2.6	22.4	76
Total	18.4	28.3	21.1	7.9	2.6	21.7	152
<b>There is an appropriate balance between 'free' and programmed resources in the RCN instrument portfolio</b>							
Humanities	0.0	10.0	10.0	50.0	30.0	0.0	10
Natural sciences	0.0	16.7	0.0	50.0	16.7	16.7	6
Medical sciences	0.0	10.0	30.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	10
Social sciences	6.3	6.3	21.9	40.6	15.6	9.4	32
Engineering sciences	25.0	25.0	16.7	8.3	0.0	25.0	12
Agriculture and fishery	0.0	37.5	12.5	50.0	0.0	0.0	8
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	13.0	19.5	13.0	23.4	15.6	15.6	77
Total	9.7	16.8	15.5	29.7	16.1	12.3	155
<b>The volume of funding associated with each instrument is adequate for the need it is intended to address</b>							
Humanities	0.0	11.1	22.2	22.2	44.4	0.0	9
Natural sciences	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	16.7	33.3	6
Medical sciences	0.0	10.0	10.0	30.0	40.0	10.0	10
Social sciences	0.0	9.4	15.6	43.8	12.5	18.8	32
Engineering sciences	0.0	33.3	8.3	8.3	25.0	25.0	12
Agriculture and fishery	0.0	12.5	12.5	37.5	37.5	0.0	8
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	1.3	10.5	13.2	31.6	19.7	23.7	76
Total	0.7	11.8	13.1	32.7	22.2	19.6	153
<b>RCN ensures gender equality in research funding</b>							
Humanities	44.4	11.1	33.3	11.1	0.0	0.0	9
Natural sciences	16.7	16.7	16.7	0.0	0.0	50.0	6
Medical sciences	30.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	10.0	10
Social sciences	18.8	31.3	37.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	32
Engineering sciences	25.0	8.3	41.7	0.0	8.3	16.7	12
Agriculture and fishery	25.0	12.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	25.0	8
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	18.4	26.3	18.4	5.3	5.3	26.3	76
Total	21.6	23.5	26.1	4.6	3.3	20.9	153
<b>RCN strategies are effective in anticipating changes in science priorities or dynamics</b>							
Humanities	0.0	10.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	10
Natural sciences	0.0	33.3	16.7	16.7	0.0	33.3	6
Medical sciences	0.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	10.0	0.0	10
Social sciences	6.3	18.8	37.5	18.8	0.0	18.8	32
Engineering sciences	16.7	16.7	41.7	8.3	0.0	16.7	12
Agriculture and fishery	0.0	37.5	50.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	8
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	3.9	22.4	30.3	17.1	3.9	22.4	76
Total	4.5	22.1	35.1	16.2	2.6	19.5	154
<b>RCN funding mechanisms are sufficiently flexible to accommodate changes in science priorities or dynamics</b>							
Humanities	0.0	10.0	30.0	20.0	10.0	30.0	10
Natural sciences	0.0	16.7	33.3	0.0	33.3	16.7	6
Medical sciences	0.0	30.0	50.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	10
Social sciences	0.0	28.1	28.1	31.3	0.0	12.5	32
Engineering sciences	25.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	8.3	16.7	12
Agriculture and fishery	0.0	37.5	25.0	25.0	0.0	12.5	8
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	3.9	31.6	22.4	22.4	2.6	17.1	76
Total	3.9	28.6	26.6	20.8	4.5	15.6	154
<b>RCN strategies and funding mechanisms ensure that Norway is able to fund research in disruptive technologies</b>							
Humanities	0.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	40.0	10
Natural sciences	0.0	33.3	0.0	50.0	0.0	16.7	6
Medical sciences	0.0	10.0	50.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	10
Social sciences	0.0	9.4	25.0	21.9	0.0	43.8	32
Engineering sciences	25.0	8.3	33.3	8.3	8.3	16.7	12
Agriculture and fishery	0.0	25.0	37.5	37.5	0.0	0.0	8
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	2.6	10.5	26.3	11.8	6.6	42.1	76
Total	3.2	11.7	27.3	16.9	5.2	35.7	154

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of leaders at research institutions.

Table 7.49 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). Research institution leaders' opinions. By most important RCN Division. Percentages.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
<b>The 2010 reorganisation of RCN divisions has improved the Council's efficiency and effectiveness</b>							
Division for Innovation	4.0	16.0	52.0	16.0	0.0	12.0	25
Division for Science	2.2	17.8	22.2	2.2	0.0	55.6	45
Division for Strategic Priorities	3.8	9.6	25.0	1.9	0.0	59.6	52
Don't know/NA	6.9	3.4	13.8	0.0	0.0	75.9	29
Total	4.0	11.9	26.5	4.0	0.0	53.6	151
<b>The quality and 'leanness' of the RCN funding processes is in line with international good practice</b>							
Division for Innovation	24.0	40.0	20.0	4.0	8.0	4.0	25
Division for Science	18.2	20.5	18.2	20.5	0.0	22.7	44
Division for Strategic Priorities	15.7	35.3	27.5	3.9	2.0	15.7	51
Don't know/NA	20.7	13.8	20.7	0.0	0.0	44.8	29
Total	18.8	27.5	22.1	8.1	2.0	21.5	149
<b>There is an appropriate balance between 'free' and programmed resources in the RCN instrument portfolio</b>							
Division for Innovation	4.0	24.0	24.0	36.0	8.0	4.0	25
Division for Science	8.9	4.4	15.6	40.0	24.4	6.7	45
Division for Strategic Priorities	17.0	22.6	13.2	20.8	17.0	9.4	53
Don't know/NA	3.4	17.2	13.8	24.1	6.9	34.5	29
Total	9.9	16.4	15.8	29.6	15.8	12.5	152
<b>The volume of funding associated with each instrument is adequate for the need it is intended to address</b>							
Division for Innovation	0.0	16.0	4.0	44.0	24.0	12.0	25
Division for Science	0.0	8.9	15.6	31.1	26.7	17.8	45
Division for Strategic Priorities	1.9	13.5	15.4	28.8	26.9	13.5	52
Don't know/NA	0.0	6.9	13.8	31.0	6.9	41.4	29
Total	0.7	11.3	13.2	32.5	22.5	19.9	151
<b>RCN ensures gender equality in research funding</b>							
Division for Innovation	28.0	16.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	16.0	25
Division for Science	28.9	28.9	20.0	4.4	4.4	13.3	45
Division for Strategic Priorities	25.0	21.2	26.9	3.8	3.8	19.2	52
Don't know/NA	0.0	24.1	24.1	10.3	0.0	41.4	29
Total	21.9	23.2	26.5	4.6	2.6	21.2	151
<b>RCN strategies are effective in anticipating changes in science priorities or dynamics</b>							
Division for Innovation	8.0	16.0	40.0	20.0	4.0	12.0	25
Division for Science	2.2	20.0	42.2	20.0	2.2	13.3	45
Division for Strategic Priorities	5.8	26.9	26.9	19.2	1.9	19.2	52
Don't know/NA	3.4	20.7	31.0	0.0	3.4	41.4	29
Total	4.6	21.9	34.4	15.9	2.6	20.5	151
<b>RCN funding mechanisms are sufficiently flexible to accommodate changes in science priorities or dynamics</b>							
Division for Innovation	8.0	32.0	24.0	24.0	8.0	4.0	25
Division for Science	0.0	33.3	24.4	24.4	6.7	11.1	45
Division for Strategic Priorities	5.8	28.8	28.8	19.2	1.9	15.4	52
Don't know/NA	3.4	17.2	31.0	13.8	0.0	34.5	29
Total	4.0	28.5	27.2	20.5	4.0	15.9	151
<b>RCN strategies and funding mechanisms ensure that Norway is able to fund research in disruptive technologies</b>							
Division for Innovation	8.0	20.0	24.0	28.0	8.0	12.0	25
Division for Science	0.0	15.6	26.7	11.1	6.7	40.0	45
Division for Strategic Priorities	5.8	9.6	30.8	13.5	3.8	36.5	52
Don't know/NA	0.0	6.9	27.6	17.2	3.4	44.8	29
Total	3.3	12.6	27.8	15.9	5.3	35.1	151

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of leaders at research institutions.

Table 7.50 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). Research institution leaders' opinions. By most participation in RCN Boards. Percentages.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
<b>The 2010 reorganisation of RCN divisions has improved the Council's efficiency and effectiveness</b>							
Member of Boards	3.0	12.8	25.6	4.5	0.0	54.1	133
Not member	10.0	10.0	30.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	20
Missing	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	3
<b>The quality and 'leanness' of the RCN funding processes is in line with international good practice</b>							
Member of Boards	18.3	26.0	22.9	7.6	0.0	22.1	131
Not member	20.0	4.0	15.0	10.0	0.0	15.0	20
Missing	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	3
<b>There is an appropriate balance between 'free' and programmed resources in the RCN instrument portfolio</b>							
Member of Boards	9.0	16.4	15.7	29.1	16.4	13.4	134
Not member	15.0	20.0	15.0	35.0	15.0	0.0	20.0
Missing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	3
<b>The volume of funding associated with each instrument is adequate for the need it is intended to address</b>							
Member of Boards	0.8	10.5	13.5	31.6	23.3	20.3	133
Not member	0.0	21.1	10.5	36.8	21.1	10.5	19
Missing	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	3
<b>RCN ensures gender equality in research funding</b>							
Member of Boards	21.1	22.6	25.6	4.5	3.0	23.3	133
Not member	26.3	26.3	26.3	5.3	5.3	10.5	19
Missing	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	3
<b>RCN strategies are effective in anticipating changes in science priorities or dynamics</b>							
Member of Boards	4.5	19.5	35.3	16.5	3.0	21.1	133
Not member	5.0	40.0	35.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	20
Missing	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	3
<b>RCN funding mechanisms are sufficiently flexible to accommodate changes in science priorities or dynamics</b>							
Member of Boards	3.8	27.8	27.8	18.8	5.3	16.5	133
Not member	5.0	35.0	20.0	30.0	0.0	10.0	20
Missing	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	3
<b>RCN strategies and funding mechanisms ensure that Norway is able to fund research in disruptive technologies</b>							
Member of Boards	3.8	12.8	27.8	15.8	6.0	33.8	133
Not member	0.0	10.0	25.0	20.0	0.0	45.0	20
Missing	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	3

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of leaders at research institutions.

Table 7.51 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). By sector. Percentages.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
<b>RCN funds the best research</b>							
Universities	4.1	34.9	23.9	18.4	4.3	14.5	490
Special. univ.inst.	3.6	23.6	18.2	27.3	12.7	14.5	55
University colleges	4.3	28.6	20.0	21.4	5.0	20.7	140
Institute sector	5.2	36.8	26.4	15.1	4.2	12.3	405
University hospitals	5.6	24.1	20.4	9.3	3.7	37.0	54
Trade and industry	11.3	41.5	18.5	11.3	2.1	15.4	195
Government/public sector	14.2	42.5	20.1	9.7	0.7	12.7	134
Other	7.8	37.5	21.9	15.6	1.6	15.6	64
<b>The degree of competition associated with RCN grants is a driver for quality</b>							
Universities	10.4	40.4	13.5	18.4	6.3	11.0	490
Special. univ.inst.	9.1	27.3	14.5	23.6	12.7	12.7	55
University colleges	8.7	32.6	21.0	12.3	8.0	17.4	138
Institute sector	14.0	39.7	20.2	15.5	3.5	7.2	401
University hospitals	13.7	29.4	17.6	5.9	5.9	27.5	51
Trade and industry	19.2	45.6	11.9	8.3	3.1	11.9	193
Government/public sector	22.6	41.4	15.0	7.5	0.8	12.8	133
Other	17.2	45.3	9.4	12.5	7.8	7.8	64
<b>There is adequate coordination between the various funding sources at the Research Council (Managed by different RCN divisions)</b>							
Universities	1.2	12.4	22.5	18.8	5.4	39.8	485
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	14.8	25.9	13.0	3.7	42.6	54
University colleges	3.6	10.9	22.5	16.7	5.1	41.3	138
Institute sector	3.3	13.1	28.9	18.6	4.3	31.9	398
University hospitals	5.9	9.8	15.7	3.9	3.9	60.8	51
Trade and industry	6.3	22.9	26.6	14.6	4.2	25.5	192
Government/public sector	3.7	14.1	27.4	21.5	3.0	30.4	135
Other	1.6	18.8	18.8	29.7	9.4	21.9	64
<b>The different RCN funding schemes complement each other</b>							
Universities	1.0	18.6	26.3	16.8	4.3	32.9	483
Special. univ.inst.	1.9	13.0	25.9	22.2	7.4	29.6	54
University colleges	2.2	18.5	26.7	11.1	5.9	35.6	135
Institute sector	3.8	25.3	28.3	15.5	3.5	23.6	399
University hospitals	2.0	8.0	24.0	10.0	2.0	54.0	50
Trade and industry	5.7	29.5	28.5	9.3	3.6	23.3	193
Government/public sector	0.7	31.9	23.0	16.3	0.7	27.4	135
Other	0.0	29.7	25.0	21.9	0.0	23.4	64
<b>RCN funding schemes complement other Norwegian funding sources</b>							
Universities	3.5	22.1	22.3	15.3	5.6	31.2	484
Special. univ.inst.	1.9	24.5	22.6	11.3	9.4	30.2	53
University colleges	4.4	19.3	23.7	17.8	3.0	31.9	135
Institute sector	4.8	24.6	25.1	15.4	3.8	26.3	395
University hospitals	2.0	18.0	20.0	8.0	4.0	48.0	50
Trade and industry	9.0	37.0	21.2	11.6	2.6	18.5	189
Government/public sector	5.2	34.1	26.7	10.4	0.7	23.0	135
Other	4.7	31.3	20.3	14.1	6.3	23.4	64
<b>RCN funding schemes complement alternative international funding sources</b>							
Universities	3.9	27.3	25.1	10.8	3.9	29.0	483
Special. univ.inst.	3.7	22.2	20.4	18.5	7.4	27.8	54
University colleges	2.3	25.6	22.6	12.0	4.5	33.1	133
Institute sector	5.3	27.0	28.5	12.8	3.3	23.3	400
University hospitals	2.0	16.3	22.4	6.1	2.0	51.0	49
Trade and industry	4.7	35.9	22.4	6.3	3.1	27.6	192
Government/public sector	3.7	37.0	21.5	4.4	0.0	33.3	135
Other	3.2	27.0	25.4	9.5	1.6	33.3	63
<b>RCN successfully creates synergies across sectoral missions/areas (health, environment, economy, education)</b>							
Universities	4.8	29.8	29.8	17.9	8.3	9.5	84
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	0.0	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	5
University colleges	8.3	25.0	25.0	8.3	8.3	25.0	12
Institute sector	0.0	20.6	38.2	11.8	11.8	11.8	34
University hospitals	0.0	16.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	6
Trade and industry	4.2	25.3	26.3	4.7	4.7	22.6	190
Government/public sector	3.0	28.1	31.1	3.7	3.7	17.8	135
Other	0.0	17.2	28.1	4.7	4.7	28.1	64
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the development needs of the research communities</b>							
Universities	3.1	18.9	18.5	31.3	12.2	16.2	482
Special. univ.inst.	1.9	15.1	18.9	28.3	18.9	17.0	53
University colleges	3.0	19.5	23.3	19.5	11.3	23.3	133
Institute sector	3.3	22.2	24.7	31.1	5.3	13.4	396
University hospitals	2.0	20.0	22.0	10.0	8.0	38.0	50
Trade and industry	4.2	35.6	25.7	11.0	4.2	19.4	191
Government/public sector	2.3	33.8	18.8	15.8	0.8	28.6	133
Other	1.6	31.3	18.8	25.0	4.7	18.8	64
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the needs of industry in Norway</b>							

Universities	3.7	15.1	18.4	11.8	2.7	48.5	485
Special. univ.inst.	1.9	7.4	22.2	14.8	9.3	44.4	54
University colleges	3.8	12.8	24.1	12.0	3.8	43.6	133
Institute sector	4.3	22.3	21.8	18.0	3.5	30.1	395
University hospitals	0.0	10.4	18.8	4.2	2.1	64.6	48
Trade and industry	4.7	37.8	19.2	20.2	7.8	10.4	193
Government/public sector	2.2	26.7	17.8	11.9	1.5	40.0	135
Other	1.6	28.1	10.9	23.4	7.8	28.1	64
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the needs of society in Norway</b>							
Universities	2.1	24.3	22.6	21.4	7.5	22.2	482
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	22.2	20.4	24.1	9.3	24.1	54
University colleges	3.7	20.7	21.5	16.3	5.2	32.6	135
Institute sector	3.8	25.9	26.4	21.9	2.8	19.3	398
University hospitals	2.0	22.4	16.3	8.2	6.1	44.9	49
Trade and industry	4.7	31.3	27.1	13.5	4.7	18.8	192
Government/public sector	3.7	44.4	21.5	16.3	0.7	13.3	135
Other	1.6	29.7	17.2	25.0	4.7	21.9	64
<b>RCN funds facilitates the international networking needed for my research institution</b>							
Universities	5.2	22.9	23.2	16.7	8.7	23.2	401
Special. univ.inst.	4.1	18.4	18.4	16.3	24.5	18.4	49
University colleges	2.5	22.1	18.9	18.0	9.8	28.7	122
Institute sector	4.7	31.6	23.6	16.5	6.9	16.8	364
University hospitals	2.3	4.7	16.3	14.0	9.3	53.5	43
<b>RCN strategies do not adequately address research relevance and user needs</b>							
Universities	9.3	22.7	22.7	16.9	6.0	22.4	397
Special. univ.inst.	10.2	30.6	22.4	14.3	8.2	14.3	49
University colleges	7.3	21.1	22.8	16.3	7.3	25.2	123
Institute sector	6.0	23.6	28.5	20.4	6.3	15.1	365
University hospitals	13.3	11.1	17.8	4.4	6.7	46.7	45

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places. Questions k-l only submitted to researchers and leaders at research institutions. Question g only to meeting participants.



Table 7.52 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). By academic field. Percentages.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
<b>RCN funds the best research</b>							
Humanities	4.5	27.1	22.6	20.3	8.3	17.3	133
Natural sciences	4.5	34.8	23.4	17.4	6.0	13.9	201
Medical sciences	6.4	34.0	23.9	10.6	4.3	20.7	188
Social sciences	3.3	32.1	22.8	22.8	4.5	14.6	246
Engineering sciences	7.3	37.0	25.6	13.8	3.7	12.6	246
Agriculture and fishery	2.2	37.8	26.7	18.9	4.4	10.0	90
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	7.0	39.1	22.6	15.6	1.6	14.0	243
Total	5.3	34.8	23.8	16.9	4.4	14.8	1347
<b>The degree of competition associated with RCN grants is a driver for quality</b>							
Humanities	8.4	30.5	16.8	22.1	9.2	13.0	131
Natural sciences	12.6	30.2	20.1	18.1	8.5	10.6	199
Medical sciences	12.4	39.8	18.3	9.7	3.2	16.7	186
Social sciences	7.4	41.4	16.0	16.0	6.1	13.1	244
Engineering sciences	16.3	40.2	15.0	14.6	4.9	8.9	246
Agriculture and fishery	9.1	44.3	20.5	14.8	5.7	5.7	88
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	16.0	47.7	12.3	13.6	3.7	6.6	243
Total	12.3	39.6	16.5	15.3	5.7	10.8	1337
<b>There is adequate coordination between the various funding sources at the Research Council (Managed by different RCN divisions)</b>							
Humanities	0.8	10.9	23.3	15.5	5.4	44.2	129
Natural sciences	1.5	13.7	22.3	14.2	6.6	41.6	197
Medical sciences	3.2	10.8	25.3	11.3	3.2	46.2	186
Social sciences	1.2	11.2	22.4	17.0	4.6	43.6	241
Engineering sciences	4.1	20.7	25.2	20.2	3.3	26.4	242
Agriculture and fishery	3.4	18.0	31.5	19.1	4.5	23.6	89
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	3.7	13.1	24.6	25.0	6.6	27.0	244
Total	2.6	14.0	24.4	17.8	4.9	36.2	1328
<b>The different RCN funding schemes complement each other</b>							
Humanities	0.8	14.1	23.4	15.6	7.8	38.3	128
Natural sciences	1.5	23.9	22.8	17.3	5.1	29.4	197
Medical sciences	1.6	11.4	32.6	11.4	3.8	39.1	184
Social sciences	1.7	15.4	28.6	17.0	4.6	32.8	241
Engineering sciences	5.4	28.1	28.5	12.8	2.9	22.3	242
Agriculture and fishery	1.1	26.1	31.8	14.8	4.5	21.6	88
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	1.6	30.5	25.5	16.9	2.5	23.0	243
Total	2.2	21.8	27.4	15.2	4.2	29.3	1323
<b>RCN funding schemes complement other Norwegian funding sources</b>							
Humanities	0.8	22.5	21.7	15.5	8.5	31.0	129
Natural sciences	3.6	20.6	17.0	13.9	7.2	37.6	194
Medical sciences	4.9	22.2	23.2	11.4	4.9	33.5	185
Social sciences	5.0	19.7	21.4	17.2	4.2	32.4	238
Engineering sciences	6.6	32.4	23.2	12.0	2.1	23.7	241
Agriculture and fishery	2.3	30.2	33.7	12.8	3.5	17.4	86
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	6.2	25.9	28.0	17.7	2.5	19.8	243
Total	4.7	24.6	23.4	14.6	4.4	28.3	1316
<b>RCN funding schemes complement alternative international funding sources</b>							
Humanities	0.8	23.3	31.0	10.9	6.2	27.9	129
Natural sciences	6.6	25.9	20.8	11.7	5.6	29.4	197
Medical sciences	3.8	20.2	25.7	9.8	2.2	38.3	183
Social sciences	5.0	21.2	25.3	13.7	2.9	32.0	241
Engineering sciences	4.9	38.7	23.9	8.2	3.3	21.0	243
Agriculture and fishery	1.2	31.4	30.2	10.5	3.5	23.3	86
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	4.1	30.3	25.7	13.7	3.3	22.8	241
Total	4.2	27.5	25.4	11.4	3.7	27.8	1320
<b>RCN successfully creates synergies across sectoral missions/areas (health, environment, economy, education)</b>							
Humanities	0.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	0.0	10.0	10
Natural sciences	5.9	35.3	17.6	17.6	5.9	17.6	17
Medical sciences	5.6	11.1	36.1	22.2	0.0	25.0	36
Social sciences	0.0	28.6	32.1	10.7	10.7	17.9	28
Engineering sciences	3.5	24.6	30.7	15.8	4.4	21.1	114
Agriculture and fishery	0.0	18.8	43.8	25.0	0.0	12.5	16
Multiple areas, high	4.0	18.5	31.5	18.5	12.1	15.3	124

degree of cross-disciplinarity, other								
Total	3.5	21.7	31.6	18.0	7.0	18.3	345	
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the development needs of the research communities</b>								
Humanities	1.6	18.9	15.0	32.3	12.6	19.7	127	
Natural sciences	3.6	20.3	17.3	33.0	13.2	12.7	197	
Medical sciences	3.8	18.1	24.7	20.3	6.6	26.4	182	
Social sciences	0.4	17.1	22.9	30.8	10.4	18.3	240	
Engineering sciences	5.3	31.3	21.8	23.5	5.3	12.8	243	
Agriculture and fishery	1.2	24.7	29.4	22.4	8.2	14.1	85	
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	2.9	24.1	22.8	26.6	7.5	16.2	241	
Total	2.9	22.3	21.7	27.1	8.9	17.0	1315	
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the needs of industry in Norway</b>								
Humanities	0.8	10.9	21.1	3.1	4.7	59.4	128	
Natural sciences	8.6	13.7	15.7	15.2	2.5	44.2	197	
Medical sciences	1.6	10.4	22.0	7.1	1.6	57.1	182	
Social sciences	1.2	10.8	22.4	12.4	2.9	50.2	241	
Engineering sciences	5.8	38.4	18.2	20.7	5.8	11.2	242	
Agriculture and fishery	1.2	29.4	24.7	21.2	4.7	18.8	85	
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	3.3	21.9	17.4	22.7	7.4	27.3	242	
Total	3.6	19.5	19.7	15.2	4.3	37.7	1317	
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the needs of society in Norway</b>								
Humanities	1.6	19.4	14.0	29.5	10.9	24.8	129	
Natural sciences	5.1	18.9	26.0	18.4	6.1	25.5	196	
Medical sciences	2.2	22.5	27.5	13.2	4.9	29.7	182	
Social sciences	0.4	24.7	24.7	22.6	4.5	23.0	243	
Engineering sciences	4.5	33.5	25.6	17.4	5.4	13.6	242	
Agriculture and fishery	2.3	22.1	31.4	18.6	2.3	23.3	86	
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	3.7	28.1	19.4	22.3	5.0	21.5	242	
Total	3.0	25.1	23.9	20.1	5.5	22.5	1320	
<b>RCN funds facilitates the international networking needed for my research institution</b>								
Humanities	4.2	17.6	24.4	13.4	19.3	21.0	119	
Natural sciences	6.1	28.7	21.0	15.5	7.2	21.5	181	
Medical sciences	3.4	14.5	20.0	14.5	9.0	38.6	145	
Social sciences	2.3	28.0	21.0	18.2	8.9	21.5	214	
Engineering sciences	7.7	23.1	24.6	17.7	8.5	18.5	130	
Agriculture and fishery	1.4	39.1	23.2	17.4	7.2	11.6	69	
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	5.0	28.6	24.4	20.2	2.5	19.3	119	
Total	4.4	25.1	22.3	16.7	8.9	22.6	977	
<b>RCN strategies do not adequately address research relevance and user needs</b>								
Humanities	6.0	29.1	18.8	13.7	9.4	23.1	117	
Natural sciences	10.6	21.7	26.1	15.6	7.2	18.9	180	
Medical sciences	10.9	17.7	25.2	10.2	5.4	30.6	147	
Social sciences	7.5	19.6	27.1	22.4	3.3	20.1	214	
Engineering sciences	4.7	24.8	20.9	20.2	10.1	19.4	129	
Agriculture and fishery	8.5	26.8	25.4	26.8	1.4	11.3	71	
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	6.7	25.2	26.9	16.0	7.6	17.6	119	
Total	8.0	22.7	24.7	17.5	6.3	20.8	977	

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places. Questions k-l only submitted to researchers and leaders at research institutions. Question g only to meeting participants.

Table 7.53 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). By most important RCN Division. Percentages.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
<b>RCN funds the best research</b>							
Division for Innovation	8.1	42.3	22.5	15.1	2.5	9.5	284
Division for Science	8.5	40.4	28.5	14.2	3.9	4.4	386
Division for Strategic Priorities	8.5	47.4	19.3	12.9	1.3	10.6	388
Don't know/NA	2.1	20.1	20.6	19.2	7.2	30.9	433
Total	6.6	36.7	22.7	15.5	3.9	14.7	1491
<b>The degree of competition associated with RCN grants is a driver for quality</b>							
Division for Innovation	13.1	49.5	15.9	11.3	4.2	6.0	283
Division for Science	18.2	43.0	16.1	15.6	5.2	1.8	384
Division for Strategic Priorities	21.5	44.8	14.2	10.9	3.4	5.2	386
Don't know/NA	4.4	27.8	16.5	18.6	6.0	26.7	431
Total	14.1	40.3	15.7	14.4	4.8	10.7	1484
<b>There is adequate coordination between the various funding sources at the Research Council (Managed by different RCN divisions)</b>							
Division for Innovation	5.2	21.0	27.3	19.9	5.9	20.6	286
Division for Science	3.9	14.4	28.8	23.8	4.7	24.3	382
Division for Strategic Priorities	3.6	20.7	28.9	17.3	3.4	26.1	387
Don't know/NA	0.2	4.7	16.5	12.0	5.4	61.1	424
Total	3.0	14.5	25.0	18.0	4.8	34.6	1479
<b>The different RCN funding schemes complement each other</b>							
Division for Innovation	2.5	32.3	31.9	12.6	3.5	17.2	285
Division for Science	3.4	24.5	32.1	16.7	5.7	17.5	383
Division for Strategic Priorities	4.2	31.9	26.0	16.6	1.8	19.5	385
Don't know/NA	0.2	9.2	18.6	14.6	3.8	53.5	424
Total	2.5	23.6	26.6	15.3	3.7	28.3	1477
<b>RCN funding schemes complement other Norwegian funding sources</b>							
Division for Innovation	5.3	36.2	26.2	14.5	4.6	13.1	282
Division for Science	5.2	26.8	27.0	15.5	5.8	19.7	381
Division for Strategic Priorities	7.3	29.8	25.8	13.6	1.6	21.9	383
Don't know/NA	2.4	16.1	15.9	14.2	4.5	46.9	422
Total	5.0	26.3	23.4	14.4	4.1	26.8	1468
<b>RCN funding schemes complement alternative international funding sources</b>							
Division for Innovation	2.5	38.4	24.6	10.9	2.1	21.5	284
Division for Science	5.2	33.3	27.6	10.8	3.7	19.4	381
Division for Strategic Priorities	6.5	34.3	26.4	9.7	1.8	21.2	382
Don't know/NA	2.4	14.8	21.2	10.6	4.7	46.4	425
Total	4.2	29.2	24.9	10.5	3.2	28.1	1472
<b>RCN successfully creates synergies across sectoral missions/areas (health, environment, economy, education)</b>							
Division for Innovation	2.8	22.5	31.5	17.8	4.7	20.7	213
Division for Science	5.3	26.5	32.7	19.5	7.1	8.8	113
Division for Strategic Priorities	2.9	27.6	28.2	17.8	5.2	18.4	174
Don't know/NA	0.0	19.6	23.5	9.8	5.9	41.2	51
Total	3.1	24.7	29.9	17.4	5.4	19.4	551
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the development needs of the research communities</b>							
Division for Innovation	1.8	32.2	23.7	23.7	4.2	14.5	283
Division for Science	4.0	25.6	23.0	29.3	9.8	8.4	379
Division for Strategic Priorities	5.2	33.5	20.7	24.1	4.2	12.3	382
Don't know/NA	1.2	10.0	21.4	23.5	10.9	33.0	421
Total	3.1	24.4	22.0	25.2	7.6	17.7	1465
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the needs of industry in Norway</b>							
Division for Innovation	1.8	37.1	17.7	25.8	7.8	9.9	283
Division for Science	3.9	19.9	21.0	12.9	2.9	39.4	381
Division for Strategic Priorities	5.5	26.6	21.4	14.3	1.8	30.5	384
Don't know/NA	2.8	7.5	19.6	10.8	4.0	55.2	424
Total	3.6	21.4	20.0	15.1	3.9	35.9	1472
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the needs of society in Norway</b>							
Division for Innovation	2.8	30.3	26.4	21.1	5.3	14.1	284
Division for Science	3.1	32.2	24.1	20.9	3.4	16.2	382
Division for Strategic Priorities	5.5	37.1	24.3	18.8	1.0	13.3	383
Don't know/NA	0.9	13.2	21.7	17.2	9.0	38.0	424
Total	3.1	27.6	23.9	19.3	4.8	21.3	1473
<b>RCN funds facilitates the international networking needed for my research institution</b>							
Division for Innovation	2.9	32.9	28.6	22.9	11.4	1.4	70
Division for Science	5.9	33.1	20.8	19.0	8.6	12.6	269
Division for Strategic Priorities	8.2	34.1	23.6	17.8	4.3	12.0	208
Don't know/NA	2.1	13.9	21.7	12.3	11.5	38.3	373
Total	4.7	25.5	22.4	16.3	9.0	22.1	920
<b>RCN strategies do not adequately address research relevance and user needs</b>							
Division for Innovation	8.6	22.9	28.6	31.4	5.7	2.9	70
Division for Science	8.5	24.1	24.8	22.6	6.3	13.7	270
Division for Strategic Priorities	6.3	25.2	27.7	22.3	8.3	10.2	206
Don't know/NA	8.8	21.8	21.5	8.5	5.9	33.5	376
Total	8.1	23.3	24.4	17.5	6.5	20.2	922

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places. Questions k-l only submitted to researchers and leaders at research institutions. Question g only to meeting participants.

Table 7.54 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). By position. Percentages.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
<b>RCN funds the best research</b>							
Researchers	4.4	32.0	23.9	17.7	5.6	16.4	965
Leaders	4.6	44.0	23.4	16.6	0.0	11.4	175
Others	11.7	41.8	19.8	11.5	1.5	13.8	419
Total	6.4	36.0	22.8	15.9	3.8	15.1	1559
<b>The degree of competition associated with RCN grants is a driver for quality</b>							
Researchers	9.7	36.6	17.5	17.1	6.6	12.5	957
Leaders	23.0	44.8	14.4	11.5	1.7	4.6	174
Others	18.9	44.6	12.9	9.1	2.9	11.5	417
Total	13.7	39.7	15.9	14.3	5.0	11.4	1548
<b>There is adequate coordination between the various funding sources at the Research Council (Managed by different RCN divisions)</b>							
Researchers	1.7	11.6	23.9	16.5	5.4	40.9	948
Leaders	6.3	17.2	27.6	22.4	1.7	24.7	174
Others	4.5	19.1	25.8	18.9	4.5	27.0	418
Total	3.0	14.3	24.9	17.8	4.7	35.3	1540
<b>The different RCN funding schemes complement each other</b>							
Researchers	1.6	18.5	25.6	16.2	5.0	33.2	943
Leaders	5.2	31.0	35.6	11.5	0.6	16.1	174
Others	3.1	30.1	26.0	13.6	2.4	24.8	419
Total	2.4	23.0	26.8	15.0	3.8	29.0	445
<b>RCN funding schemes complement other Norwegian funding sources</b>							
Researchers	3.5	19.9	23.7	14.2	5.5	33.1	939
Leaders	6.3	36.2	23.0	19.5	0.6	14.4	174
Others	7.0	34.7	22.9	12.0	2.7	20.7	415
Total	4.8	25.8	23.4	14.2	4.2	27.6	422
<b>RCN funding schemes complement alternative international funding sources</b>							
Researchers	3.8	24.1	26.4	10.9	4.3	30.4	943
Leaders	5.8	39.0	22.7	16.3	1.2	15.1	172
Others	4.3	35.0	21.8	6.5	1.9	30.5	417
Total	4.2	28.7	24.7	10.3	3.3	28.7	1532
<b>RCN successfully creates synergies across sectoral missions/areas (health, environment, economy, education)</b>							
Researchers	4.5	20.5	33.0	20.5	9.8	11.6	112
Leaders	0.0	52.0	20.0	12.0	4.0	12.0	25
Others	2.9	24.0	29.8	16.8	4.3	22.1	416
Total	3.1	24.6	30.0	17.4	5.4	19.5	553
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the development needs of the research communities</b>							
Researchers	3.1	19.2	20.5	29.9	10.4	17.0	938
Leaders	2.9	26.2	26.2	20.9	6.4	17.4	172
Others	3.1	34.2	22.4	15.9	2.9	21.4	415
Total	3.1	24.1	21.6	25.0	7.9	18.2	1525
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the needs of industry in Norway</b>							
Researchers	3.5	15.4	20.2	10.3	3.0	47.5	939
Leaders	4.1	23.8	22.7	32.0	5.8	11.6	172
Others	3.3	32.2	17.4	17.7	5.5	23.9	419
Total	3.5	21.0	19.7	14.8	4.0	37.0	1530
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the needs of society in Norway</b>							
Researchers	2.7	24.1	23.7	21.3	6.1	22.2	942
Leaders	3.5	25.0	23.8	14.5	2.9	30.2	172
Others	3.8	35.2	23.7	16.5	3.3	17.5	418
Total	3.1	27.2	23.7	19.3	5.0	21.8	1532
<b>RCN funds facilitates the international networking needed for my research institution</b>							
Researchers	4.7	23.5	21.9	15.6	9.7	24.5	831
Leaders	3.4	33.8	24.3	22.3	4.7	11.5	148
Others	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	4.5	25.0	22.3	16.6	9.0	22.6	979
<b>RCN strategies do not adequately address research relevance and user needs</b>							
Researchers	8.3	22.7	24.4	16.1	5.9	22.7	833
Leaders	6.8	22.6	26.0	25.3	9.6	9.6	146
Others	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	8.1	22.7	24.6	17.5	6.4	20.7	979

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders of research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places. Questions k-l only submitted to researchers and leaders at research institutions. Question g only to meeting participants.

Table 7.55 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). By participation in RCN Board. Percentages.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
<b>RCN funds the best research</b>							
Member of Boards	5.4	32.3	24.0	17.0	4.5	16.9	1285
Not member	13.4	57.9	14.8	9.7	0.5	3.7	216
Missing	1.7	36.2	25.9	15.5	1.7	19.0	58
<b>The degree of competition associated with RCN grants is a driver for quality</b>							
Member of Boards	12.4	37.2	16.7	15.3	5.6	12.8	1278
Not member	21.2	56.1	9.0	10.4	1.4	1.9	212
Missing	13.8	32.8	24.1	8.6	5.2	15.5	58
<b>There is adequate coordination between the various funding sources at the Research Council (Managed by different RCN divisions)</b>							
Member of Boards	2.5	12.6	24.4	17.1	4.9	38.5	1272
Not member	5.6	25.6	28.8	21.9	3.7	14.4	215
Missing	3.8	9.4	20.8	17.0	5.7	35.3	53
<b>The different RCN funding schemes complement each other</b>							
Member of Boards	2.3	21.0	26.6	14.4	4.2	31.5	1269
Not member	3.3	36.7	31.2	15.3	2.3	11.2	215
Missing	1.9	17.3	13.5	26.9	0.0	40.4	52
<b>RCN funding schemes complement other Norwegian funding sources</b>							
Member of Boards	4.8	24.4	22.5	14.2	4.5	29.6	1262
Not member	5.1	34.4	32.6	13.0	1.9	13.0	215
Missing	3.9	23.5	7.8	19.6	5.9	39.2	51
<b>RCN funding schemes complement alternative international funding sources</b>							
Member of Boards	3.7	26.8	24.4	11.1	3.7	30.3	1268
Not member	5.6	43.5	28.0	6.1	1.4	15.4	214
Missing	10.0	14.0	20.0	8.0	2.0	46.0	50
<b>RCN successfully creates synergies across sectoral missions/areas (health, environment, economy, education)</b>							
Member of Boards	3.4	21.1	29.3	16.9	5.9	23.4	355
Not member	2.7	30.1	32.2	18.6	4.4	12.0	183
Missing	0.0	40.0	20.0	13.3	6.7	20.0	15
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the development needs of the research communities</b>							
Member of Boards	3.1	21.1	21.1	25.7	8.9	20.0	1258
Not member	3.3	42.5	24.3	21.0	2.3	6.5	214
Missing	1.9	18.9	22.6	26.4	7.5	22.6	53
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the needs of industry in Norway</b>							
Member of Boards	3.8	19.3	19.8	14.5	4.5	20.0	1258
Not member	2.8	32.6	20.9	15.8	1.9	6.5	214
Missing	0.0	14.0	14.0	18.0	0.0	22.6	53
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the needs of society in Norway</b>							
Member of Boards	3.2	23.4	23.6	20.1	5.7	24.0	1266
Not member	1.9	50.9	23.8	14.0	1.4	7.9	214
Missing	3.8	23.1	25.0	21.2	1.9	25.0	52
<b>RCN funds facilitates the international networking needed for my research institution</b>							
Member of Boards	4.6	24.8	22.3	16.7	9.1	22.5	911
Not member	0.0	38.7	29.0	6.5	12.9	12.9	31
Missing	5.4	18.9	16.2	24.3	2.7	32.4	37
<b>RCN strategies do not adequately address research relevance and user needs</b>							
Member of Boards	8.3	22.7	24.7	17.3	6.3	20.7	912
Not member	3.2	19.4	35.5	22.6	12.9	6.5	31
Missing	5.6	25.0	13.9	16.7	5.6	33.3	36

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places. Questions k-l only submitted to researchers and leaders at research institutions. Question g only to meeting participants.

Table 7.56 RCN management, organisation, expertise and strategy (II). By questionnaire/survey sample. Percentages.

To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
<b>RCN funds the best research</b>							
Researchers	9.3	29.0	25.1	17.9	6.1	18.0	854
Meeting places	11.0	45.0	18.6	12.4	1.4	11.5	555
Leaders	3.3	42.0	25.3	17.3	0.0	12.0	150
Total	6.4	36.0	22.8	15.9	3.8	15.1	1559
<b>The degree of competition associated with RCN grants is a driver for quality</b>							
Researchers	8.7	33.9	18.8	17.4	7.2	13.9	846
Meeting places	18.8	47.6	11.6	10.1	2.7	9.1	552
Leaders	22.7	42.7	15.3	12.7	1.3	5.3	150
Total	13.7	39.7	15.9	14.3	5.0	11.4	1548
<b>There is adequate coordination between the various funding sources at the Research Council (Managed by different RCN divisions)</b>							
Researchers	1.4	10.6	23.0	15.0	5.3	44.7	836
Meeting places	4.5	19.1	26.8	21.1	4.9	23.6	555
Leaders	6.0	16.8	28.2	21.5	1.3	26.2	149
Total	3.0	14.3	24.9	17.8	4.7	35.3	1540
<b>The different RCN funding schemes complement each other</b>							
Researchers	1.4	16.7	24.4	16.0	5.1	36.3	831
Meeting places	2.9	30.8	28.4	14.2	2.7	21.0	556
Leaders	6.0	29.5	34.2	12.1	0.7	17.4	149
Total	2.4	23.0	26.8	15.0	3.8	29.0	1536
<b>RCN funding schemes complement other Norwegian funding sources</b>							
Researchers	3.3	19.6	21.6	14.1	5.7	35.7	827
Meeting places	6.3	33.3	25.7	12.7	3.1	18.8	552
Leaders	7.4	32.2	24.8	20.1	0.0	15.4	149
Total	4.8	25.8	23.4	14.2	4.2	27.6	1528
<b>RCN funding schemes complement alternative international funding sources</b>							
Researchers	3.7	21.8	26.5	10.8	4.5	32.7	831
Meeting places	4.2	37.1	22.4	7.6	2.4	26.4	553
Leaders	6.8	36.5	23.6	17.6	0.7	14.9	148
Total	4.2	28.7	24.7	10.3	3.3	28.7	1532
<b>RCN successfully creates synergies across sectoral missions/areas (health, environment, economy, education)</b>							
Researchers	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Meeting places	3.1	24.6	30.0	17.4	5.4	19.5	553
Leaders	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	3.1	24.6	30.0	17.4	5.4	19.5	553
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the development needs of the research communities</b>							
Researchers	3.1	16.9	20.9	28.7	11.5	18.8	828
Meeting places	3.1	35.3	21.1	20.5	2.7	17.3	550
Leaders	2.7	22.4	27.9	21.1	7.5	18.4	147
Total	3.1	24.1	21.6	25.0	7.9	18.2	1525
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the needs of industry in Norway</b>							
Researchers	3.7	13.8	20.2	10.3	3.1	48.9	827
Meeting places	3.1	31.1	18.2	16.0	4.9	26.8	556
Leaders	4.1	23.1	23.1	35.4	5.4	8.8	147
Total	3.5	21.0	19.7	14.8	4.0	37.0	1530
<b>RCN strategies are in line with the needs of society in Norway</b>							
Researchers	2.7	20.7	23.9	22.0	6.5	24.2	830
Meeting places	3.4	38.6	23.1	16.6	3.4	15.0	555
Leaders	4.1	21.1	25.2	13.6	2.0	34.0	147
Total	3.1	27.2	23.7	19.3	5.0	21.8	1532
<b>RCN funds facilitates the international networking needed for my research institution</b>							
Researchers	4.7	23.5	21.9	15.6	9.7	24.5	831
Meeting places	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Leaders	3.4	33.8	24.3	22.3	4.7	11.5	148
Total	4.5	25.0	22.3	16.6	9.0	22.6	979
<b>RCN strategies do not adequately address research relevance and user needs</b>							
Researchers	8.3	22.7	24.4	16.1	5.9	22.7	833
Meeting places	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Leaders	6.8	22.6	26.0	25.3	9.6	9.6	146
Total	8.1	22.7	24.6	17.5	6.4	20.7	979

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places. Questions k-l only submitted to researchers and leaders at research institutions. Question g only to meeting participants.

Table 7.57 Leaders at research institutions: Institutional interaction with RCN. Per cent by sector.

<b>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?</b>							
<b>Sector</b>	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Cannot say	N
<b>RCN schemes constitute an integral component of my units' strategic activities</b>							
Universities	43.8	40.6	9.4	3.1	0.0	3.1	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	18.4	34.7	14.3	14.3	10.2	8.2	49
Institute sector	47.0	36.4	3.0	4.5	6.1	3.0	66
Total	36.7	36.7	8.2	7.5	6.1	4.8	147
<b>RCN funding mechanisms are sufficiently flexible for us to choose the instruments that are most appropriate for my unit's objectives</b>							
Universities	6.3	34.4	31.3	25.0	0.0	3.1	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	6.3	18.8	22.9	22.9	20.8	8.3	48
Institute sector	13.4	26.9	17.9	26.9	9.0	6.0	67
Total	9.5	25.9	22.4	25.2	10.9	6.1	147
<b>The performance-based component of core funding (PBRF) adds distinct value and performs a role that is differentiated from project funding</b>							
Universities	3.1	37.5	28.1	0.0	0.0	31.3	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	4.3	12.8	27.7	12.8	2.1	40.4	47
Institute sector	22.7	27.3	12.1	7.6	3.0	27.3	66
Total	12.4	24.8	20.7	7.6	2.1	32.4	145
<b>There is a clear distinction between the objectives, tasks and criteria for the RCN instruments and the PBRFs</b>							
Universities	3.1	21.9	21.9	0.0	0.0	53.1	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	2.1	12.8	27.7	6.4	0.0	51.1	47
Institute sector	23.1	15.4	15.4	9.2	1.5	35.4	65
Total	11.8	16.0	20.8	6.3	0.7	44.4	144
<b>Greater autonomy for Norwegian research institutions means that the policy dialogue with the RCN has increased in importance for my institution</b>							
Universities	21.9	37.5	31.3	3.1	3.1	3.1	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	6.3	25.0	25.0	8.3	6.3	29.2	48
Institute sector	13.8	21.5	24.6	16.9	12.3	10.8	65
Total	13.1	26.2	26.2	11.0	8.3	15.2	145
<b>The RCN's role in allocating research funds is a threat to the autonomy of the research institutions</b>							
Universities	15.6	15.6	15.6	43.8	6.3	3.1	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	6.3	16.7	22.9	20.8	12.5	20.8	48
Institute sector	7.7	10.8	15.4	23.1	38.5	4.6	65
Total	9.0	13.8	17.9	26.9	22.8	9.7	145
<b>The RCN's role in funding recruitment positions is a threat to the autonomy of the research institutions</b>							
Universities	9.7	12.9	16.1	38.7	19.4	3.2	31
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	4.2	14.6	22.9	25.0	14.6	18.8	48
Institute sector	1.5	10.8	15.4	24.6	40.0	7.7	65
Total	4.2	12.5	18.1	27.8	27.1	10.4	144
<b>The research evaluations organised by RCN (of research fields and institutions) have been valuable to my unit</b>							
Universities	34.4	46.9	3.1	9.4	0.0	6.3	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	16.7	29.2	20.8	8.3	4.2	20.8	48
Institute sector	25.4	31.7	14.3	9.5	4.8	14.3	63
Total	24.5	34.3	14.0	9.1	3.5	14.7	143
<b>The research evaluations organised by RCN (of research fields and institutions) have been valuable to the the Norwegian research community</b>							
Universities	34.4	56.3	6.3	3.1	0.0	0.0	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	16.7	41.7	18.8	2.1	0.0	20.8	48
Institute sector	32.3	40.0	10.8	4.6	0.0	12.3	65
Total	27.6	44.1	12.4	3.4	0.0	12.4	145

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of leaders at research institutions.

Table 7.58 Leaders at research institutions: Changes in framework conditions last ten years. Per cent by sector.

<b>If you consider the ten last years in Norway, would you say that:</b>							
<b>Sector</b>	<b>Agree fully</b>	<b>Agree partly</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	<b>Disagree partly</b>	<b>Disagree fully</b>	<b>Cannot say</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Researchers in publicly funded institutions have become overworked and underpaid</b>							
Universities	21.9	31.3	18.8	12.5	15.6	0.0	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	22.0	22.0	26.0	20.0	4.0	6.0	50
Institute sector	4.5	28.8	16.7	21.2	21.2	7.6	66
Total	14.2	27.0	20.3	18.9	14.2	5.4	148
<b>Norway has not attracted enough foreign researchers</b>							
Universities	6.3	46.9	18.8	21.9	3.1	3.1	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	19.6	25.5	33.3	11.8	2.0	7.8	51
Institute sector	6.1	36.4	18.2	22.7	12.1	4.5	66
Total	10.7	34.9	23.5	18.8	6.7	5.4	149
<b>The procedures for obtaining national research funding have become more bureaucratic and time consuming</b>							
Universities	25.0	18.8	25.0	28.1	3.1	0.0	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	34.0	34.0	14.0	14.0	0.0	4.0	50
Institute sector	22.7	33.3	15.2	18.2	9.1	1.5	66
Total	27.0	30.4	16.9	18.9	4.7	2.0	148
<b>Research priorities are increasingly decided at the individual level</b>							
Universities	.0	9.4	9.4	59.4	18.8	3.1	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	2.0	6.0	34.0	32.0	24.0	2.0	50
Institute sector	.0	4.5	22.7	40.9	25.8	6.1	66
Total	.7	6.1	23.6	41.9	23.6	4.1	148
<b>Research priorities are increasingly decided at the institutional level</b>							
Universities	12.5	65.6	9.4	9.4	3.1	0.0	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	17.6	45.1	23.5	9.8	2.0	2.0	51
Institute sector	6.1	48.5	24.2	18.2	1.5	1.5	66
Total	11.4	51.0	20.8	13.4	2.0	1.3	149
<b>Research priorities are increasingly decided at the national level</b>							
Universities	18.8	75.0	3.1	3.1	0.0	0.0	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	26.0	50.0	14.0	8.0	0.0	2.0	50
Institute sector	18.2	47.0	22.7	7.6	1.5	3.0	66
Total	20.9	54.1	15.5	6.8	0.7	2.0	148
<b>Research priorities are increasingly decided at the international level</b>							
Universities	21.9	46.9	21.9	6.3	0.0	3.1	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	10.0	46.0	30.0	10.0	0.0	4.0	50
Institute sector	15.2	53.0	18.2	7.6	3.0	3.0	66
Total	14.9	49.3	23.0	8.1	1.4	3.4	148
<b>Research priorities have become more sensitive to broader social issues</b>							
Universities	6.3	56.3	18.8	12.5	0.0	6.3	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	12.0	34.0	30.0	14.0	0.0	10.0	50
Institute sector	13.8	36.9	30.8	13.8	1.5	3.1	65
Total	11.6	40.1	27.9	13.6	0.7	6.1	147
<b>Research priorities have become more sensitive to market demands</b>							
Universities	12.5	46.9	21.9	12.5	0.0	6.3	32
Spe.univ./univ.colleges	17.6	51.0	15.7	9.8	0.0	5.9	51
Institute sector	19.7	33.3	27.3	15.2	0.0	4.5	66
Total	17.4	42.3	22.1	12.8	0.0	5.4	149

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of leaders at research institutions.



## B.6 Tables relating to Chapter 7

Table 7.59 RCN Meeting place function (I): RCN activities within communication and dissemination. By sector. Percentages.

Considering RCN's activities within communication and dissemination of research results, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Cannot say	N
<b>RCN maintains the best practice activities in science communication</b>							
Universities	14.2	37.2	26.5	7.1	0.0	15.0	113
Special. univ.inst.	16.7	41.7	41.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	12
University colleges	3.6	30.9	36.4	7.3	1.8	20.0	55
Institute sector	9.7	35.0	28.2	19.4	1.0	6.8	103
University hospitals	16.7	50.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6
Trade and industry	6.1	37.1	27.4	11.7	1.5	16.2	197
Government/public sector	9.6	40.7	22.2	8.1	0.7	18.5	135
Other	3.2	25.4	38.1	7.9	4.8	20.6	63
Total	8.5	36.1	28.4	10.4	1.3	15.4	684
<b>RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and industry</b>							
Universities	9.6	42.1	25.4	4.4	0.0	18.4	114
Special. univ.inst.	8.3	58.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	12
University colleges	0.0	29.1	34.5	10.9	1.8	23.6	55
Institute sector	11.7	26.2	24.3	16.5	1.9	19.4	103
University hospitals	16.7	33.3	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6
Trade and industry	15.7	41.4	18.2	9.1	2.5	13.1	198
Government/public sector	12.6	41.5	13.3	9.6	0.7	22.2	135
Other	11.1	34.9	22.2	7.9	3.2	20.6	63
Total	11.7	37.9	21.3	9.3	1.6	18.2	686
<b>RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and the public service sector</b>							
Universities	6.3	42.0	32.1	6.3	0.9	12.5	112
Special. univ.inst.	8.3	66.7	16.7	8.3	0.0	0.0	12
University colleges	1.8	29.1	34.5	10.9	3.6	20.0	55
Institute sector	6.9	26.5	28.4	17.6	2.9	17.6	102
University hospitals	0.0	16.7	66.7	0.0	0.0	16.7	6
Trade and industry	3.6	25.1	27.2	5.6	2.1	36.4	195
Government/public sector	8.8	39.7	20.6	11.8	2.9	16.2	136
Other	4.8	20.6	34.9	9.5	1.6	28.6	63
Total	5.6	31.6	28.3	9.5	2.2	22.8	681
<b>RCN facilitates the development and strengthening of strategic intelligence among research performers, national and regional authorities and RCN itself</b>							
Universities	11.6	44.6	23.2	6.3	2.7	11.6	112
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	41.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	25.0	12
University colleges	0.0	41.8	27.3	10.9	1.8	18.2	55
Institute sector	10.9	29.7	26.7	10.9	1.0	20.8	101
University hospitals	16.7	50.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6
Trade and industry	7.2	37.4	26.2	4.1	1.5	23.6	195
Government/public sector	6.6	42.6	21.3	7.4	1.5	20.6	136
Other	11.1	33.3	22.2	7.9	3.2	22.2	63
Total	8.1	38.7	24.7	6.9	1.8	19.9	680

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders of research institutions, and participants in RCN meeting places.

Table 7.60 RCN Meeting place function (I): RCN activities within communication and dissemination. By academic field. Percentages.

Considering RCN's activities within communication and dissemination of research results, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
<b>RCN maintains the best practice activities in science communication</b>							
Humanities	9.5	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	23.8	21
Natural sciences	13.6	31.8	27.3	9.1	9.1	9.1	22
Medical sciences	8.9	37.8	37.8	4.4	2.2	8.9	45
Social sciences	3.4	37.3	22.0	18.6	0.0	18.6	59
Engineering sciences	8.0	40.0	27.2	8.8	2.4	13.6	125
Agriculture and fishery	7.7	34.6	46.2	7.7	0.0	3.8	26
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	10.7	34.7	28.6	12.8	1.5	11.7	196
Total	8.9	36.4	29.4	10.7	1.8	12.8	494
<b>RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and industry</b>							
Humanities	9.5	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	23.8	21
Natural sciences	19.0	23.8	19.0	4.8	4.8	28.6	21
Medical sciences	4.4	33.3	37.8	8.9	0.0	15.6	45
Social sciences	5.1	23.7	22.0	11.9	1.7	35.6	59
Engineering sciences	17.5	49.2	13.5	8.7	1.6	9.5	126
Agriculture and fishery	7.4	48.1	33.3	7.4	0.0	3.7	27
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	12.2	33.2	25.0	10.7	3.1	15.8	196
Total	11.9	36.6	23.4	9.3	2.0	16.8	495
<b>RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and the public service sector</b>							
Humanities	4.8	42.9	28.6	0.0	0.0	23.8	21
Natural sciences	19.0	14.3	33.3	4.8	4.8	23.8	21
Medical sciences	0.0	33.3	40.0	8.9	0.0	17.8	45
Social sciences	3.4	39.0	28.8	10.2	1.7	16.9	59
Engineering sciences	6.4	24.0	24.8	8.0	2.4	34.4	125
Agriculture and fishery	4.0	28.0	24.0	16.0	0.0	28.0	25
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	6.6	31.1	29.1	11.2	4.1	17.9	196
Total	5.9	30.1	28.9	9.6	2.6	23.0	492
<b>RCN facilitates the development and strengthening of strategic intelligence among research performers, national and regional authorities and RCN itself</b>							
Humanities	9.5	28.6	38.1	0.0	0.0	23.8	21
Natural sciences	15.0	45.0	15.0	5.0	0.0	20.0	20
Medical sciences	6.7	37.8	28.9	8.9	0.0	17.8	45
Social sciences	3.4	41.4	22.4	8.6	0.0	24.1	58
Engineering sciences	9.5	40.5	22.2	4.8	2.4	20.6	126
Agriculture and fishery	4.0	36.0	36.0	8.0	0.0	16.0	25
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	9.7	31.1	29.6	10.2	4.6	14.8	196
Total	8.6	36.0	26.9	7.7	2.4	18.4	491

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders of research institutions, and participants in RCN meeting places.

Table 7.61 RCN Meeting place function (I): RCN activities within communication and dissemination. By RCN Division of most interest/importance. Percentages.

Considering RCN's activities within communication and dissemination of research results, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
<b>RCN maintains the best practice activities in science communication</b>							
Division for Innovation	7.1	36.1	31.5	9.7	2.1	13.4	238
Division for Science	11.5	40.1	28.0	7.6	0.0	12.7	157
Division for Strategic Priorities	9.2	39.5	24.1	14.9	1.8	10.5	228
Don't know/NA	3.9	19.7	35.5	3.9	0.0	36.8	76
<b>RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and industry</b>							
Division for Innovation	16.3	41.8	20.1	11.7	2.9	7.1	239
Division for Science	8.3	38.9	26.1	6.4	0.0	20.4	157
Division for Strategic Priorities	11.8	34.9	20.1	10.9	1.7	20.5	229
Don't know/NA	3.9	32.9	21.1	3.9	0.0	38.2	76
<b>RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and the public service sector</b>							
Division for Innovation	5.0	31.5	28.2	10.1	2.5	22.7	238
Division for Science	5.1	37.2	30.8	7.7	1.9	17.3	156
Division for Strategic Priorities	8.0	31.0	27.0	9.3	2.2	22.6	226
Don't know/NA	1.3	23.7	27.6	11.8	1.3	34.2	76
<b>RCN facilitates the development and strengthening of strategic intelligence among research performers, national and regional authorities and RCN itself</b>							
Division for Innovation	7.1	38.2	26.9	7.1	2.5	18.1	238
Division for Science	9.7	42.9	24.7	6.5	1.9	14.3	154
Division for Strategic Priorities	9.7	40.5	23.3	7.5	0.9	18.1	227
Don't know/NA	3.9	27.6	21.1	6.6	2.6	38.2	76

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, and participants in RCN meeting places

Table 7.62 RCN Meeting place function (I): RCN activities within communication and dissemination. By position. Percentages.

Considering RCN's activities within communication and dissemination of research results, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
<b>RCN maintains the best practice activities in science communication</b>							
Researchers	14.3	42.9	22.3	8.9	0.9	10.7	112
Leaders	7.5	32.4	35.3	12.1	0.6	12.1	173
Others	7.1	36.5	27.7	9.7	1.7	17.3	422
<b>RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and industry</b>							
Researchers	8.8	39.8	26.5	5.3	0.9	18.6	113
Leaders	8.7	30.6	26.6	12.7	1.2	20.2	173
Others	13.7	40.2	18.0	9.0	2.1	17.0	423
<b>RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and the public service sector</b>							
Researchers	8.1	36.9	34.2	4.5	1.8	14.4	111
Leaders	3.5	33.1	29.1	14.5	2.3	17.4	172
Others	5.7	29.9	26.1	8.6	2.4	27.3	421
<b>RCN facilitates the development and strengthening of strategic intelligence among research performers, national and regional authorities and RCN itself</b>							
Researchers	9.0	45.0	26.1	7.2	1.8	10.8	111
Leaders	9.4	34.5	25.7	8.8	1.8	19.9	171
Others	7.4	39.2	23.3	6.2	1.9	22.1	421

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, and participants in RCN meeting places

Table 7.63 RCN Meeting place function (I): RCN activities within communication and dissemination. By participation in RCN Boards. Percentages.

Considering RCN's activities within communication and dissemination of research results, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
<b>RCN maintains the best practice activities in science communication</b>							
Member of RCN Board	5.5	32.6	31.2	10.5	1.6	18.5	487
Not member	15.8	47.3	22.7	8.9	0.0	5.4	203
Missing	0.0	17.6	29.4	17.6	5.9	29.4	17
<b>RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and industry</b>							
Member of RCN Board	11.7	32.5	21.9	11.2	1.8	20.9	489
Not member	12.8	50.7	20.2	3.4	1.5	11.3	203
Missing	0.0	35.3	23.5	23.5	0.0	17.6	17
<b>RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and the public service sector</b>							
Member of RCN Board	4.9	25.9	28.0	10.5	2.7	28.0	486
Not member	7.5	46.3	28.9	6.5	0.5	10.4	201
Missing	0.0	29.4	23.5	11.8	11.8	23.5	17
<b>RCN facilitates the development and strengthening of strategic intelligence among research performers, national and regional authorities and RCN itself</b>							
Member of RCN Board	8.4	32.3	26.1	7.4	2.3	23.5	486
Not member	8.0	55.5	20.0	5.5	0.5	10.5	200
Missing	0.0	35.3	23.5	11.8	5.9	23.5	17

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, and participants in RCN meeting places.

Table 7.64 RCN Meeting place function (I): RCN activities within communication and dissemination. By questionnaire. Percentages.

Considering RCN's activities within communication and dissemination of research results, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements	Agree fully	Agree partly	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree partly	Disagree fully	Don't know	N
<b>RCN maintains the best practice activities in science communication</b>							
Meeting places	8.9	38.5	26.5	9.1	1.4	15.6	559
Leaders	6.1	29.1	37.2	14.2	0.7	12.8	148
Total	8.3	36.5	28.7	10.2	1.3	15.0	707
<b>RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and industry</b>							
Meeting places	13.0	40.3	19.1	8.7	1.8	17.1	561
Leaders	6.8	28.4	30.4	11.5	1.4	21.6	148
Total	11.7	37.8	21.4	9.3	1.7	18.1	709
<b>RCN facilitates the creation of partnerships between the research/higher education sector and the public service sector</b>							
Meeting places	6.1	32.1	27.5	8.1	2.2	24.1	557
Leaders	3.4	30.6	30.6	14.3	2.7	18.4	147
Total	5.5	31.8	28.1	9.4	2.3	22.9	704
<b>RCN facilitates the development and strengthening of strategic intelligence among research performers, national and regional authorities and RCN itself</b>							
Meeting places	8.1	41.3	23.2	6.1	1.8	19.6	557
Leaders	8.2	30.1	28.8	10.3	2.1	20.5	146
Total	8.1	39.0	24.3	7.0	1.8	19.8	703

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys to leaders of Norwegian researcher institutions, and participants in RCN meeting places

Table 7.65 RCN Meeting place function (II): Results from participation in RCN boards/meetings. By sector. Percentages.

You have indicated that you have participated in one or more RCN boards and/or other meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes. To what extent did your participation in these meetings result in any of the following	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To a moderate extent	To a limited extent	Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Your improved understanding of the rationale for RCN policies and strategies</b>							
Universities	10.9	36.0	33.7	10.3	2.3	6.9	175
Special. univ.inst.	6.7	53.3	26.7	13.3	0.0	0.0	15
University colleges	8.2	34.7	42.9	8.2	2.0	4.1	49
Institute sector	10.9	28.8	34.0	14.7	3.2	8.3	156
University hospitals	8.3	41.7	25.0	16.7	0.0	8.3	12
Trade and industry	8.0	39.8	37.2	11.5	0.0	3.5	113
Government/public sector	7.6	45.6	32.9	10.1	1.3	2.5	79
Other	4.9	31.7	26.8	14.6	4.9	17.1	41
<b>Your improved insight into a wider set of research areas</b>							
Universities	6.9	34.9	37.1	10.9	4.0	6.3	175
Special. univ.inst.	13.3	33.3	46.7	6.7	0.0	0.0	15
University colleges	4.2	35.4	37.5	12.5	4.2	6.3	48
Institute sector	6.4	31.3	31.4	18.6	3.8	8.3	156
University hospitals	8.3	33.3	33.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	12
Trade and industry	4.5	38.4	32.1	18.8	2.7	3.6	112
Government/public sector	10.1	45.6	26.6	12.7	2.5	2.5	79
Other	2.4	24.4	39.0	14.6	4.9	14.6	41
<b>Input to RCN for changes in policies/strategies</b>							
Universities	1.7	22.4	43.7	16.1	6.9	9.2	174
Special. univ.inst.	13.3	13.3	26.7	33.3	13.3	0.0	15
University colleges	2.0	22.4	28.6	18.4	14.3	14.3	49
Institute sector	4.5	23.7	32.7	19.2	6.4	13.5	156
University hospitals	8.3	25.0	16.7	16.7	25.0	8.3	12
Trade and industry	1.8	19.3	41.2	20.2	9.6	7.9	114
Government/public sector	6.3	26.6	35.4	19.0	5.1	7.6	79
Other	4.9	22.0	24.4	19.5	7.3	22.0	41
<b>Input to RCN for changes in funding schemes</b>							
Universities	1.2	15.0	32.9	22.5	15.6	12.7	173
Special. univ.inst.	6.7	13.3	26.7	26.7	20.0	6.7	15
University colleges	0.0	8.3	20.8	22.9	31.3	16.7	48
Institute sector	3.9	6.5	30.3	23.2	16.8	19.4	155
University hospitals	0.0	8.3	25.0	16.7	25.0	25.0	12
Trade and industry	0.0	8.2	36.4	26.4	14.5	14.5	110
Government/public sector	6.3	7.6	29.1	29.1	13.9	13.9	79
Other	0.0	17.1	24.4	14.6	17.1	26.8	41
<b>Input to RCN for changes in funding processes</b>							
Universities	0.7	8.1	26.2	25.5	23.5	16.1	149
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	10.0	30.0	20.0	40.0	0.0	10
University colleges	0.0	3.4	13.8	24.1	37.9	20.7	29
Institute sector	0.9	6.4	23.6	23.6	21.8	23.6	110
University hospitals	0.0	8.3	16.7	16.7	25.0	33.3	12
Trade and industry	0.9	8.0	26.8	23.2	25.9	15.2	112
Government/public sector	1.3	13.9	20.3	34.2	16.5	13.9	79
Other	2.4	9.8	19.5	26.8	12.2	29.3	41
<b>Changes in RCN policy or processes</b>							
Universities	0.0	5.2	30.8	23.3	25.6	15.1	172
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	20.0	13.3	33.3	13.3	20.0	15
University colleges	0.0	8.3	10.4	31.3	31.3	18.8	48
Institute sector	1.3	9.0	18.6	27.6	21.8	21.8	156
University hospitals	0.0	0.0	33.3	16.7	33.3	16.7	12
Trade and industry	0.0	5.4	22.5	26.1	27.0	18.9	111
Government/public sector	2.5	6.3	25.3	32.9	13.9	19.0	79
Other	0.0	9.8	17.1	19.5	24.4	29.3	41

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places.

Table 7.66 RCN Meeting place function (II): Results from participation in RCN boards/meetings. By academic field. Percentages.

You have indicated that you have participated in one or more RCN boards and/or other meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes. To what extent did your participation in these meetings result in any of the following	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To a moderate extent	To a limited extent	Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Your improved understanding of the rationale for RCN policies and strategies</b>							
Humanities	5.9	38.2	41.2	11.8	2.9	0.0	34
Natural sciences	3.6	36.4	29.1	18.2	0.0	12.7	55
Medical sciences	11.3	35.5	29.0	12.9	3.2	8.1	62
Social sciences	9.3	26.7	45.3	8.1	3.5	7.0	86
Engineering sciences	10.1	37.4	33.3	9.1	0.0	10.1	99
Agriculture and fishery	6.5	32.6	37.0	15.2	4.3	4.3	46
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	14.1	38.5	29.6	11.1	2.2	4.4	135
Total	9.9	35.2	34.2	11.6	2.1	7.0	517
<b>Your improved insight into a wider set of research areas</b>							
Humanities	0.0	41.2	50.0	5.9	2.9	0.0	34
Natural sciences	3.6	34.5	40.0	16.4	0.0	5.5	55
Medical sciences	8.1	30.6	30.6	16.1	4.8	9.7	62
Social sciences	5.8	26.7	43.0	11.6	4.7	8.1	86
Engineering sciences	5.1	32.7	32.7	13.3	5.1	11.2	98
Agriculture and fishery	6.5	43.5	19.6	21.7	6.5	2.2	46
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	8.1	36.8	33.8	11.8	4.4	5.1	136
Total	6.0	34.2	35.2	13.5	4.3	6.8	517
<b>Input to RCN for changes in policies/strategies</b>							
Humanities	0.0	11.8	50.0	26.5	2.9	8.8	34
Natural sciences	3.6	20.0	36.4	20.0	9.1	10.9	55
Medical sciences	6.5	21.0	30.6	17.7	9.7	14.5	62
Social sciences	2.3	20.9	36.0	15.1	12.8	12.8	86
Engineering sciences	2.0	22.2	37.4	19.2	8.1	11.1	99
Agriculture and fishery	2.1	17.0	40.4	21.3	8.5	10.6	47
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	3.0	25.9	33.3	22.2	6.7	8.9	135
Total	2.9	21.4	36.3	19.9	8.5	11.0	518
<b>Input to RCN for changes in funding schemes</b>							
Humanities	0.0	11.8	32.4	20.6	20.6	14.7	34
Natural sciences	3.7	11.1	35.2	20.4	14.8	14.8	54
Medical sciences	3.2	9.7	30.6	17.7	17.7	21.0	62
Social sciences	1.2	10.6	29.4	24.7	21.2	12.9	85
Engineering sciences	1.0	9.2	37.8	17.3	17.3	17.3	98
Agriculture and fishery	2.2	4.3	26.1	34.8	17.4	15.2	46
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	2.2	11.9	27.6	21.6	17.2	19.4	134
Total	1.9	10.1	31.2	21.8	17.9	17.0	513
<b>Input to RCN for changes in funding processes</b>							
Humanities	0.0	7.1	25.0	21.4	35.7	10.7	28
Natural sciences	0.0	10.2	16.3	28.6	24.5	20.4	49
Medical sciences	0.0	10.9	25.5	21.8	18.2	23.6	55
Social sciences	0.0	1.5	30.3	22.7	24.2	21.2	66
Engineering sciences	0.0	6.6	28.6	15.4	26.4	23.1	91
Agriculture and fishery	0.0	5.1	28.2	33.3	20.5	12.8	39
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	3.2	6.4	16.0	30.9	24.5	19.1	94
Total	0.7	6.6	23.9	24.4	24.4	19.9	422
<b>Changes in RCN policy or processes</b>							
Humanities	0.0	2.9	23.5	26.5	29.4	17.6	34
Natural sciences	0.0	5.5	27.3	23.6	25.5	18.2	55
Medical sciences	0.0	6.7	26.7	21.7	20.0	25.0	60
Social sciences	0.0	2.3	24.4	27.9	25.6	19.8	86
Engineering sciences	0.0	5.1	21.2	19.2	28.3	26.3	99
Agriculture and fishery	2.2	8.9	22.2	40.0	13.3	13.3	45
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	0.7	13.3	17.0	24.4	27.4	17.0	135
Total	0.4	7.2	22.2	25.1	25.1	20.0	514

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places.

Table 7.67 RCN Meeting place function (II): Results from participation in RCN boards/meetings. By RCN division of most interest/importance. Percentages.

You have indicated that you have participated in one or more RCN boards and/or other meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes. To what extent did your participation in these meetings result in any of the following	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To a moderate extent	To a limited extent	Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Your improved understanding of the rationale for RCN policies and strategies</b>							
Division for Innovation	8.8	41.9	30.4	14.2	1.4	3.4	148
Division for Science	11.6	34.3	38.1	8.3	2.8	5.0	181
Division for Strategic Priorities	10.1	40.5	32.2	9.7	1.8	5.7	227
Don't know/NA	4.8	21.7	34.9	21.7	2.4	14.5	83
Total	9.5	36.6	33.8	11.9	2.0	6.1	639
<b>Your improved insight into a wider set of research areas</b>							
Division for Innovation	4.7	44.6	28.4	14.9	5.4	2.0	148
Division for Science	9.9	35.4	37.6	9.9	2.2	5.0	181
Division for Strategic Priorities	6.6	35.4	32.7	15.5	3.1	6.6	226
Don't know/NA	1.2	20.5	37.3	20.5	7.2	13.3	83
Total	6.4	35.6	33.7	14.4	3.9	6.0	638
<b>Input to RCN for changes in policies/strategies</b>							
Division for Innovation	4.7	18.8	37.6	20.8	9.4	8.7	149
Division for Science	4.4	19.3	39.8	20.4	5.0	11.0	181
Division for Strategic Priorities	3.5	29.4	36.0	16.2	7.0	7.9	228
Don't know/NA	1.2	15.9	28.0	19.5	14.6	20.7	82
Total	3.8	22.3	36.4	18.9	8.0	10.6	640
<b>Input to RCN for changes in funding schemes</b>							
Division for Innovation	2.7	10.1	35.1	25.0	16.2	10.8	148
Division for Science	2.8	11.2	29.1	26.3	14.5	16.2	179
Division for Strategic Priorities	1.8	12.1	31.7	21.9	18.3	14.3	224
Don't know/NA	1.2	6.1	22.0	22.0	19.5	29.3	82
Total	2.2	10.6	30.5	23.9	16.9	16.0	633
<b>Input to RCN for changes in funding processes</b>							
Division for Innovation	0.8	9.4	26.6	25.8	24.2	13.3	128
Division for Science	2.0	8.1	20.3	32.4	19.6	17.6	148
Division for Strategic Priorities	0.0	9.5	27.1	24.6	21.6	17.1	199
Don't know/NA	1.4	4.3	15.9	18.8	29.0	30.4	69
Total	0.9	8.5	23.7	26.3	22.6	18.0	544
<b>Changes in RCN policy or processes</b>							
Division for Innovation	2.7	6.1	25.0	25.7	24.3	16.2	148
Division for Science	0.6	7.8	23.5	27.4	21.2	19.6	179
Division for Strategic Priorities	0.0	8.0	24.3	27.9	23.5	16.4	226
Don't know/NA	0.0	4.9	16.0	19.8	28.4	30.9	81
Total	0.8	7.1	23.2	26.2	23.7	19.1	634

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places.

Table 7.68 RCN Meeting place function (II): Results from participation in RCN boards/meetings. By position. Percentages.

You have indicated that you have participated in one or more RCN boards and/or other meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes. To what extent did your participation in these meetings result in any of the following	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To a moderate extent	To a limited extent	Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Your improved understanding of the rationale for RCN policies and strategies</b>							
Researchers	8.9	32.0	37.1	12.0	2.4	7.6	291
Leaders	14.2	36.3	29.2	12.4	2.7	5.3	113
Other	7.7	41.7	32.8	11.3	1.2	5.3	247
Total	9.4	36.4	34.1	11.8	2.0	6.3	651
<b>Your improved insight into a wider set of research areas</b>							
Researchers	4.1	31.6	37.5	15.5	4.1	7.2	291
Leaders	13.4	36.6	30.4	9.8	3.6	6.3	112
Other	5.7	39.7	31.2	15.0	3.6	4.9	247
Total	6.3	35.5	33.8	14.3	3.8	6.2	650
<b>Input to RCN for changes in policies/strategies</b>							
Researchers	2.4	19.7	36.6	19.3	10.0	12.1	290
Leaders	6.2	28.3	36.3	18.9	8.1	8.8	113
Other	4.0	22.9	36.1	19.7	7.6	9.6	249
Total	3.7	22.4	36.3	18.9	8.1	10.6	652
<b>Input to RCN for changes in funding schemes</b>							
Researchers	1.0	9.0	31.6	21.9	20.1	16.3	288
Leaders	5.4	16.1	25.0	24.1	14.3	15.2	112
Other	2.0	9.8	31.8	25.7	14.3	16.3	245
Total	2.2	10.5	30.5	23.7	16.9	16.1	645
<b>Input to RCN for changes in funding processes</b>							
Researchers	0.7	6.6	22.6	24.3	25.3	20.5	288
Leaders	0.0	8.3	24.0	25.8	22.6	5.3	19
Other	1.2	10.1	23.9	27.9	19.8	17.0	247
Total	0.9	8.3	24.0	25.8	22.6	18.4	554
<b>Changes in RCN policy or processes</b>							
Researchers	0.0	3.5	23.5	25.6	27.3	20.1	289
Leaders	1.8	17.1	23.4	26.1	16.2	15.3	111
Other	1.2	6.5	22.8	27.2	22.4	19.9	246
Total	0.8	7.0	23.2	26.3	23.5	19.2	646

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places.



Table 7.69 By RCN Meeting place function (II): Results from participation in RCN boards/meetings. By participation in RCN Boards. Percentages.

You have indicated that you have participated in one or more RCN boards and/or other meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes. To what extent did your participation in these meetings result in any of the following	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To a moderate extent	To a limited extent	Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Your improved understanding of the rationale for RCN policies and strategies</b>							
Member of RCN Board	7.4	33.1	35.1	13.3	2.8	8.3	459
No participation	14.9	44.8	31.5	7.7	0.0	1.1	181
Missing	0.0	36.4	36.4	18.2	0.0	9.1	11
Total	9.4	36.4	34.1	11.8	2.0	6.3	651
<b>Your improved insight into a wider set of research areas</b>							
Member of RCN Board	5.0	30.9	34.2	16.6	5.2	8.1	459
No participation	9.4	48.3	32.2	8.3	0.6	1.1	180
Missing	9.1	18.2	45.4	18.2	0.0	9.1	11
Total	6.3	35.5	33.8	14.3	3.8	6.2	650
<b>Input to RCN for changes in policies/strategies</b>							
Member of RCN Board	3.3	19.6	33.7	19.6	10.2	13.7	460
No participation	4.9	29.1	43.4	17.0	2.7	2.7	182
Missing	0.0	30.0	30.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	10
Total	3.7	22.4	36.3	18.9	8.1	10.6	652
<b>Input to RCN for changes in funding schemes</b>							
Member of RCN Board	2.4	9.2	29.4	21.5	17.8	19.7	456
No participation	1.7	14.0	34.6	29.6	12.8	7.3	179
Missing	0.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	50.0	10.0	10
Total	2.2	10.5	30.5	23.7	16.9	16.1	645
<b>Input to RCN for changes in funding processes</b>							
Member of RCN Board	1.0	7.0	19.6	25.3	24.3	22.7	383
No participation	0.6	11.2	35.4	27.3	16.8	8.7	161
Missing	0.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	50.0	10.0	10
Total	0.9	8.3	24.0	25.8	22.6	18.4	554
<b>Changes in RCN policy or processes</b>							
Member of RCN Board	1.1	5.7	21.6	23.6	25.5	22.5	458
No participation	0.0	9.6	27.5	34.3	17.4	11.2	178
Missing	0.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	40.0	10.0	10
Total	0.8	7.0	23.2	26.3	23.5	19.2	646

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places.

Table 7.70 RCN Meeting place function (II): Results from participation in RCN boards/meetings. By questionnaire. Percentages.

You have indicated that you have participated in one or more RCN boards and/or other meetings giving input to RCN strategy work or development of research programmes. To what extent did your participation in these meetings result in any of the following	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To a moderate extent	To a limited extent	Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Your improved understanding of the rationale for RCN policies and strategies</b>							
Researchers	4.9	26.5	39.7	15.7	2.9	10.3	204
Meeting places	11.0	41.6	32.6	9.1	1.4	4.2	353
Leaders	12.8	38.3	27.7	13.8	2.1	5.3	94
Total	9.4	36.4	34.1	11.8	2.0	6.3	651
<b>Your improved insight into a wider set of research areas</b>							
Researchers	2.0	24.5	37.7	20.1	5.4	10.3	204
Meeting places	7.4	41.6	32.3	11.9	3.1	3.7	353
Leaders	11.8	36.6	31.2	10.8	3.2	6.5	93
Total	6.3	35.5	33.8	14.3	3.8	6.2	650
<b>Input to RCN for changes in policies/strategies</b>							
Researchers	2.0	16.7	33.5	18.7	12.8	16.3	203
Meeting places	3.9	24.2	37.7	20.0	6.5	7.6	355
Leaders	6.4	27.7	37.2	14.9	4.3	9.6	94
Total	3.7	22.4	36.3	18.9	8.1	10.6	652
<b>Input to RCN for changes in funding schemes</b>							
Researchers	1.0	7.4	28.7	20.8	20.8	21.3	202
Meeting places	1.7	10.9	33.5	25.5	15.5	12.9	349
Leaders	6.4	16.0	23.4	23.4	13.8	17.0	94
Total	2.2	10.5	30.5	23.7	16.9	16.1	645
<b>Input to RCN for changes in funding processes</b>							
Researchers	0.5	6.4	18.8	22.3	27.2	24.8	202
Meeting places	1.1	9.4	27.0	27.8	19.9	14.8	349
Leaders	0.9	8.3	24.0	25.8	22.6	18.4	94
Total	1.1	8.7	24.3	25.7	22.1	18.2	645
<b>Changes in RCN policy or processes</b>							
Researchers	0.0	3.4	19.7	25.1	27.6	24.1	203
Meeting places	0.9	5.7	25.9	27.1	23.6	16.8	351
Leaders	2.2	19.6	20.7	26.1	14.1	17.4	92
Total	0.8	7.0	23.2	26.3	23.5	19.2	646

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places.

Table 7.71 RCN Meeting place function (III): Importance of RCN. By sector. Percentages.

You have indicated that you have participated in meetings disseminating results from RCN programmes. To what extent did this participation result in any of the following:	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To a moderate extent	To a limited extent	Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of international developments in your field of research</b>							
Universities	4.5	17.7	43.4	18.2	9.6	6.6	198
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	31.6	42.1	15.8	10.5	0.0	19
University colleges	5.5	20.0	34.5	21.8	7.3	10.9	55
Institute sector	3.4	20.2	40.4	23.1	10.1	2.9	208
University hospitals	0.0	9.1	63.6	18.2	9.1	0.0	11
Trade and industry	1.0	21.9	32.3	26.0	12.5	6.3	96
Government/public sector	2.2	22.5	39.3	22.5	3.4	10.1	89
Other	3.1	18.8	40.6	9.4	0.0	28.1	32
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of new research fields</b>							
Universities	5.6	19.9	47.4	17.9	5.1	4.1	196
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	26.3	36.8	31.6	5.3	0.0	19
University colleges	1.8	20.0	41.8	23.6	9.1	3.6	55
Institute sector	3.3	23.9	45.5	21.1	3.3	2.9	209
University hospitals	9.1	36.4	18.2	27.3	9.1	0.0	11
Trade and industry	2.0	27.6	34.7	22.4	8.2	5.1	98
Government/public sector	3.3	35.2	39.6	11.0	2.2	8.8	91
Other	3.0	21.2	33.3	24.2	3.0	15.2	33
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of new science and technology methods</b>							
Universities	2.0	16.8	33.0	24.9	15.2	8.1	197
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	0.0	47.4	31.6	10.5	10.5	19
University colleges	0.0	16.4	32.7	21.8	18.2	10.9	55
Institute sector	0.5	16.4	41.5	24.6	9.2	7.7	207
University hospitals	0.0	9.1	45.5	9.1	36.4	0.0	11
Trade and industry	1.0	21.6	39.2	19.6	11.3	7.2	97
Government/public sector	1.1	15.4	39.6	25.3	7.7	11.0	91
Other	3.1	12.5	28.1	34.4	3.1	18.8	32
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with (other) institutions in the research or higher education sector</b>							
Universities	4.6	14.8	36.7	21.9	15.3	6.6	196
Special. univ.inst.	5.3	15.8	31.6	21.1	21.1	5.3	19
University colleges	5.5	16.4	21.8	23.6	25.5	7.3	55
Institute sector	3.9	16.4	32.4	26.6	15.9	4.8	207
University hospitals	0.0	18.2	54.5	18.2	9.1	0.0	11
Trade and industry	0.0	17.5	37.1	22.7	13.4	9.3	97
Government/public sector	1.1	15.7	32.6	20.2	13.5	16.9	89
Other	3.0	3.0	39.4	30.3	9.1	15.2	33
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with industry</b>							
Universities	0.0	3.6	14.8	15.3	44.9	21.4	196
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	0.0	11.1	22.2	61.1	5.6	18
University colleges	1.9	11.3	15.1	7.5	47.2	17.0	53
Institute sector	1.9	6.3	18.4	18.0	40.8	14.6	206
University hospitals	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.2	63.6	18.2	11
Trade and industry	2.1	22.1	27.4	26.3	15.8	6.3	95
Government/public sector	2.2	7.7	19.8	15.4	34.1	20.9	91
Other	0.0	24.2	12.1	15.2	21.2	27.3	33
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with the public services sector</b>							
Universities	0.0	8.2	19.0	22.1	35.4	15.4	195
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	5.3	31.6	26.3	31.6	5.3	19
University colleges	0.0	11.1	18.5	24.1	35.2	11.1	54
Institute sector	0.5	7.2	18.4	26.6	34.8	12.6	207
University hospitals	9.1	0.0	9.1	27.3	36.4	18.2	11
Trade and industry	2.1	7.3	16.7	25.0	33.3	15.6	96
Government/public sector	3.4	7.9	25.8	25.8	18.0	19.1	89
Other	0.0	0.0	31.3	25.0	15.6	28.1	32
<b>Your improved understanding of user needs</b>							
Universities	5.6	13.7	29.2	20.3	16.8	14.2	197
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	21.1	63.2	10.5	5.3	0.0	19
University colleges	1.8	20.0	25.5	25.5	20.0	7.3	55
Institute sector	2.9	17.4	34.8	24.6	15.9	4.3	207
University hospitals	0.0	25.0	33.3	16.7	16.7	8.3	12
Trade and industry	2.1	20.0	33.7	20.0	16.8	7.4	95
Government/public sector	2.2	16.3	42.4	19.6	12.0	7.6	92
Other	0.0	24.2	27.3	21.2	12.1	15.2	33
<b>Your improved understanding of industry needs</b>							
Universities	2.6	7.7	19.9	10.2	35.2	24.5	196
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	5.3	21.1	31.6	31.6	10.5	19
University colleges	1.9	9.4	13.2	20.8	34.0	20.8	53
Institute sector	2.4	11.7	18.4	27.7	24.3	15.5	206
University hospitals	0.0	0.0	8.3	16.7	58.3	16.7	12
Trade and industry	4.1	25.8	32.0	18.6	15.5	4.1	97
Government/public sector	1.1	15.2	27.2	26.1	18.5	12.0	92

Other	0.0	21.9	21.9	9.4	15.6	31.3	32
<b>Commercialisation of research results</b>							
Universities	0.0	7.3	20.0	12.7	41.8	18.2	55
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	0.0	3
University colleges	0.0	11.1	22.2	22.2	33.3	11.1	9
Institute sector	0.0	4.2	20.8	25.0	29.2	20.8	24
University hospitals	0.0	0.0	60.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	5
Trade and industry	1.0	18.4	32.7	22.4	17.3	8.2	98
Government/public sector	1.1	5.4	30.4	22.8	18.5	21.7	92
Other	0.0	15.6	28.1	18.8	15.6	21.9	32
<b>Innovation in the public services sector</b>							
Universities	3.6	5.5	18.2	29.1	25.5	18.2	55
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3
University colleges	0.0	11.1	22.2	33.3	22.2	11.1	9
Institute sector	0.0	4.2	8.3	37.5	29.2	20.8	24
University hospitals	0.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	5
Trade and industry	0.0	2.1	20.8	27.1	27.1	22.9	96
Government/public sector	0.0	13.3	30.0	16.7	21.1	18.9	90
Other	0.0	15.2	15.2	18.2	15.2	36.4	33
<b>Change in the focus of your research unit</b>							
Universities	2.2	9.4	19.6	23.2	34.1	11.6	138
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	0.0	37.5	43.8	18.8	0.0	16
University colleges	0.0	2.2	30.4	26.1	30.4	10.9	46
Institute sector	0.6	7.2	27.1	29.8	29.8	5.5	181
University hospitals	0.0	14.3	57.1	0.0	28.6	0.0	7
<b>Your improved understanding of innovation needs in the public service sector</b>							
Universities	1.8	10.9	32.7	21.8	21.8	10.9	55
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3
University colleges	0.0	11.1	55.6	22.2	11.1	0.0	9
Institute sector	0.0	0.0	16.7	50.0	12.5	20.8	24
University hospitals	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	5
Trade and industry	1.0	11.5	24.0	26.0	22.9	14.6	96
Government/public sector	4.4	14.3	33.0	25.3	13.2	9.9	91
Other	0.0	21.2	21.2	6.1	15.2	36.4	33

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places. Question 'k' was only asked in the leader and researcher surveys. Questions 'i', 'j' and 'l' were only asked in the survey to participants in RCN meeting places.

Table 7.72 RCN Meeting place function (III): Importance of RCN. By academic field. Percentages.

You have indicated that you have participated in meetings disseminating results from RCN programmes. To what extent did this participation result in any of the following:	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To a moderate extent	To a limited extent	Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of international developments in your field of research</b>							
Humanities	10.8	24.3	43.2	10.8	2.7	8.1	37
Natural sciences	7.3	24.4	32.9	18.3	9.8	7.3	82
Medical sciences	1.8	17.5	50.9	19.3	1.8	8.8	57
Social sciences	3.4	16.4	42.2	23.3	12.1	2.6	116
Engineering sciences	0.9	17.0	48.2	20.5	11.6	1.8	112
Agriculture and fishery	2.2	15.2	45.7	23.9	8.7	4.3	46
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	2.1	22.4	35.7	25.2	8.4	6.3	143
Total	3.4	19.6	41.7	21.4	8.9	5.1	593
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of new research fields</b>							
Humanities	8.3	19.4	50.0	19.4	0.0	2.8	36
Natural sciences	7.2	27.7	42.2	16.9	3.6	2.4	83
Medical sciences	3.6	30.4	37.5	14.3	5.4	8.9	56
Social sciences	2.6	20.7	40.5	26.7	6.0	3.4	116
Engineering sciences	2.7	21.4	47.3	22.3	4.5	1.8	112
Agriculture and fishery	2.1	16.7	47.9	29.2	2.1	2.1	48
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	3.5	23.9	43.7	16.9	8.5	3.5	142
Total	3.9	23.1	43.7	20.7	5.2	3.4	593
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of new science and technology methods</b>							
Humanities	5.6	8.3	22.2	38.9	13.9	11.1	36
Natural sciences	2.5	23.5	35.8	22.2	9.9	6.2	81
Medical sciences	0.0	17.5	45.6	14.0	10.5	12.3	57
Social sciences	0.9	9.6	28.7	28.7	20.9	11.3	115
Engineering sciences	1.8	15.0	48.7	23.9	7.1	3.5	113
Agriculture and fishery	2.1	16.7	47.9	27.1	4.2	2.1	48
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	0.0	20.4	35.2	22.5	13.4	8.5	142
Total	1.4	16.4	37.8	24.5	12.2	7.8	592
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with (other) institutions in the research or higher education sector</b>							
Humanities	13.9	11.1	38.9	25.0	5.6	5.6	36
Natural sciences	4.9	18.5	35.8	16.0	18.5	6.2	81
Medical sciences	1.8	19.3	45.6	12.3	10.5	10.5	57
Social sciences	3.5	9.6	28.7	27.8	25.2	5.2	115
Engineering sciences	1.8	19.3	37.7	20.2	17.5	3.5	114
Agriculture and fishery	2.2	13.0	41.3	30.4	10.9	2.2	46
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	2.8	17.5	30.1	26.6	12.6	10.5	143
Total	3.5	15.9	35.0	23.0	16.0	6.6	592
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with industry</b>							
Humanities	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.4	54.3	34.3	35
Natural sciences	2.5	6.2	13.6	21.0	44.4	12.3	81
Medical sciences	0.0	1.8	10.7	16.1	48.2	23.2	56
Social sciences	0.0	0.0	5.3	8.8	60.2	25.7	113
Engineering sciences	1.8	20.4	38.9	17.7	17.7	3.5	113
Agriculture and fishery	2.2	6.5	23.9	30.4	28.3	8.7	46
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	1.4	11.2	20.3	14.7	37.1	15.4	143
Total	1.2	8.2	18.2	16.2	40.2	16.0	587
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with the public services sector</b>							
Humanities	0.0	5.6	22.2	22.2	25.0	25.0	36
Natural sciences	0.0	4.9	17.3	21.0	44.4	12.3	81
Medical sciences	1.8	14.5	16.4	23.6	25.5	18.2	55
Social sciences	0.9	9.6	11.4	26.3	40.4	11.4	114
Engineering sciences	1.8	4.4	24.6	20.2	37.7	11.4	114
Agriculture and fishery	0.0	2.2	23.9	23.9	34.8	15.2	46
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	0.7	7.7	24.6	26.1	26.1	14.8	142
Total	0.9	7.1	20.1	23.6	34.2	14.1	588
<b>Your improved understanding of user needs</b>							
Humanities	2.8	13.9	25.0	25.0	5.6	27.8	36
Natural sciences	3.7	18.5	30.9	22.2	18.5	6.2	81
Medical sciences	6.9	13.8	31.0	19.0	13.8	15.5	58
Social sciences	4.3	18.3	28.7	26.1	13.0	9.6	115
Engineering sciences	4.4	23.0	37.2	15.0	15.9	4.4	113
Agriculture and fishery	0.0	15.2	34.8	34.8	10.9	4.3	46
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	1.4	14.7	35.7	20.3	21.7	6.3	143
Total	3.4	17.4	32.8	22.0	15.9	8.6	592
<b>Your improved understanding of industry needs</b>							
Humanities	0.0	0.0	2.9	8.6	51.4	37.1	35

Natural sciences	2.5	13.6	21.0	19.8	25.9	17.3	81
Medical sciences	1.7	6.9	13.8	13.8	31.0	32.8	58
Social sciences	1.8	3.5	8.8	15.8	43.9	26.3	114
Engineering sciences	6.2	26.5	40.7	11.5	14.2	0.9	113
Agriculture and fishery	0.0	12.8	25.5	40.4	14.9	6.4	47
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	2.1	8.5	20.4	26.8	26.1	16.2	142
Total	2.5	11.4	20.8	19.5	28.3	17.5	590
<b>Commercialisation of research results</b>							
Humanities	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	3
Natural sciences	0.0	10.0	30.0	10.0	40.0	10.0	10
Medical sciences	0.0	0.0	41.2	23.5	23.5	11.8	17
Social sciences	0.0	0.0	16.0	16.0	28.0	40.0	25
Engineering sciences	1.7	15.3	42.4	20.3	15.3	5.1	59
Agriculture and fishery	0.0	11.1	33.3	33.3	22.2	0.0	9
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	0.0	6.3	22.8	17.7	39.2	13.9	79
Total	0.5	8.9	29.7	18.8	28.7	13.4	202
<b>Innovation in the public services sector</b>							
Humanities	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	3
Natural sciences	0.0	11.1	44.4	0.0	33.3	11.1	9
Medical sciences	5.6	5.6	22.2	44.4	16.7	5.6	18
Social sciences	0.0	4.2	16.7	37.5	4.2	37.5	24
Engineering sciences	0.0	1.7	22.0	32.2	18.6	25.4	59
Agriculture and fishery	0.0	0.0	12.5	25.0	37.5	25.0	8
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	0.0	8.8	15.0	27.5	31.3	17.5	80
Total	1.0	5.5	18.9	30.3	23.4	20.9	201
<b>Change in the focus of your research unit</b>							
Humanities	3.1	6.3	21.9	31.3	18.8	18.8	32
Natural sciences	0.0	8.7	23.2	24.6	37.7	5.8	69
Medical sciences	2.5	12.5	30.0	17.5	27.5	10.0	40
Social sciences	1.1	6.7	17.8	35.6	32.2	6.7	90
Engineering sciences	1.8	3.6	38.2	23.6	32.7	0.0	55
Agriculture and fishery	0.0	2.7	29.7	32.4	24.3	10.8	37
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	0.0	9.5	27.0	22.2	31.7	9.5	63
Total	1.0	7.3	25.9	27.2	30.8	7.8	386
<b>Your improved understanding of innovation needs in the public service sector</b>							
Humanities	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	3
Natural sciences	0.0	20.0	40.0	20.0	10.0	10.0	10
Medical sciences	0.0	11.8	35.3	41.2	5.9	5.9	17
Social sciences	0.0	8.0	36.0	24.0	12.0	20.0	25
Engineering sciences	0.0	10.2	28.8	27.1	15.3	18.6	59
Agriculture and fishery	0.0	12.5	25.0	25.0	25.0	12.5	8
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	3.8	7.5	27.5	23.8	25.0	12.5	80
Total	2.0	9.4	30.2	25.7	18.3	14.4	202

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places. Question 'k' was only asked in the leader and researcher surveys. Questions 'i', 'j' and 'l' were only asked in the survey to participants in RCN meeting places.

Table 7.73 RCN Meeting place function (III): Importance of RCN. By RCN Division of most interest/importance. Percentages.

You have indicated that you have participated in meetings disseminating results from RCN programmes. To what extent did this participation result in any of the following:	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To a moderate extent	To a limited extent	Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of international developments in your field of research</b>							
Division for Innovation	1.3	21.4	39.0	22.1	7.1	9.1	154
Division for Science	5.9	20.5	38.0	23.4	5.4	6.8	205
Division for Strategic Priorities	2.2	22.9	43.2	21.6	6.2	4.0	227
Don't know/NA	3.3	11.6	38.0	18.2	19.8	9.1	121
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of new research fields</b>							
Division for Innovation	1.9	25.9	41.8	19.0	5.1	6.3	158
Division for Science	5.9	24.6	43.8	19.2	2.5	3.9	203
Division for Strategic Priorities	1.8	30.8	44.5	17.2	3.5	2.2	227
Don't know/NA	5.0	10.7	41.3	25.6	10.7	6.6	121
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of new science and technology methods</b>							
Division for Innovation	1.9	13.4	42.0	24.2	8.3	10.2	157
Division for Science	1.0	16.7	40.2	21.1	12.3	8.8	204
Division for Strategic Priorities	0.4	20.3	41.0	26.9	7.0	4.4	227
Don't know/NA	1.7	13.3	24.2	24.2	25.0	11.7	120
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with (other) institutions in the research or higher education sector</b>							
Division for Innovation	3.2	14.7	37.8	28.2	7.7	8.3	156
Division for Science	3.9	16.1	35.6	22.4	12.2	9.8	205
Division for Strategic Priorities	1.8	19.1	36.4	20.0	18.7	4.0	225
Don't know/NA	3.3	8.3	26.7	25.0	25.8	10.8	120
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with industry</b>							
Division for Innovation	3.9	19.5	35.7	18.2	13.6	9.1	154
Division for Science	0.5	4.9	12.3	14.8	45.8	21.7	203
Division for Strategic Priorities	0.0	8.8	17.3	19.5	39.8	14.6	226
Don't know/NA	0.8	2.5	8.4	15.1	52.9	20.2	119
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with the public services sector</b>							
Division for Innovation	3.2	7.7	22.6	30.3	22.6	13.5	155
Division for Science	0.5	7.5	15.9	22.4	31.3	22.4	201
Division for Strategic Priorities	0.4	8.0	25.8	23.6	32.9	9.3	225
Don't know/NA	0.0	5.0	16.5	24.8	39.7	14.0	121
<b>Your improved understanding of user needs</b>							
Division for Innovation	3.8	18.6	35.9	17.9	17.3	6.4	156
Division for Science	3.4	15.2	33.3	25.0	10.3	12.7	204
Division for Strategic Priorities	2.6	21.1	36.8	21.1	14.5	3.9	228
Don't know/NA	2.5	11.6	28.9	20.7	24.0	12.4	121
<b>Your improved understanding of industry needs</b>							
Division for Innovation	5.1	20.5	30.8	23.7	13.5	6.4	156
Division for Science	0.5	8.9	16.3	20.7	29.6	24.1	203
Division for Strategic Priorities	1.3	13.7	24.3	19.9	27.9	12.8	226
Don't know/NA	1.7	9.9	16.5	14.0	34.7	23.1	121
<b>Commercialisation of research results</b>							
Division for Innovation	1.8	19.3	36.0	21.1	13.2	8.8	114
Division for Science	0.0	4.2	26.4	20.8	30.6	18.1	72
Division for Strategic Priorities	0.0	5.9	27.1	19.5	29.7	17.8	118
Don't know/NA	0.0	7.7	11.5	26.9	26.9	26.9	26
<b>Innovation in the public services sector</b>							
Division for Innovation	0.0	7.1	25.7	23.0	25.7	18.6	113
Division for Science	0.0	6.8	19.2	31.5	20.5	21.9	73
Division for Strategic Priorities	0.9	8.6	21.6	24.1	24.1	20.7	116
Don't know/NA	4.0	8.0	20.0	16.0	24.0	28.0	25
<b>Change in the focus of your research unit</b>							
Division for Innovation	0.0	16.7	38.1	28.6	14.3	2.4	42
Division for Science	2.3	6.2	26.2	23.8	31.5	10.0	130
Division for Strategic Priorities	0.0	7.3	28.4	29.4	30.3	4.6	109
Don't know/NA	1.1	4.3	17.0	27.7	40.4	9.6	94
<b>Your improved understanding of innovation needs in the public service sector</b>							
Division for Innovation	2.6	14.0	28.1	20.2	20.2	14.9	114
Division for Science	0.0	6.9	38.9	27.8	11.1	15.3	72
Division for Strategic Priorities	0.9	15.5	25.0	30.2	17.2	11.2	116
Don't know/NA	7.7	3.8	26.9	15.4	23.1	23.1	26

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places. Question 'k' was only asked in the leader and researcher surveys. Questions 'i', 'j' and 'l' were only asked in the survey to participants in RCN meeting places.

Table 7.74 RCN Meeting place function (III): Importance of RCN. By position. Percentages.

You have indicated that you have participated in meetings disseminating results from RCN programmes. To what extent did this participation result in any of the following:	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To a moderate extent	To a limited extent	Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of international developments in your field of research</b>							
Researchers	3.6	18.0	42.2	20.8	10.4	4.9	384
Leaders	4.8	24.0	37.5	21.2	6.7	5.8	104
Others	1.7	21.0	37.8	22.7	6.4	10.2	233
Total	3.2	19.8	40.1	21.5	8.6	6.8	721
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of new research fields</b>							
Researchers	3.9	20.9	45.4	20.6	5.2	3.9	383
Leaders	4.8	27.9	42.3	20.2	3.8	1.0	104
Others	2.5	28.7	38.8	17.7	4.6	7.6	237
Total	3.6	24.4	42.8	19.6	4.8	4.7	724
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of new science and technology methods</b>							
Researchers	1.3	14.7	36.9	24.9	13.6	8.6	382
Leaders	0.0	20.2	37.5	24.0	11.5	6.7	104
Others	1.3	17.4	40.3	22.9	8.5	9.7	236
Total	1.1	16.3	38.1	24.1	11.6	8.7	722
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with (other) institutions in the research or higher education sector</b>							
Researchers	3.7	15.0	34.6	23.4	17.8	5.5	381
Leaders	6.7	19.2	29.8	24.0	13.5	6.7	104
Others	0.9	13.6	36.6	23.0	13.2	12.8	235
Total	3.2	15.1	34.6	23.3	15.7	8.1	720
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with industry</b>							
Researchers	0.8	4.8	14.0	14.8	47.1	18.5	378
Leaders	1.9	7.8	24.3	15.5	35.9	14.6	103
Others	1.7	15.7	22.1	21.3	24.3	14.9	235
Total	1.3	8.8	18.2	17.0	38.0	16.8	716
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with the public services sector</b>							
Researchers	0.5	8.2	17.6	22.9	37.1	13.7	380
Leaders	0.0	6.8	22.3	29.1	29.1	12.6	103
Others	2.1	6.0	24.0	25.3	24.0	18.5	233
Total	1.0	7.3	20.4	24.6	31.7	15.1	716
<b>Your improved understanding of user needs</b>							
Researchers	4.4	16.4	31.9	21.9	15.7	9.7	383
Leaders	1.0	19.2	34.6	22.1	18.3	4.8	104
Others	1.7	17.8	37.3	20.8	14.0	8.5	236
Total	3.0	17.3	34.0	21.6	15.5	8.6	723
<b>Your improved understanding of industry needs</b>							
Researchers	2.4	9.4	16.8	16.8	33.3	21.3	381
Leaders	2.0	10.8	24.5	26.5	22.5	13.7	102
Others	2.1	19.4	28.7	21.9	16.5	11.4	237
Total	2.2	12.9	21.8	19.9	26.3	16.9	720
<b>Commercialisation of research results</b>							
Researchers	0.0	5.2	20.8	16.9	37.7	19.5	77
Leaders	0.0	12.5	25.0	12.5	37.5	12.5	16
Others	0.8	11.8	31.5	22.7	18.5	14.7	238
Total	0.6	10.3	28.7	20.8	23.9	15.7	331
<b>Innovation in the public services sector</b>							
Researchers	2.6	6.5	19.5	33.8	19.5	18.2	77
Leaders	0.0	6.3	18.8	25.0	37.5	12.5	16
Others	0.0	8.1	23.4	21.7	24.3	22.6	235
Total	0.6	7.6	22.3	24.7	23.8	21.0	328
<b>Change in the focus of your research unit</b>							
Researchers	1.3	7.0	23.6	26.2	33.2	8.6	301
Leaders	0.0	8.0	33.3	29.9	23.0	5.7	87
Others	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	1.0	7.2	25.8	27.1	30.9	8.0	388
<b>Your improved understanding of innovation needs in the public service sector</b>							
Researchers	1.3	7.8	35.1	31.2	14.3	10.4	77
Leaders	0.0	12.5	25.0	18.8	31.3	12.5	16
Others	2.1	13.6	28.0	23.3	17.4	15.7	236
Total	1.8	12.2	29.5	24.9	17.3	14.3	329

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places. Question 'k' was only asked in the leader and researcher surveys. Questions 'i', 'j' and 'l' were only asked in the survey to participants in RCN meeting places.



Table 7.75 RCN Meeting place function (III): Importance of RCN. By participation in RCN Boards. Percentages.

You have indicated that you have participated in meetings disseminating results from RCN programmes. To what extent did this participation result in any of the following:	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To a moderate extent	To a limited extent	Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of international developments in your field of research</b>							
Member of RCN Board	3.2	17.9	39.3	22.5	9.8	7.4	570
No participation	2.9	28.5	43.1	18.2	3.6	3.6	137
Missing	7.1	14.3	42.9	14.3	7.1	14.3	14
Total	3.2	19.8	40.1	21.5	8.6	6.8	721
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of new research fields</b>							
Member of RCN Board	3.2	20.9	42.8	22.1	5.6	5.4	570
No participation	4.3	38.8	43.2	10.8	2.2	0.7	139
Missing	13.3	26.7	40.0	6.7	0.0	13.3	15
Total	3.6	24.4	42.8	19.6	4.8	4.7	724
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of new science and technology methods</b>							
Member of RCN Board	0.7	15.1	36.0	25.1	13.0	10.0	569
No participation	2.2	23.0	45.3	20.9	5.8	2.9	139
Missing	7.1	0.0	50.0	14.3	14.3	14.3	14
Total	1.1	16.3	38.1	24.1	11.6	8.7	722
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with (other) institutions in the research or higher education sector</b>							
Member of RCN Board	3.2	13.6	33.3	22.4	18.3	9.3	568
No participation	2.2	21.7	39.1	27.5	5.8	3.6	138
Missing	14.3	14.3	42.9	21.4	7.1	0.0	14
Total	3.2	15.1	34.6	23.3	15.7	8.1	720
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with industry</b>							
Member of RCN Board	1.6	8.3	15.9	16.8	40.0	17.3	565
No participation	0.0	10.9	26.1	18.8	30.4	13.8	138
Missing	0.0	7.7	30.8	7.7	30.8	23.1	13
Total	1.3	8.8	18.2	17.0	38.0	16.8	716
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with the public services sector</b>							
Member of RCN Board	0.7	7.2	18.5	21.7	34.7	17.1	567
No participation	0.7	7.4	27.2	37.5	20.6	6.6	136
Missing	15.4	7.7	30.8	15.4	15.4	15.4	13
Total	1.0	7.3	20.4	24.6	31.7	15.1	716
<b>Your improved understanding of user needs</b>							
Member of RCN Board	3.5	17.0	31.8	21.1	16.7	10.0	570
No participation	1.4	18.0	43.2	24.5	10.1	2.9	139
Missing	0.0	21.4	35.7	14.3	21.4	7.1	14
Total	3.0	17.3	34.0	21.6	15.5	8.6	723
<b>Your improved understanding of industry needs</b>							
Member of RCN Board	2.6	12.3	21.0	19.4	27.1	17.6	568
No participation	0.7	15.1	25.9	22.3	21.6	14.4	139
Missing	0.0	15.4	15.4	15.4	38.5	15.4	13
Total	2.2	12.9	21.8	19.9	26.3	16.9	720
<b>Commercialisation of research results</b>							
Member of RCN Board	1.0	10.2	28.8	19.0	22.9	18.0	205
No participation	0.0	11.0	28.8	22.9	26.3	11.0	118
Missing	0.0	0.0	25.0	37.5	12.5	25.0	8
Total	0.6	10.3	28.7	20.8	23.9	15.7	331
<b>Innovation in the public services sector</b>							
Member of RCN Board	0.0	7.9	20.7	20.2	26.6	24.6	203
No participation	1.7	6.0	23.9	32.5	20.5	15.4	117
Missing	0.0	25.0	37.5	25.0	0.0	12.5	8
Total	0.6	7.6	22.3	24.7	23.8	21.0	328
<b>Change in the focus of your research unit</b>							
Member of RCN Board	1.1	6.6	24.4	28.0	32.1	7.8	361
No participation	0.0	9.5	52.4	19.0	9.5	9.5	21
Missing	0.0	33.3	16.7	0.0	33.3	16.7	6
Total	1.0	7.2	25.8	27.1	30.9	8.0	388
<b>Your improved understanding of innovation needs in the public service sector</b>							
Member of RCN Board	1.5	10.7	26.3	22.4	19.5	19.5	205
No participation	2.6	13.8	35.3	28.4	14.7	5.2	116
Missing	0.0	25.0	25.0	37.5	0.0	12.5	8
Total	1.8	12.2	29.5	24.9	17.3	14.3	329

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places. Question 'k' was only asked in the leader and researcher surveys. Questions 'i', 'j' and 'l' were only asked in the survey to participants in RCN meeting places.

Table 7.76 RCN Meeting place function (III): Importance of RCN. By questionnaire. Percentages.

You have indicated that you have participated in meetings disseminating results from RCN programmes. To what extent did this participation result in any of the following:	To a very large extent	To a large extent	To a moderate extent	To a limited extent	Not at all	Cannot say	N
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of international developments in your field of research</b>							
Researchers	4.6	17.3	40.8	19.9	11.8	5.6	306
Meeting places	1.5	20.8	40.4	22.6	6.7	8.0	327
Leaders	4.5	25.0	36.4	22.7	4.5	6.8	88
Total	3.2	19.8	40.1	21.5	8.6	6.8	721
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of new research fields</b>							
Researchers	3.9	19.0	44.9	22.3	5.6	4.3	395
Meeting places	3.0	29.0	40.8	16.9	4.2	6.0	331
Leaders	4.5	26.1	43.2	20.5	4.5	1.1	88
Total	3.6	24.4	42.8	19.6	4.8	4.7	724
<b>Your enhanced knowledge of new science and technology methods</b>							
Researchers	1.6	14.1	35.9	24.0	14.8	9.5	304
Meeting places	0.9	17.0	40.9	23.9	8.8	8.5	330
Leaders	0.0	21.6	35.2	25.0	11.4	6.8	88
Total	1.1	16.3	38.1	24.1	11.6	8.7	722
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with (other) institutions in the research or higher education sector</b>							
Researchers	4.6	14.2	31.4	23.4	20.1	6.3	303
Meeting places	1.2	15.2	38.6	22.8	12.2	10.0	329
Leaders	5.7	18.2	30.7	25.0	13.6	6.8	88
Total	3.2	15.1	34.6	23.3	15.7	8.1	720
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with industry</b>							
Researchers	1.0	5.0	12.3	15.7	47.7	18.3	300
Meeting places	1.5	12.5	21.9	18.8	29.5	15.8	329
Leaders	1.1	8.0	24.1	14.9	36.8	14.9	87
Total	1.3	8.8	18.2	17.0	38.0	16.8	716
<b>The creation of strategic partnerships with the public services sector</b>							
Researchers	0.7	8.3	15.8	20.8	39.6	14.9	303
Meeting places	1.5	6.4	23.3	27.6	25.5	15.6	326
Leaders	0.0	6.9	25.3	26.4	27.6	13.8	87
Total	1.0	7.3	20.4	24.6	31.7	15.1	716
<b>Your improved understanding of user needs</b>							
Researchers	4.9	15.7	29.8	22.0	16.7	10.8	305
Meeting places	1.8	18.5	36.4	21.8	13.9	7.6	330
Leaders	1.1	18.2	39.8	19.3	17.0	4.5	88
Total	3.0	17.3	34.0	21.6	15.5	8.6	723
<b>Your improved understanding of industry needs</b>							
Researchers	2.6	9.6	14.5	16.2	35.3	21.8	303
Meeting places	1.8	17.2	27.2	20.8	19.9	13.0	331
Leaders	2.3	8.1	26.7	29.1	18.6	15.1	86
Total	2.2	12.9	21.8	19.9	26.3	16.9	720
<b>Commercialisation of research results</b>							
Researchers	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Meeting places	0.6	10.3	28.7	20.8	23.9	15.7	331
Leaders	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	0.6	10.3	28.7	20.8	23.9	15.7	331
<b>Innovation in the public services sector</b>							
Researchers	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Meeting places	0.6	7.6	22.3	24.7	23.8	21.0	328
Leaders	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	0.6	7.6	22.3	24.7	23.8	21.0	328
<b>Change in the focus of your research unit</b>							
Researchers	1.3	7.0	23.6	26.2	33.2	8.6	301
Meeting places	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Leaders	0.0	8.0	33.3	29.9	23.0	5.7	87
Total	1.0	7.2	25.8	27.1	30.9	8.0	388
<b>Your improved understanding of innovation needs in the public service sector</b>							
Researchers	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Meeting places	1.8	12.2	29.5	24.9	17.3	14.3	329
Leaders	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total	1.8	12.2	29.5	24.9	17.3	14.3	329

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys of leaders at research institutions, researchers, and participants in RCN meeting places. Question 'k' was only asked in the leader and researcher surveys. Questions 'i', 'j' and 'l' were only asked in the survey to participants in RCN meeting places.

Table 7.77 RCN Meeting place function (IV): Importance of RCN. By sector. Percentages.

Compared with the meeting places provided by other Norwegian institutions*, how important is RCN for you/your organisation for the following issues:	The most important national meeting place	Among the most important national meeting places	A less important national meeting place	The least important national meeting place	Cannot say	N
<b>As a meeting place for research dissemination/communication</b>						
Universities	8.5	50.0	31.7	4.9	4.9	82
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	80.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	5
University colleges	0.0	41.7	58.3	0.0	0.0	12
Institute sector	5.7	54.3	37.1	0.0	2.9	35
University hospitals	0.0	83.3	0.0	16.7	0.0	6
Trade and industry	8.2	52.0	23.0	6.1	10.7	196
Government/public sector	13.1	59.9	12.4	2.9	11.7	137
Other	10.8	50.8	16.9	1.5	20.0	65
Total	9.3	54.1	22.1	4.3	10.2	538
<b>As a meeting place for discussion of Norwegian research policy</b>						
Universities	11.0	63.4	11.0	3.7	11.0	82
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5
University colleges	16.7	58.3	25.0	0.0	0.0	12
Institute sector	11.4	62.9	20.0	2.9	2.9	35
University hospitals	0.0	83.3	16.7	0.0	0.0	6
Trade and industry	15.3	52.0	12.2	2.6	17.9	196
Government/public sector	16.2	52.2	7.4	1.5	22.8	136
Other	14.1	45.3	20.3	1.6	18.8	64
Total	14.2	54.7	12.5	2.2	16.4	536
<b>As a meeting place for discussion of Norwegian innovation policy</b>						
Universities	2.4	40.2	22.0	1.2	34.1	82
Special. univ.inst.	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	5
University colleges	0.0	25.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	12
Institute sector	2.9	41.2	23.5	0.0	32.4	34
University hospitals	0.0	50.0	16.7	16.7	16.7	6
Trade and industry	7.7	52.0	18.4	6.1	15.8	196
Government/public sector	4.4	33.3	25.2	2.2	34.8	135
Other	6.2	38.5	24.6	3.1	27.7	65
Total	5.2	42.6	22.2	3.6	26.4	535

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of participants in RCN meeting places. \* Such as other government bodies or ministries, large research/higher education institutions and interest organisations.

Table 7.78 RCN Meeting place function (IV): Importance of RCN. By academic field. Percentages.

Compared with the meeting places provided by other Norwegian institutions*, how important is RCN for you/your organisation for the following issues:	The most important national meeting place	Among the most important national meeting places	A less important national meeting place	The least important national meeting place	Cannot say	N
<b>As a meeting place for research dissemination/communication</b>						
Humanities	11.1	33.3	33.3	0.0	22.2	9
Natural sciences	0.0	70.6	17.6	0.0	11.8	17
Medical sciences	2.9	45.7	31.4	17.1	2.9	35
Social sciences	3.4	62.1	31.0	3.4	0.0	29
Engineering sciences	7.0	56.5	21.7	4.3	10.4	115
Agriculture and fishery	23.5	41.2	23.5	5.9	5.9	17
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	8.7	48.4	30.2	4.0	8.7	126
Total	7.5	52.3	26.7	5.2	8.3	348
<b>As a meeting place for discussion of Norwegian research policy</b>						
Humanities	11.1	44.4	22.2	0.0	22.2	9
Natural sciences	17.6	58.8	11.8	0.0	11.8	17
Medical sciences	8.6	60.0	14.3	5.7	11.4	35
Social sciences	6.9	75.9	6.9	3.4	6.9	29
Engineering sciences	17.4	52.2	10.4	1.7	18.3	115
Agriculture and fishery	17.6	58.8	5.9	5.9	11.8	17
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	13.7	50.0	17.7	2.4	16.1	124
Total	14.2	54.6	13.3	2.6	15.3	346
<b>As a meeting place for discussion of Norwegian innovation policy</b>						
Humanities	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	9
Natural sciences	0.0	29.4	17.6	0.0	52.9	17
Medical sciences	8.6	40.0	17.1	8.6	25.7	35
Social sciences	0.0	25.0	28.6	0.0	46.4	28
Engineering sciences	9.6	53.0	19.1	4.3	13.9	115
Agriculture and fishery	5.9	52.9	23.5	5.9	11.8	17
Multiple areas, high degree of cross-disciplinarity, other	4.0	38.7	25.0	4.8	27.4	124
Total	5.8	42.6	21.4	4.3	25.8	345

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of participants in RCN meeting places. \* Such as other government bodies or ministries, large research/higher education institutions and interest organisations.

Table 7.79 RCN Meeting place function (IV): Importance of RCN. By RCN Division of most interest/importance. Percentages.

Compared with the meeting places provided by other Norwegian institutions*, how important is RCN for you/your organisation for the following issues:	The most important national meeting place	Among the most important national meeting places	A less important national meeting place	The least important national meeting place	Cannot say	N
<b>As a meeting place for research dissemination/communication</b>						
Division for Innovation	9.3	50.5	25.2	3.3	11.7	214
Division for Science	8.0	51.8	27.7	5.4	7.1	112
Division for Strategic Priorities	9.4	61.1	20.0	4.4	5.0	180
Don't Know/NA	13.7	43.1	9.8	5.9	27.5	51
Total	9.5	53.5	22.6	4.3	10.1	557
<b>As a meeting place for discussion of Norwegian research policy</b>						
Division for Innovation	14.6	53.5	14.6	1.9	15.5	213
Division for Science	9.8	58.9	13.4	2.7	15.2	112
Division for Strategic Priorities	20.0	53.9	11.1	2.8	12.2	180
Don't Know/NA	7.8	41.2	11.8	2.0	37.3	51
Total	14.7	53.6	12.9	2.3	16.4	556
<b>As a meeting place for discussion of Norwegian innovation policy</b>						
Division for Innovation	7.0	50.7	24.4	6.1	11.7	213
Division for Science	2.7	38.4	25.9	1.8	31.3	112
Division for Strategic Priorities	7.8	36.9	19.6	3.4	32.4	179
Don't Know/NA	0.0	29.4	13.7	0.0	56.9	51
Total	5.8	41.8	22.2	3.8	26.5	555

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of participants in RCN meeting places. \* Such as other government bodies or ministries, large research/higher education institutions and interest organisations.

Table 7.80 By RCN Meeting place function (IV): Importance of RCN. By position. Percentages.

Compared with the meeting places provided by other Norwegian institutions*, how important is RCN for you/your organisation for the following issues:	The most important national meeting place	Among the most important national meeting places	A less important national meeting place	The least important national meeting place	Cannot say	N
<b>As a meeting place for research dissemination/communication</b>						
Researchers	6.3	48.6	35.1	5.4	4.5	111
Leaders	8.0	64.0	28.0	0.0	0.0	25
Other	10.3	54.2	18.8	4.2	12.4	426
Total	9.4	53.6	22.4	4.3	10.3	562
<b>As a meeting place for discussion of Norwegian research policy</b>						
Researchers	11.7	63.1	14.4	2.7	8.1	111
Leaders	8.0	76.0	12.0	4.0	0.0	25
Other	15.8	49.8	12.5	2.1	19.8	424
Total	14.6	53.6	12.9	2.3	16.6	560
<b>As a meeting place for discussion of Norwegian innovation policy</b>						
Researchers	3.6	35.5	21.8	1.8	37.3	110
Leaders	0.0	48.0	28.0	0.0	24.0	25
Other	6.6	42.7	21.9	4.5	24.3	424
Total	5.7	41.5	22.2	3.8	26.8	559

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – survey of participants in RCN meeting places. \* Such as other government bodies or ministries, large research/higher education institutions and interest organisations.

Table 7.81 RCN Meeting place function (IV): Importance of RCN. By participation in RCN Boards. Percentages.

Compared with the meeting places provided by other Norwegian institutions*, how important is RCN for you/your organisation for the following issues:	The most important national meeting place	Among the most important national meeting places	A less important national meeting place	The least important national meeting place	Cannot say	N
<b>As a meeting place for research dissemination/communication</b>						
Member of RCN Board	9.2	51.0	21.4	5.0	13.4	359
No participation	10.8	57.8	25.4	3.2	2.7	185
Missing	0.0	61.1	11.1	0.0	27.8	18
Total	9.4	53.6	22.4	4.3	10.3	562
<b>As a meeting place for discussion of Norwegian research policy</b>						
Member of RCN Board	12.6	52.0	12.8	2.5	20.1	358
No participation	19.5	56.8	13.5	2.2	8.1	185
Missing	5.9	52.9	5.9	0.0	35.3	17
Total	14.6	53.6	12.9	2.3	16.6	560
<b>As a meeting place for discussion of Norwegian innovation policy</b>						
Member of RCN Board	6.2	42.0	20.2	4.2	27.5	357
No participation	5.4	41.6	25.9	3.2	23.8	185
Missing	0.0	29.4	23.5	0.0	47.1	17
Total	5.7	41.5	22.2	3.8	26.8	559

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – surveys to participants in RCN meeting places. \* Such as other government bodies or ministries, large research/higher education institutions and interest organisations.



## Appendix C Survey free text replies

The tables in this appendix contain comments entered in the free text space at the end of the questionnaires – roughly sorted into three categories: comments on the RCN programme portfolio and policy (Table C.1), comments on the RCN application process (Table C.2), and comments on other and general topics (Table C.3). Entries which do not provide any opinions on the RCN, are incomprehensible or too general, are not included. Information/text that may be used to identify the respondents is deleted, and to some extent spelling is corrected.

Table C.1 Free text comments on the RCN programme portfolio/policy

Survey*/sector**	Free text comment
L/I	It is critical to develop close to demand expertise and regional competence centres / R&D in parallel to supporting major technological institutions. There is an unbalance today that creates unfair marked advantages and monopolistic situations. Being close to and fully understand the industry needs is as important as getting the best expertise and sometimes even more important. Monopolistic situations and public funding used to expand market share are too widespread and there must be a change in this.
L/I	It is a challenge to have the right balance between long term research programs and opportunities for funding more acute themes. RCN need to be more flexible.
L/I	CN is spreading their activities too much. Norway should develop leading scientific competence in fewer areas were we have advantage and responsibility internationally. RCN does not have a sufficient understanding of Norwegian industry; its needs and opportunities. RCN staff could sometimes be perceived to have too close links to institutions in their own geographical area or their own scientific field. This is still a problem more than 15 years after the merging of the old councils into RCN.
L/I	There is a tendency that the requirements of involving several partners, regionalization and building consortia has led to increased bureaucracy, more reporting and time consumption, as well as a fragmentation of national research efforts, which over time will lead to drop of quality. RCN has an important role to play as policy maker for national research and could be more proactive towards politicians and ministries on long term challenges and the need for long term funding across ministries (national priorities). This have to be for periods longer than four years and cannot change due to changes in 'the colour' of the government. There is a need for understanding in the Norwegian society that research is high risk activity, demanding patience, predictable funding schemes and that the outcome cannot be measured in short term payback (financially speaking).
L/I	Programme committees could, in the past, influence the national research environment within their area in a strategic way. This is no longer possible. Due to stricter conflict-of-interest rules, if one is competent in a field one is also in a conflict-of-interest situation with respect to most applications in the field. In practice this limits the influence of the committee members to only influence the development of the research opportunity announcement texts. The applications themselves are mostly evaluated and prioritized by foreign peer reviewers. This severely limits the strategic role that these committees had in the past. Inappropriate behaviour in this strategic role was practically non-existing.
L/I	I think more funds should go back to FRIPRO projects, less to SFF. Calls for special funds should be longer than 6 weeks, and instructions should be crystal clear, and modelled on NIH forms and instructions. There should also be two deadlines during the year, for FRIPRO projects and other special awards - so that this was predictable - and the application deadlines should be June 1 and December 1. There should be no other 'special deadlines'. Alternatively, FRIMED could have different deadlines than FRISAM etc, but the deadlines should be predictable from year to year.
L/I	RCN should engage more actively in joint programming with selected countries within social sciences to open more opportunities for comparative research within areas that are important for Norway but weakly represented in EUs FP. RCNs assessment procedures gives too little credit to the relevance of projects proposals and their potential in terms of informing policy and contributing to social problem solving. The researchers' record in terms of relevance and contributions to solving societal challenges is insufficiently credited in the assessment of project proposals. Relevance in terms of societal needs are paid too little attention to in assessment at the project level.
L/U	In health research, the role of RCN has been dramatically reduced as a result of the funding from the Ministry of Health bypassing the RCN. This has greatly increased funding, but created an unproductive competition between universities and hospitals, even though the researchers involved are partly the same. In total this has reduced funding to basic biomedical sciences and research in public health, dentistry and primary health care. This is a threat to translational research.
L/U	RCN does not provide any programs or opportunities for funding the main body of the research that is being done at our faculty - artistic bases research. This is a fundamental flaw of the RCN funding system.
L/UC	The arts operates differently from academic fields, but may be valuable in cross disciplinary projects. So far, our institution has not been able to acquire funding from NFR during the last years (we gained minor support to some design projects some years ago, and one PhD-project in the 1990s). Prosjektprogrammet is now established for the arts as autonomous. However, such a program may strengthen the existing distance between NFR/knowledge production and the arts. In the evaluation process of the SHP-project, I suggested the establishment of a new program in which traditional research and arts or practical projects could be combined. Such a program might become innovative in a new way and open for possibilities no one can imagine. Society/NFR asks for the new and fantastic, beneficial for all, but from start to end, gate keepers assess and stops projects and ideas which are really new, fragile, unarticulated and sensed. In my opinion and concerning all fields of knowledge, it is hard to get beyond Thomas Kuhn's description of how academic life operates.

<b>M/G</b>	THE WAY I SEE IT, TOO LITTLE IS DONE IN ORDER TO GET THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY COUPLED TO RESEARCH ON ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES.
<b>M/T</b>	RCN have not facilitated research on district heating and cooling otherwise then through IEA, has refused most of the proposals, even participation in IEA ex comm for the next annex. We need research on alternative renewable energy, seems as RCN is mainly interested in electricity and power generation
<b>R/H</b>	RCN is 'too far' from the clinical research world !!
<b>R/H</b>	RCN activity, policies and funding have made it increasingly irrelevant for many research organizations. Among my unit's 15 researchers, most never apply since the effort involved rarely pays off. I know many in other units who agree. It is ok to support excellence, but most research in Norway is not excellent. The excellence has to come from somewhere. It has to build on what is good. Without seeding there is no harvest.
<b>R/I</b>	To offer better funding schemes that really allow (in terms of costs) international mobility; To offer substantial funding to researcher-driven projects To care for the continuity of funding research teams over time in order to build excellence
<b>R/I</b>	1) RCN web site is messy and info important info is difficult to access. I have wasted too much time searching for specific info on the RCN web site. 2) RCN should not make a call unless they have resources to fund at least 50% of the proposals (assuming they are sufficiently good). When RCN cannot fund more than 20% of the applications then too much resources are wasted on making them. There is no point in making a top quality proposal if the odds are going to be low. 3) RCN should not forget that we are an oil and gas producing nation. Oil and gas production and exploration are very important research topics for Norway. 4) A research call, for instance like Petromaks, should not be narrow in terms of themes. It should be open to all proposals that are relevant in a broad sense. Good research proposals are not the same as 'political correct' proposals. 5) Be very careful when listening to large industrial companies. When someone says that something like "it is Statoil's opinion that" it is more likely the opinion of the specific representative of the company. 6) RCN should put much more pressure on Norwegian companies to engage in research projects. It is depressing to observe that they are often happy with business as usual.
<b>R/I</b>	i feel that RCN (as EU framework) is rather distant for me, as programs are so limited in focus and priorities and success-rate that my field have no chance and interdisciplinary actions have small chances to get funding .
<b>R/I</b>	1) For a research institute there are not enough calls one can respond to. Funding in the programmes which are suitable for part of our research institute (PETROMAKS) has sunken and the low number of proposals granted in the FRIPRO programme (compared to the high number of proposals sent in) is ridiculous. In my opinion, the higher and higher amount of proposals sent in to this programme reflects that there are a lot of research topics where no calls are available (for example, we try since longer time to get founded e.g. a collaboration between seismologists and engineers which is really important for building safety all over the world...tsunami research is also very difficult to apply for). In general, during the last two years, almost none of the proposals sent in from our research institute to NFR was founded...and the reason is surely not that all proposals were badly written! For such a small research institute as we are, this is a very difficult situation. Some colleagues have the possibility to apply to the Foreign Ministry, but this does not apply for all research groups. Also for such a small institute, it is difficult to write many EU applications. 2) I now got several reviews for proposals back...although the reviews had very good grades and very positive comments, none of the proposals was founded. For me that makes it very hard to understand why and sometimes I suspect that decisions are rather political than based on the reviews. 3) Funding research proposals should be of much higher importance to Norway (more money for research), because once the oil is finished, there are not many products which can be exported...knowledge could be one of the export goods of future Norway. 4) This is not directly related to the NFR, but the cooperation between research institutes in Norway can be very frustrating. We applied for an EU project not too long ago and while doing so, we found out that another Norwegian research institute was sending out adhesion contracts to organisations all over Europe (such that they were not allowed to send in other EU proposals together with other institutes - although some of those organisations are so big that different research groups could have taken part in different EU proposals) torpedoing effectively our possibilities to get relevant data sets. I think this practice is highly unfair and unnecessary, especially in such a small country as Norway, where people should rather help each other and collaborate. When we tried to complain, neither NFR nor EU felt they were responsible.
<b>R/I</b>	Norway is a small country in terms of human resource. It is important to focus on some really important topics, instead of spreading money on everything (including sometimes unrealistic or useless researches, if it's not cheating). I believe it is a challenge for RCN to properly select the applications and follow up the output of those financed projects.
<b>R/I</b>	Research programmes for safety of people seems to be absent, as well as risk-reducing research (read Fire safety research) in the RCN portfolio. Too much focus on the "popular" topics and on cost-savings for individual industry partners, not for the society.
<b>R/I</b>	1. It is a problem that some areas of research are generally defined as "applied". Applied research is fine, but there is also a need for basic research. The calls within my area, which is consumption, food and policy-making, are user oriented (understood as industry oriented), which means that they rarely allow for concentrating on the development of basic research (theory, methodology). The inclusion of phd and post-doc grants are quite unpredictable. Even EU research programmes are generally highly applied within this area. I have given several talks at RCN events, but that has rarely had any effect. 2. I have coordinated several large, international projects. Collaboration is important. But the expectations of structure and organisation that have developed tend to lead to too much resources being spent on collaboration and management and fragmentation of research and publication activities. Also, for comparative research, too little attention is often paid to comparative methodology and analysis.
<b>R/I</b>	Not enough money to do excellent research. Should focus more on what Norway has as "fordel" like the epidemiological registers to do very important research in public health/epidemiology/drug safety! it is very important to do this WITHOUT the industry and their money!
<b>R/I</b>	Major challenges: important with financial support for writing applications-especially for research institutes with only minor basic funding. Support basic research outside strategic programs. We need new, good ideas for the future.



R/I	I believe the RCN would benefit from thinking independently of the European Commission Framework Programmes.
R/I	RCN should focus more on societal needs and less on "political correctness" - certain fields (my own - land-based geology and mineral resources) have been completely neglected for many years while in others there has been a move to develop activities nationwide. The consequence of neglect is that national capacity within the affected fields gradually disappears. This is being corrected for the above-mentioned field but there are probably other "narrow" fields which risk the same fate.
R/I	The programs of RCN do not contain elements relevant to my field of expertise, dispersion and effects of air pollution on local to regional scale
R/I	Long-term funding of research activities essential to achieve excellence in a field. Here RCN fails.
R/I	The EU FP7 program allow large projects with significant funding, but these project require collaboration with partners spread throughout Europe. This good for cultural collaboration, but makes inappropriate scientific teams and we cannot select the partners that serves the project best. Further, Norwegian partners are avoided due to high salaries. I strongly suggest that the National funding is increased at the funding through EU FP7 is significantly decreased. Further BIA, Forny and other projects that really leads to new innovation in Norway should be prioritized more.
R/I	Appears to be little money for food safety and microbiology many colleagues are without jobs or looking to leave science or forced out of science because the number of jobs and successful grants is so low.
R/I	RCN ought to have a certain amount of money (funding), periodically (tentatively yearly) to be shared by all qualified research institutions in Norway. Thus, each institution would be secured a minimum amount (funding). This "grunnfinansiering" ought to be regulated each year.
R/I	Strengthen natural end technical science on behalf of the humanities if needed. To get a bigger percentage of Norway's BNP to science and product development
R/I	In comparison to, e.g., the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF), RCN allocates a small share of its funding for user-initiated research and thus hampers innovative projects. When the success rate of *good* proposals is as low as it is now, a lot of frustration builds up among the researchers.
R/I	Financing of research should be more predictive and long-lasting. Depending on evaluations, RCN should be more obliged to their initiated long term strategic building of competence and support of expensive equipment.
R/I	There is a high focus on development of technology and too little on the constraints to how technology can be utilized in new innovations. Limiting factors are in particular established business models in various sectors. To enable innovation, one need also to look at external factors that "break up" such established models. Examples are new international standards, new cooperation fora as well as legislation.
R/I	Some Research Council programs are plagued by a tendency towards schematic and unnatural idealization of the invention process. Examples might be NANO2021 or RENERGI, where there is a tendency to think that at first all projects should be science projects (forskerprosjekt), then the science part should finish up and almost all funding should move on to commercialization. This is not how things work. People don't stop coming up with new ideas! The invention process is a bottom-up process with ever new ideas arising and needing scientific funding (forskerprosjekt) before they can reach the level of maturity where they can be commercialized. There should be a balance more like 50% FP, 30% KMB, 20% BIP.
R/I	There is a major lack of funding for specially basic, but also applied, research within my field which is animal health
R/I	The main challenge of the RCN is to focus on the originality and the scientific content and quality of projects rather than with collaboration with certain countries and namedropping, yearly changes of topical checklists for the programs or more or less vague political criteria. These evaluation parameters will of course reduce the cost of evaluation (and number) of applications, but they will not increase the scientific output and the impact of the research funded. Also the strict requirement for industry funding within many programs is not always supporting community relevance as the industry is often short sighted compared to what the RCN should be or do not prioritize the same topics as the RCN.
R/I	Det synes som det er en mangel på NFR midler innen offshore olje og gas konstruksjoner.
R/I	RCN needs to provide more funding for general research topics and less specified calls. There should be annual funding calls for basic research fields such as Mathematics, Atmospheric Sciences, Oceanography, Hydrology, Social Sciences, etc. See for example the US NSF funding programs.
R/I	RCN DOES HAVE LOT OF GOOD THINGS, BUT ALSO CONTRIBUTES IN CAUSING UNCLEAR LINES BETWEEN BASIC AND APPLIED RESEARCH ENVIRONMENTS. GOOD GROWTH POSSIBILITIES ARE DIFFICULT IN BOTH SECTORS. MAY CONTRIBUTE TO UNCLEAR LINES BETWEEN GOVERNMENTAL/PUBLICLY AND TRADE-RELATED RESEARCH. MAY ADD TO STRONG GUIDING ON WHICH UNITS WHO MUST COOPERATE STRATEGICALLY, WHICH MAY BE AN OPBASTCLE TOWARDS THE FORMATION OF VALUES IN SOCIETY
R/SUI	To me it seems that: - RCN programs are too much driven by buzzwords and the whims of policymakers. Not enough money for high-quality, basic curiosity-driven research targeted at top-journals with high impact. - The RCN does not seem to encourage high-quality research, at least not within my field. Instead it seems to incentivise quick solutions like writing reports and book-chapters rather than research articles, and if research articles are written, they target low-ranking journals. Business research funded by RCN seems in general to be light-weight. I think perhaps this is due to a focus on quantity of output, rather than quality. - RCN is bureaucratic. I don't have time to spend writing long applications. I prefer doing actual research.
R/SUI	Identification of important fields of research for real longstanding scientific progress. Difficult and maybe no tool is available for this.
R/SUI	Increase funding of practice oriented research groups that that knows the actual fields. Quantitative research is too dominant, gets too much of the funding within programs of education and educational practice.
R/SUI	The limiting of basic research support to the FRIPRO programs (even though other programs fall under grunnforskning or storeprogramme units) hinders research in many scientific fields. There is far too much need to include business/economic development and society relevance in research. I see that this is important to include in many fields (and I do participate in

	this willingly!) but pure research is valuable in its own right and furthers scientific fields (and future applications of science) far faster than having to tailor all research projects to economic/societal elements.
R/U	Success rate in free programs like FRINAT is too low to make it an efficient instrument. The balance between free programs and policy driven ones is strongly biased towards the latter.
R/U	MUCH MORE SHOULD GO TO BASIC RESEARCH. YOU NEED TO SHOW US UNIVERSITY-PROFESSORS ENOUGH TRUST FOR US TO MAKE THE PRIORITATIONS. PUBLICLY FUNDED APPLIED RESEARCH SHOULD BE GIVEN DRASTICALLY LESS. I HAVE SEEN PLENTY MISERABLE RESEARCH OF THIS KIND OVER THE YEARS. I HAVE, LONG TIME AGO, GIVEN UP APPLYING RCN FOR GUNDS - AFTER PLENTY OF TIME WASTE AND FRUSTRATION, IT IS A PARADOX THAT WE PROFESSORS GET NOTHING FOR BASIC RESEARCH, BUT AT THE SAME TIME WE ARE EXPECTED TO SUPERVISE PHD CANDIDATES WHO RECEIVE MILLIONS! WHERE'S THE LOGIC? RCN HAS, IN MY OPINION, BEEN A HUGE FIASCO, AND WASTED A TREMENDOUS AMOUNT OF TAXPAYERS' MONEY, AND ON ADMINISTRATION AND PRODUCTION OF COUNTLESS DOCUMENTS CONTAINING NOTHING BUT NONSENSE AND CRAP, AND LITTLE LESS. SORRY!
R/U	My overall impression of the RCN is good. As a humanist my chief concern is the low percentage of applicants that get funding, and the very limited number of programmes that are relevant for humanists. One reason for this seems to be the lack of interest in research taken by the Ministry of Culture. I would strongly wish that the research council worked harder to get the Ministry of Culture to channel more money into the council and to take a higher interest in research questions.
R/U	Major challenge 1: no funding for young researchers at start of their career. Especially the "requirement" of previous project management/ PhD supervision to have a chance to get funded. Major challenge 2: very weak funding, and dubious evaluation of, interdisciplinary research projects. Also, RCN research focus is extremely Europe centric and mostly ignores, or makes it hard, to cooperate with US researchers. Finally, way too much focus on predetermined research themes.
R/U	RCN focus too much on large applied research programs. And too much focus in cooperation with industry, that often have too low academic interest. It should be more "free research" projects in all research fields.
R/U	There should be possibilities for PhDs and post docs who get funding from elsewhere but who cannot get funding for a stay abroad to apply for this from the Research Council of Norway. Otherwise they will not get the opportunity to collaborate with international institutions.
R/U	THE RCN is not perceived as a flexible organisation. The fact that most of the programme advisors stay within the same field and associate themselves with the same people (outside of the RCN) contributes to poor dynamics and impaired objectivity. It is imperative that such an organisation constantly tries to minimise what effectively and eventually develops into friendship corruption, to the benefit of those few favoured, and to the dismay of those shut out. The importance of maintaining objectivity with respect to regional balance within Norway must also always stay in tight focus. It is neither a secret nor a social surprise that the proximity of scientists located in the Oslo region works in their favour. The RCN also still adheres to the mainstream trend of establishing and supporting 'centres of excellence' and the like, that quickly develop into large, ineffective and costly units that eventually become an extremely costly liability to e.g. the university they are affiliated to, at the cost of other activities. It is not hard to calculate the cost of scientific output e.g. in bona fide publications and theses for small effective groups vs. large centres. It is also futile to try to uphold the long standing RCN policy of forcing 'national collaborations and networks' onto individual scientists and projects. More so, in a (too) small country like Norway. It is an established and international fact that individual scientists wish to seek and establish their own collaborations as they find best and appropriate, regardless of any kind of borders. As long as they produce a scientific output of international quality and rate they should be given the opportunity to do so. They should also be given a budget which is flexible in its use and application, rather than having it constrained in the outset to be quite the opposite. The RCN should never lose sight of the fact that for most scientific disciplines it is actually very easy to objectively measure the yield of investment.
R/U	The public services e.g. government bureaucrats (with decision making powers), communes, central IT service decision makers, politicians, public education (elementary schools, collage) etc. seems to never be present at venues where RCN-based research central to the Norwegian society are presented. This is particularly in the field of ICT (my field of experience). This makes me concerned that top quality research with a potential impact for society never fulfils its potential. Reducing the barrier between public services and government-funded research, I think would benefit both sides. At this point, there is a strong focus on industry collaboration, while some of the biggest ICT contracts are signed by the government.
R/U	Major lack of support for research on the United States.
R/U	RCN is in my opinion too much leaned towards applied research for solving problems today, while leaving highly inadequate funding for basic research for future challenges
R/U	The field of social work and child protection is less developed as an academic discipline in Norway compared to other countries. There is a need for more research competence at Universities. Social work and child protection needs funding for ph.d projects, but as the RCN wants bigger projects it is difficult as we are few people with ph.d competence in this field. We have master students in child welfare who are well qualified and interested in ph.d - funding is a problem as RCN do not support individual ph.d project. For us post doc is less relevant because we do not have the docs ! We also do not have the possibility for Strategic programs for university colleges which will put priority on social work for the applications due 18.april. Child protection is a field that needs to be strengthened also at the university level !
R/U	I have been disappointed in the way the RCN have looked at a project like this, both because it has significance for our society, for basic research and for cross-disciplinary collaboration The point is that the RCN does not seem to handle cross-sectional projects like this, and I think this should be a challenge. Logopedics is an upcoming field of research in Norway targeting people with developmental and acquired communication problems, but does not fit with any of the "boxes" of the RCN.
R/U	More funding for medical and health care research over a broad spectrum under the heading "global health" More funds available for medical and health care research in primary health care in Norway available for GP researches - as well as funding of multidisciplinary research projects in primary health care.
R/U	RCN used to run the "Småforsk" program which I (and others I have discussed with) found useful and time-effective (time spent on applications and research). It apparently was found too simple, inexpensive and unbureaucratic for RCN, and has

	been removed. The ideas and people responsible for policy changes like that should be eradicated from the decision processes at RNC, and the "Småforsk" program reinstated.
R/U	IN GENERAL, I BELIEVE THAT THE STATE SHOULD USE MORE MONEY ON RESEARCH IN A RICH COUNTRY AS NORWAY. I ALSO BELIEVE THAT THERE SHOULD BE MORE FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR FREE PROJECTS. FURTHER, THE UNDERSTANDING OF RESEARCH WITHIN THE ARTS SCIENCES SHOULD BE INCREASED. IT IS IMPORTANT THAT A NEW PROGRAMME FOR ARCHITECTURAL RESEARCH IS ESTABLISHED AT THE RCN - A PROGRAMME THAT TAKES INTO ACCOUNT THAT THE ACADEMIC FOUNDATION FOR ARCHITECTURE IS PHILOSOPHY, NOT HUMANISTIC OR NATURAL SCIENCES.
R/U	In my opinion, funding for basic, long term research PhDs, postdocs, should go direct from ministries to universities. Each professor should automatically be granted a new PhD when the previous has defended the thesis. Each professor should have 1-2 such PhDs all the time. This assures research based education.RCN should be responsible for funding applied research. Professors should apply for such funding, in order to supervise 1-2 PhDs at any time.This means that all professors should supervise at least 2-4 PhDs all the time.RCN should increase the support for research and innovation centres, in order to support promising or outstanding research groups.
R/U	There is a lack of funding of development of numerical methods and its implementation into simulation software for research and innovations. Most of the funding from RCN/EU/public/industry is application driven, i.e. to little opportunity for funding of enabling technologies as numerical mathematics and applied computer science.The maximum funding of multidisciplinary projects (KPN-projects) are too small. Today there is a ceiling about 5 MNOK/year should be increased to 10 MNOK/year.
R/U	RCN is too much based on research programmes. The committee members are not independent. They are biased and have strong ties to their own institution and to colleges in the committee. Difficult for the new universities to get funding.
R/U	The Norwegian Research Council should offer more possibilities for long term research collaboration with poor and middle income countries addressing global development challenges in several disciplines (both basic and applied research) and particularly on multidisciplinary, cross disciplinary research, transdisciplinary research on global development challenges (including global health, poverty reduction, climate change, access to water, nutrition and food security, peace research, political violence, human rights, children's psychosocial health, basic human needs in a rapidly changing world)
R/U	Very important to continue with free projects grants, plus to boost support for hiring post docs and RAs. Applicants for projects involving PhD students (stipendiats) or post docs and RAs should not be scored downwards if they do not state a particular applicant in the application. This reduces incentive to apply for grants when one does not have applicants lined up already (often difficult in Norway), and reduces ability to create projects which then bring in expertise from other countries.
R/UC	NRC fails in addressing science of law in their calls, and there are few, if any at all, lawyers represented in the different NRC committees, which makes it extremely hard to reach through with law research.
R/UC	Very seldom the research programs of RCN include business economics and administrative topics. NCR has insufficient understanding of business economics and NRØA has repeatedly tried to convince representatives for the Council that business economics is not the same as economics. NRØA has asked for a research program more suited for business economic topics and has suggested a specific program. So far, no positive response. However, we are very satisfied that RCN has supported the research school in business economics and administration.
R/UC	The financial crisis that morphed into a debt and fiscal crisis underscored the need for Norwegian Research in (International) Political Economy. There is no programme supporting this kind of research. It's all economics or traditional political science.This could be alleviated through earmarked funds for political economy or through increased funding for free, basic research.
R/UC	The smaller university colleges, at least the one I'm employed at, do not have a central administrative office that coordinates R&D activities. As a result, a newly appointed academic, with or without a record of past accomplishments, is faced with huge stumbling blocks, not even to mention the total lack of start-up funds which is standards at nearly all tertiary institutions across the world. This is especially a disadvantage for a researcher engaged in basic research, since the Research Council is the only source of funding for this type of work. If the powers-that-be really wish to raise the level of scholarly activities at university college level, issues such as these need to be addressed earnestly.

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – Free text comments at the end of the questionnaires.

\*R=survey to researchers (question 25); L=survey to leaders of Norwegian researcher institutions (question 23); M= survey to participants in RCN meeting places (question 12).

\*\*U=University; UC=University college; SUI= Specialised university institution; I=Institute sector; H=University hospital; G=Government/Public service; T=Trade and industry; O=Other.

Table C.2 Free text comments on the RCN application process

Survey*/sector**	Free text comment
L/I	In general I think NRC is doing a very good job. There is a gap between international R&D strategies and Norwegian in fields of research where we have an important role to play. We need to increase the success rate for excellent scientists that apply for funding. There seems to be a pattern that excellent international scientists have greater problems getting funding when working in Norway than what is the case for good ethnic Norwegian scientists. This is probably because it takes time to establish networks in Norway. It is demotivating when they get a flat 7 on their applications and no money. After a few years, they skip NRC and go only for international funding. This is negative for building national networks.
L/I	Det gjøres oppmerksom på at vår virksomhet er et forvaltningsorgan med tilsnitt av noe forskning på utvalgte områder. Avkrysningen ville derfor blitt noe forskjellig om en forsker hadde besvart skjema. Vårt primærbehov innen FoU er å utvikle vår institusjonelle kompetanse for å styrke vår forvaltningskompetanse (forvaltningsrettet forskning). Vi føler ikke at relevante prosjekter hos oss får gjennomslag i NFR - selv om NFR har løpende program som dekker prosjektområdet. Vi antar at dette bl.a. kan skyldes bruken av eksterne refererer i rådets evaluering av prosjektsøknader. Forskningsprogrammer som initieres av NFR er kun unntaksvis innrettet mot forvaltningens behov.
L/I	The main challenge relates to the large amount of highly eligible research applications that are not being funded. This serves as a disincentive to researchers and recruitment and to a waste of resources connected to the preparation of applications. The RCN should have much larger funds available for PhD scholarships. To ensure relevance and reduce administrative costs, a large share of the scholarships should be channelled through the applied research institutions and decided on by them.
L/I	There is a great lack of adequate knowledge among reviewers of applications for research funding. Very often you also need several reviewers for an application. The balance between relevance and quality of research applications is often very difficult to understand, and the explanation for why top-quality research applications are not funded, is poorly, or not at all, present in the responses from RCN.
L/UC	There is a great risk of 'conservation of old ideas' by being too strict on competitiveness and evaluation of CVs and publications lists. More priorities should be put on the value of new ideas and new thinking, and interdisciplinary research and development. This is important both in applied/user based research and more fundamental basic research. The world is changing faster and faster in most areas, and is by nature interdisciplinary. Therefore "the research communities, including researchers, funding practises and models for implementation of the results" has to keep up the speed by being more dynamic and ground breaking. But, the nature of some research areas are though more slow, and if its sufficient ground-breaking, we should allow for better time :-). Research related to large public reforms is not insufficient, eg. the NAV reform and now days the "Health reform". The research communities should be better aligned upfront these reforms with large pilots in order to avoid potential full scale negative risks. Today this is too slow, the research is performed on why things went wrong, not how to make them right. - The best University Colleges are struggling with insufficient funding compared to the Universities. Even so, these organisations are dynamic, able to new thinking and change. This positive effect should be stimulated more by better support, being a threat to the more "laid back and satisfied" university communities. More PhD grants and post docs (the latter is not a model for university colleges today) would be helpful, in addition to larger programmes related to innovation and improvement of the public sector. This way of thinking, supporting small and growing organisations, can be a driver to change and creative ideas if done in the right way. A challenge is to avoid the 'Matthew effect' and to be able to fund the new, innovative ideas rather than always running after those with the longest CV.
M/T	the design of the programs, the application process, the feedback process is all aligned with academic work design and outcome, do not facilitate industry needs and is way too comprehensive to use, stimulating the growth of research institutes being hybrids of proper research but enabling the industry to partially onboard but hindering the take-up of results in new services and products. The recruitment to boards is a system to ensure that my institute and organization get the needed funding.
R/H	During the last years the experience of my co-workers has been that it is very difficult to get any funding from RCN without already having obtained a solid amount of basis, and to do that you need a funding you don't get. Vicious circle! To start from scratch with new ideas in a new field is nearly a hopeless task.
R/I	The Research Council definitely does not adequately address our needs. 1) We -- the (...) -- seem to fall between the cracks in many calls for funding. Many calls for funding are not open to us, partly because we do not have the mandate to educate students. There seems to be a perception within the Research Council that because we are a government agency we do not need access to large sums of external research money to do our jobs -- yet at the same time our management is pushing us to bring in external money because the government budget is not adequate for much more than covering salaries. 2) The mandate for educating students which permeates many calls for proposals tends to be counterproductive -- it creates a need for a much higher proposal budget (to support student or post-doc salaries), which often makes the proposal far too expensive. And it ultimately leads to a need to acquire more funding shortly thereafter or to alternatively cast the hired student or post-doc adrift in a difficult market. 3) The proposal review process is not transparent. Reasons for making decisions are not given or are incompletely explained. We are convinced that commonly persons we have for valid professional reasons asked NOT to review our proposals, have been asked to review them. On at least one occasion an NGU proposal that received the highest marks in the review process was not funded, apparently for lack of funds. 4) The Research Council does not appear to have within its own ranks people who are competent in sufficiently many of the wide range of Earth Sciences disciplines. Proposals seem to be reviewed by people who do not have a full understanding of the topic that is being proposed, which is partly because the people sending the proposals for review do not themselves seem to be able to properly evaluate who should (or should not) do the reviewing. 5) The overall rate of success in the Research Council is so low that it is no longer really worth trying -- it takes up far too much time which could otherwise be spent doing what types of research don't take research money. Enough said....
R/I	NFR seem to have an increasing focus on developing strategies and other activities which generates political interest. The

	<p>application process reveals a large internal bureaucracy, and that there is to some extent a general lack of understanding of what generates innovative and novel research. Evaluations and hearings, establishment of program committees etc certainly keeps the research council busy, but perhaps it would be even more efficient if funding could to a larger extent be made available through basic funding, rather than on a competitive arena? With an anticipated success rate in the order of 20% when submitting a proposal, there is certainly a large overhead for the scientists. A specific comment is that the current large focus on research infrastructures are not accompanied by funding allow research on the generated data. While this may not be a problem for universities where man-hours may have institutional support (and access to students), this limits the usefulness for research infrastructures for many of the users. A second comment is that objectives like outreach and the educational aspect is considered to important in the evaluation of project applications. With an increasing expectation of research groups to generate funding also for permanent staff, one must accept project formulations which secures a basis for keeping the strong research groups going, and not only generating new PhDs/post docs.</p>
R/I	<p>There is a large problem that interdisciplinary project do not result in good research. The projects are organized in order to fit with the proposals, but that is a result forced by the proposals and not the best way to achieve the goals.</p>
R/I	<p>Despite some deficiencies, the RCN funding and procedures are the number-one choice for our research group. There is still a big challenge in front of the RCN to create an application procedure that would reduce unnecessary competition for funds. Indeed, the success rate of 9% when even the outstanding projects get no funding in the FRIPRO programme cannot be tolerated. It clearly indicates a failure of the call formulation and procedure. Another important challenge for the RCN is to understand that EU funding is only complementary to the national funding. To increase Norwegian involvement into the EU funded projects, the RCN calls must be issued on the same topic and WELL AHEAD of EU calls.</p>
R/I	<p>The competence and interests of the members of the programme committee must equally cover the whole spectrum of the call.</p>
R/I	<p>The application scheme is complicated to fill in - it is sometimes difficult to know exactly what kind of information they want to have under the different headings - and when do you perform development, innovation or research? (giving much text repetition in the document). It is difficult to get funding for multidisciplinary research where the research issue is "falling between two chairs". E.g. food packaging is such a topic. If it is most focus on material - it should be in one program (BIA). If it is most focus on food - it should be in another program (MAT). If it is a mixture - food &amp; material-topic (which is often the case) - it is more complicated and we have to make a project addressed to one of the programs and the overall project will not be as well defined as originally intended. Norway is a small country, where a large portion of our products are imported and we do not have any production companies in Norway. Addressing some topics, it is difficult to perform industry projects when their main supplier is not a Norwegian company - and we cannot receive sufficient funding due to the no funding of foreign companies. The NRC favourites Norwegian companies and production in Norway - which usually is OK - but for some business sectors is this difficult due to missing Norwegian production companies and suppliers.</p>
R/I	<p>- Det er et stort problem at det brukes uforholdsmessig store ressurser på å skrive søknader til NFR ift summene som er til rådighet. Det blir lange og ressurskrevende prosesser hvor de samme ressursene kunne vært brukt til forskning. - NFR er for byråkratisk.</p>
R/I	<p>THERE IS A CLEAR TENDENCY THAT RCNs FEEDBACK GOES TO THE APPLICANTS LATER THAN IT USED TO. ALSO: ONCE A DECISION IS MADE, IT TAKES MORE TIME BEFORE THE EXACT SUM IS CONFIRMED. HAVING THE FUNDS TRANSFERRED ALSO TAKES LONGER TIME.</p>
R/I	<p>Research projects focusing on internationally and regionally defined research questions and issues have to compete for funds in RCN programmes, where the criteria for project quality and relevance are often defined primarily on the basis of Norwegian challenges and issues.</p>
R/I	<p>A main problem with applications is a continuous upscaled competition. It sadly appears to me that the best projects / ideas do not necessarily get funding, since it is more important to answer every question on the application to an extent that is some optimum for a bureaucracy. If two similar applications are evaluated, and just one supposed to receive funding, where one has addressed just one question slightly worse than the other, the chances it gets funding is slim. The grading could also differ because no referees are the same. Of course there has never been justice in the world. My point is, however, that good ideas will not necessarily be funded if all questions have not been filled out in a meticulous manner. It also means that bad ideas will get funded if the people / researchers are not skilled in application writing. Imagine a future Leonardo da Vinci or an Einstein trying to write applications to NRC. Sorry, but I don't think they would get funding. The system leads to some professors or scientists having to have professional application writers do the applications. This is soon going to be a big business in Norway.</p>
R/I	<p>Major challenges: The funding process takes a lot of time and resources, there is an enormous mismatch between funds available, the number of applications and the workload in producing applications. My last application ranked very good at all but one point which was erroneously ranked only good (see below). Further the program stated that 2-4 projects would be financed. 5 projects were eventually initiated which in this case would mean less than one million per project. With hours costs at minimum 1100 to 1800 NOK for the different project owners, all these are tiny projects. I need to sell 1400 hours a year, the calculus I leave to you.... The application we sent costed our institute two full day months in work equivalent to ~ 350000 NOK in hours. The evaluation process is not transparent, there is no way we can see the minutes from the meetings when funds are located and what mark the granted projects got. From my opinion the grants were given on a geographically and institutionally even distribution, not considering objective criteria. Also the reply from reviewers was missing, only a summarised sheet containing main conclusions and mark, which is not helpful in improving the application. Also since there were huge flaws in the evaluation stating a lack of will and plans for scientific papers (Five titles were given together with journal), I have no confidence whatsoever that the processes are fair and scientifically based. I have yet to send in an official complaint. If my boss allows me to do it I will do it, but probably I'm not allowed as it could harm the Institutional rumour and thus since this is not a transparent objective process but a political lobbyism process, it could hurt our future funding. As the main funding source for fisheries which is what we will have to base our future welfare on, the RCN is a total disaster. Sorry to say this but I think it is the truth.</p>
R/I	<p>It is a challenge to limit the necessary reporting from the different projects such that the researchers can focus on doing</p>

	research and not spending too much time in reporting. I have also experienced that the handling persons at RCN do not have updated information about different kinds of applications. This has resulted in unnecessary work with applications.
R/SUI	I have long given up on the NFR for funding and/or support, and take care of my stuff through my international research network outside Norway. It all looks good on the outside but the dense bureaucracy and paperwork are a waste of time. To be fair to the NFR, this is even worse when getting funded by Brussels. After three FP-programs, I had enough and get my funds directly from industry now. The thing to worry about is that Norway is NOT an attractive place to work or research for its closed parochial culture - on several occasions I have actively disadvised my foreign colleagues to come here, and my research is now fully outside Norway (funding, research data acquisition, diffusion) although I'm still publishing under the heading of my Norwegian employer. So you get the "hits" and that's it.
R/SUI	Rejection rate too high, easier to get funding from international sources.
R/SUI	The formal requirements for funding support only larger institutions. Research that could have been important for smaller institutions and for our society does not have the possibility to develop the support needed to fulfil the requirements in order to receive funding. The network and facilities an institution lack becomes more important than the research idea. I doubt that the research system of today could have fostered and supported thinkers as for example Ludvig Wittgenstein who had very few publications. If he had applied for research funding he would not have received it because of lack of international network, publications etc. I suppose the same point could be made concerning many intellectual persons within the university systems that have fostered great and important ideas and theories earlier.
R/SUI	Unreliability, e.g. funding for research on a specific subject is transferred from ministries to RCN but then re-distributed or used for other purposes, is a problem. The fact that many researchers applying for funding from the RCN have non-permanent or contract-based positions make long application processes unreliability a particularly serious problem. Fall back solutions for applications receiving excellent evaluations but not funding would be of help.
R/SUI	There is a problem/Challenge concerning the group of people picked for the evaluation: To what extent are they competent to evaluate the applications? This is questioned a lot, especially within certain areas of human research - for example the field of culture (music, aesthetics) and health, in which great national and international development is going on. There is a need for the Council to recruit a wider range of experts in the evaluation processes, especially within particular fields of knowledge.
R/SUI	I was a member of a research committee in Denmark for 3 years - (...) - evaluating research proposals and applications. Compared to this experience, where I found the approach, methods and organizing very productive for my field of research (social science - business- management) I found the program management and applicant procedures in the Research Council of Norway very bureaucratized, enclosed, dominated by certain perspectives with institutional affiliation to only a few dominating research institutions in Norway.
R/SUI	The main problems with RCN are a) It is a monolithic structure without competition. Mainstream approaches dominate the appointment of panels and decisions, hence new and heterodox perspectives are usually turned down b) insiders are very often favoured c) the priorities of the RCN are dominated by fads d) Grants for research in the humanities have decreased continuously and are now almost wiped out e) programs initiated by ministries and political considerations dominate to the detriment of freestanding, researcher initiated projects
R/U	My experience is quite limited. The first time I applied for funding for an animal technician when setting up a new lab. The application was rejected on the grounds that the research council wanted this skill to stay in Norway, and I should apply for PhD funding. I did that in the next round. I paraphrase the reply, but it was roughly, "we are not funding your research and we are not legally obliged to tell you why". That is the most useless letter I have ever received. I concluded there was no point in ever applying again until I had a few papers on the kind of research I asked to be funded. The problem is that my papers get rejected because I don't have enough animals. However, I don't have the resources to look after as many animals as the reviewers want. If you want applications that meet your criteria, I would consider it quite sensible to give some informative feedback. I do that as a reviewer, I do that as a teacher. I am sure the reviewers of grant applications are required to do the same in those situations. Why is that too much to ask when they review for RCN?
R/U	RCN should be aware of personal networks among the board members. I think that NCR should not use Norwegian members at all, especially when these members are submitters of grants from NCR. NCR relies on a naive conception of power.
R/U	I would prefer that the council, when it comes to established researchers, * pays MORE AFTER journal publication (as premiums, added to annum) * requires that publication premiums be fully given to the group/researcher * provides MUCH LESS support prior to publication (in particular travel money) * give absolutely no support to pre-project drafting of applications * puts more emphasis on researchers merits * disqualifies those who didn't publish internationally the last 3 years * allocate more for free research among those of international standing
R/U	To have review boards that are internationally oriented also in young research disciplines such as educational research. That way projects can get a fair evaluation that is in line with the international research front, and not only based on Scandinavian research that often have poor quality in these young disciplines.
R/U	MUCH RESEARCH FALLS BETWEEN TO CHAIRS, I.E. CALLS. I SEE RCN APPLICATIONS ALMOST LIKE A LOTTERY. APPLICATIONS NEED TO BE ADJUSTED THE CALLS, WHICH DAMAGES THE QUALITY OF THE RESEARCH. I HAVE EXPERIENCED, IN RECENT YEARS, TO GET MANY PAPERS PUBLISHED IN LEADING JOURNALS, BUT MY APPLICATIONS TO RCN HAVE BEEN REJECTED. I AM A BIT FED UP BY THIS SYSTEM.
R/U	Too much of RCN's work goes through EU projects now, which are politically motivated and way too large/burdensome. It is simply not worth the effort of applying for these funds, as the reporting and administrative burden is too cumbersome.
R/U	The main challenge is to find ways to evaluate inter- and trans-disciplinary research proposals. It is almost impossible to achieve high score from independent reviewers. Quality and excellence of science is important, but it is also equally important to make strategic decisions regarding what projects are funded, ensuring development in desired direction.
R/U	My experience with the RCN is that it is not worth bothering about. The application process is too cumbersome in relation to the chances of actually getting any funding. The evaluation process seems often to be sloppy and perfunctory. The risk that spending months on an application for a research project will end up being simply lost research time is too great.

R/U	RCN HAS THE SAME PROFILE AS OTHER SEEKING INSTITUTIONS, CONSERVING REGARDING PROJECTS: NEW AND SMALLER PROJECTS ARE NOT SUPPORTED. IT IS THEREFORE A WASTE OF EFFORT TO APPLY.
R/U	It is difficult as a young researcher to compete with experienced researchers; EVEN if the project is of really high quality. Projects for researchers under 35/40 years of age should have its own RCN funding programme!
R/U	The greatest challenge RCN currently faces is funding large-scale basic research (grunnforskning) of high quality. Over the past 10 years funding sources for the humanities and social sciences have decreased significantly, while the funding offered by Store Programmer has not been complementary. Sustaining high quality of research and research-based teaching, while at the same time struggling to get the funds, is very challenging. In our experience, preparing a good project proposal is highly time-consuming and unrewarding under the current circumstances.
R/U	I believe that Norwegian research is poorer due to the limited amount of money available for basic and collaborative research. This limitation excludes many potentially brilliant researchers. Besides, the distribution of available resources for humanities and social scientific research seems to be skewed in favour of certain institution and certain regions of the country.
R/U	about the application form of larger projects in large programs: it is a pity that the reviewers do not read all the sub-projects, only the general overview
R/U	The RCN has a long way to go in order to evaluate multi-disciplinarity adequately when reviewing applications for funding. In my experience, even in programs like INFRA where applications from many fields compete, each application is put into a box tagged "social sciences", "humanities", "medicine", etc. Then the applications are ranked inside each field (box) without much consideration for whether they will also contribute to research in other fields. This hampers the cross-fertilization of research that can most easily take place when researchers from diverse disciplines are working closely together.
R/U	Application process too time consuming and never pay off. Difficult to find programs that fit our projects, in particular concerning interdisciplinary research. There is too little money in the RCN system. In spite of excellent reviews on our applications we (I) never get any money.
R/U	I AM A RELATIVELY YOUNG RESEARCHER HAVING COMPLETED MY PHD AND STILL WORKS AS A RESEARCHER IN A SSF. I HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO A FEW RESEARCHER DRIVEN APPLICATIONS, WHICH HAVE GOTTEN GOOD SCORES, BUT NO MONEY. RATHER, WE SEEKED AND GOT FUNDS FROM INDUSTRY/PRIVATE FIRMS. WE KNOW THE PEOPLE, WE DISCUSS RESEARCH QUESTIONS, AND THEN RECEIVE MONEY WITHOUT ENTERING THE RCN BUREAUCRACY "PACKAGE". HERE, THERE ARE OCCASIONALLY LOTS (!! ) OF MONEY TO GET. WHEN IT COMES TO BASIC RESEARCH/THEMES THAT MAY NOT NECESSARILY BE IMPLEMENTED COMMERCIALY BEFORE 10-20 YEARS HAVE PASSED, I SE A GRATER NEED FOR SUPPORT/FUNDS FROM RCN. HOWEVER, LONG-TERM IS NOT A CONCEPT THAT IS REFLECTED IN THE RCN CALLS. I HOPE THIS CAN CHANGE.
R/U	It looks like it is very hard for young researchers to write applications that will be granted by RCN. This is a challenge.
R/U	Spending years on applications to RCN is an excellent way to ruin a research career. The best ideas, if they come before everybody knows this, are rejected. At least at times, evaluations seem to be done by evaluators without knowledge of either topic, research or need of funding. Before one has a name, or has entered a "stream of money", RCN is completely useless.
R/U	The problem is that RCN is too political. Everyone knows that (i) chances of funding increases drastically with a female project leader, and (ii) an interdisciplinary focus. So applicants make sure that both (i) and (ii) are fulfilled before they apply, and this arrangement comes at the cost of the quality of the research. It is better for purposes of funding to have a mediocre woman as a leader, and a false pretension of interdisciplinary focus, than a high quality male leader, and a strict disciplinary focus. It is just sad. It leads the funded research in the opposite direction of quality. As it is run today, I believe RCN should be mostly dissolved and the money sent directly into established research institutions.
R/U	We (musicians - teachers) would love to use possibilities given by RCN but lack of information keeps this unavailable for us.
R/U	In most of my fellow researchers minds funding from the RC is very seldom a choice because it is so difficult to go through the needle's eye. This is also the case for the senior investigators/professors.
R/U	LIFE IS TOO SHORT TO APPLY RCN FOR FUNDS MORE THAN ONCE.
R/U	One of the biggest problems with selecting research for funding is the preoccupation with relevance criteria. This is merely a political beauty contest and does not advance the quality of research in Norway. In particular, there is not enough funding for curiosity-driven basic research.
R/U	I am new in Norway, recruited from abroad and that is why it is a little bit difficult for me to evaluate RCN. I am in the process of applying for funding, I guess I know more then. We did not receive any feedback on one of our applications, and this is not good for the incentive to develop the research plan when you don't know what we should have done better. The rumours go like this: It is no use in trying to get funding from RCN where only those who have already got funding will receive more, and only the old universities get funding. I hope this is not true. Nursing science does not seem to have its own place yet in RCN categorizations, we are not a part of the Medical sciences.
R/U	DEVELOPING A GOOD PROJECT APPLICATION, WHICH SATISFIES ALL PERSONAL REQUIREMENTS (RESEARCH INTEREST) AND RCN REQUIREMENTS, IS A VERY TIME-DEMANDING PROCESS. IT IS THEREFORE VERY DEMOTIVATING TO KNOW THAT THERE IS ONLY A 7% CHANCE OF SUCCEEDING (FREE FUNDING). IT IS PARTICULARLY DEMANDING FOR A "YOUNG" RESEARCHER NOT HAVING A PERMANENT POSITION, AND BEING DEPENDANT ON EXTERNAL FUNDING FOR HIS PROJECTS, WITH VALUABLE TIME BEING DEVOTED TO WRITING APPLICATIONS INSTEAD OF DOING RESEARCH. I WISH THAT RCN COULD MAKE A PROGRAMME FOR YOUNG RESEARCHERS WHO WANTED TO CARRY OUT INDEPENDENT RESEARCH, BUT WITH A GENEROUS BUDGET, AND WHICH OFFERS THE RESEARCHERS' AN OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE A WIDER PERSPECTIVE ON THEIR ACTIVITIES. I HAVE SENT QUITE A FEW APPLICATIONS TO RCN IN RECENT YEARS, AND BELIEVE THERE SHOULD BE A CLOSER CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE CALL AND THE EVALUATION. THEY HAVE A FORMULA FOR APPLICATIONS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION, WHICH CORRESPONDS WELL WITH HOW THE APPLICATION IS BEING EVALUATED. THIS FORMULA MAKES IT EASIER TO WRITE THE APPLICATION; PROBABLY ALSO TO EVALUATE IT, AND THE EVALUATION FEELS MORE "JUST/FAIR". THIS IS SOMETHING RCN SHOULD ADOPT IN THEIR SYSTEM.
R/U	As a member of a relatively small research group in medical virology, our experience is that it is very difficult to get funding

	through FRIBIOMOL or related programmes. Funding to research outside RCN-defined programmes must be increased.
R/U	There should have been prequalification of grants (like they have in Sweden), then you will maybe put more work into a research application when your chances for getting it approved is higher than today. Too many researchers waste time on writing application that they will not be approved.
R/U	I have three topics that I will comment on: 1)"Grunnforskning" is very limited for small projects. In former years we could do fieldwork and labwork for low cost. This possibility is now very small if at all possible. In my field, for a yearly budget of 100 000 NOK, both fieldwork, labwork and microscopy for myself and a master student could have been done. Example: I had one master student who did her degree on time with excellent results. A 4 year PhD fellowship was granted by the university. 2 months before the fellowship expired, the defence was performed with excellent result. The whole PhD was paid for by the yearly NOK 50 000 that followed the fellowship for running expenses. A post-doc fellowship proposal was submitted to RCN and granted. This indicates that small projects can have a high enough research quality to be excepted for RCN funding, and not only large political directed fields of research. It should be told here that this post doc proposal was focused on a high risk field, and we struggled hard, together with our international partners, to get results. After all, two papers came out of this postdoc fellowship. 2) Point 10 question 2 "Opportunities offered for addressing high-risk topics" My colleagues and I had a proposal both in 2010 and 2011. The non-culturable group xxx (group of organism to be studied) was the same as was granted as the postdoc project above. Both years the project got high scores, in 2011 Excellent as an average. However, the reviewer stated that this was a 'high risk' group and suggested instead that the research should be focused on yyy that could be cultured. 3) Even if the average score was Excellent, the proposal was declined. There was no information in the review comments that DIRECTLY stated why the proposal was rejected. But as told, we learned it was a ?high risk project?, but we are missing: If Excellent, why not funded? This is an example how a 'high risk project' is not funded, in spite of a good proposal and with documented published papers, and manuscript in press.
R/U	When evaluating larger projects, one should look closer at what the various individual participants have actually produced. Having participated in various in various larger projects within humanities, I have experienced that some of those who have taken the most resources without publishing hardly anything, are again included in new larger projects or even given large individual grants, where they again publish close to nothing. When deciding which projects should be awarded grants, the RCN should have the opportunity to have some of the applicants removed if they have a history of not publishing.
R/UC	I feel that applications from the University Colleges have to be motivated by RCN. Although RCN is supporting strategic programs at the University Colleges, as a researcher attached to a University College, I would like the RCN to motivate researcher project applications from the University Colleges by introducing a new research program. Without such a program, I wonder whether the project applications from University Colleges get the same recognition as the applications from Universities and the well-established research institutions in Norway. University Colleges don't have much scientific research history compared to the well-known Universities and institutions. Lack of a long research history will not be favourable for the University Colleges during the assessment process of the project managements.RCN must find ways to fund more preprojects to researchers such that many more researchers become motivated to do more research. The newly established research groups must be given a chance. It is rather demotivating and depressing that even the good applications get rejected due to many applications from the well-known and well established research groups.
R/UC	RCNs policy and practice regarding funding Norwegian research is primarily associated with the following problems: - too much of the money is tied up in large programmes - clearly based on the assumption that research results are best when the research i steered, which is a mistake because it conflicts with the research's distinctive character, and leads to innovative talents/research issues not given the support they deserve. - it seems that RCN has an elitist way of thinking: the best researchers are all found at the "centre", i.e. the universities/the largest units. This may have been a good thing at the time when recruitment and the career system was as in the old days, when vacant positions to a larger extent was decisive to careers and mobility. This is not the case today. The current promotion system results in more people staying put, thus weaking mobility, some environments become self-citing/self-recruiting and protected from change and challenges. In other words: there are both good - and sometimes better - research environments in the periphery compared to the centre, but they have smaller chances making it in the rcn. This point is reinforced as leading environments tend to sit at both sides of the table when funds are distributed. Through this practice, they favourize their own institutions, regardless of quality. The processes are thus hampered by a hability problem, and a possible solution to this would be to put more emphasis on opinions of external experts. Such as practice, however, requires that the RCN employees have adequate competences (academic, authority, etc) to make good decisions, which is hardly the case today. The application processes are too bureaucratic, which in the worst case results in large/heavy applications being dismissed because of (technical) details in the application process.
R/UC	Det store problemet med Norges Forskningsråd er juks og kameraderi. I NRF må man kjenne noen og være innenfor systemet ellers er det ikke noen vits å søke i det hele tatt.
R/UC	I am quite dissatisfied with the Research Council of Norway. I have to spend a lot of time to make a reasonably good application, perhaps up to 40% of my available research time in a given year. This often leads to not getting any funding, and having waisted a lot of time that could be used for research. I have mostly given up applying for research money from RCN, trying to find other sources for research or to fund my own research, because of my low success rate with applications to RCN.
R/UC	IN RECENT YEARS, I HAVE SEEN NO NEED TO USE TIME AND EFFORTS IN SEEKING RCN, AS THE POSSIBILITY FOR SUPPORT TO INDIVIDUAL PROJECTS IS ZERO. I MANAGE WELL WITH THE 45% I HAVE FOR DOING RESEARCH IN MY CURRENT POSITION.
R/UC	For a senior lecturer who works mostly with making books and booklets for teaching and engaging mainly in development work (utviklingsarbeid) NFR is a distant and not very interesting body. Especially when knowing that one out of ten gets money and that a small University College a5re badly funded for professional application work

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – Free text comments at the end of the questionnaires.

\*R=survey to researchers (question 25); L=survey to leaders of Norwegian researcher institutions (question 23); M= survey to participants in RCN meeting places (question 12).

\*\*U=University; UC=University college; SUI= Specialised university institution; I=Institute sector; H=University hospital; G=Government/Public service; T=Trade and industry; O=Other.



Table C.3 Free text comments on general/other topics

Survey*/sector**	Free text comment
L/I	RCN can better understand the development of new innovations by involving other Norwegian organizations.
L/I	A major challenge is to develop possibilities for international cooperation beyond EU, how to gain recognition and funding for such cooperation, and how to operationalize it without being too prescriptive and limited w.r.t. countries and themes. This will be crucial to unlock the potential from working with emerging clusters of expertise in other parts of the world.
L/I	It is a problem that the research evaluation performed by RCN. We are not evaluated with respect to our role. The members of the review panels typically have no knowledge about research institutes (coming from Sweden and Denmark) If we choose to be evaluated together with our university partner, our publications are not registered if they are together with personnel from the university partner.
L/I	The main problem is the way that the RCN is engaged in virtually all elements of research, from being a strategic advised to the government, to being the main funding source, to itself building up capacities that compete for markets with research institutions (most importantly, the recently established 'knowledge-center' on basic education. A related problem is that on the funding side, the RCN is increasingly becoming the main conduit for all funding, regardless of the source and the purpose of the program. This weakens the RCN's profile, and forces to institution to vary its basic criteria (so that, for example, scientific merit may confront relevance/applicability may confront distribution concerns geographically and in the sector). A third, also related challenge is that with command on so many elements of research policy and support, the RCN tends to undermine the ability of institutions to act strategically, and is in fact increasingly seeking to instruct institutions on strategic issues (i.e. who to collaborate with; what to focus on).
L/U	Jeg leder en humanistisk forskningsinstitusjon. Vi kommer godt ut i de frie prioriteringene, men her er midlene relativt begrenset. Når vi forsøker å komme med initiativer til andre typer av programmer etc. opplever jeg at Forskningsrådet opplever dette som forstyrrende. Forskningsrådet ser til en viss grad ut til å foretrekke sine egne ideer og ser ut til å støtte seg på de samme menneskene ('gamle kjente') når de skal foreslå nye ting. Det er generelt vanskelig å få råd og veiledning om hvordan vi skal gå fram for å posisjonere oss bedre. Vi møter hele tiden et krav om at vi skal posisjonere oss og komme med nye initiativer. Men når vi kommer med slike initiativer er det uklart hvorfor de ikke blir tatt videre, og hva som eventuelt skal til for å lykkes.
M/O	Some general observations: 1. Dissemination events by RCN struggle to attract an audience beyond the inner circle (companies and researchers directly involved). 2. RCN often appears more as a loyal instrument for the ministry/ies than as an active advisor to the authorities. 3. The Programme Boards are often challenged to "take on a strategic role", while their tasks are more administrative in nature. A real "strategic role" is reserved for other bodies in the RCN system.
M/O	I have only been exposed through RCN through Skattefunn. Here you act as an bureaucratic administrator, with ignorance towards the real issues in the industry. Your way of handling this is surely a result of many applications and rules decided by others, but it does not give you credit as a Research Council.
M/O	Best-practice disqualifies RCN from a higher score. All R&D is currently based on fragmented and outdated knowledge externalized as either text in reports or verbally. Practical workspaces cannot be expressed by these methods. Cross sector or domain R&D and innovation and learning is today prohibited by many barriers that need to be removed.
M/O	I can't see that they're so good in making partnership, most often the industry and the public sector are'nt participating.
M/O	could be even more out-turned and visible to the public
M/O	IN my opinion the research performers are not presented at strategic level in that kind of workshops, and therefore it is difficult to achieve strategic decisions
M/T	It is often very demanding to know when activities take place, and to know when to be engaged. I think that a few actors who have the time/resources get a very strong voice as opposed to for instance small/medium businesses who have to prioritise business rather than participation in meetings etc. Maybe the input phase could be organised differently in order to better involve SMEs who are actually operational and depend on own revenues. This sector is largely missed out now.
M/T	They have no initiatives except a yearly meeting where they explain how good they can serve us.
M/T	RCN does not seem to be active in the fields above. They are good at arranging huge seminars, but the creation of partnerships is not their business.
M/T	The partnership meetings, seminars etc organised by RCN are good opportunities.
M/U	Science communication outside the R&D community should be required documented before last part of project money is paid.
R/H	It is difficult to find information on various bodies that may support clinical research in Norway.
R/I	The Research Council of Norway has an important societal role, but the whole set up is - too bureaucratic, meaning that the operation and its resources very often are not in sync with the stakeholders and world on the outside, which they are supposed to serve, and - too governed by the Ministries, concerning priorities on themes and programmes which the RCN supports with funding. This is of course due the legacy of Norway being a nation of little consciousness for science and research among the elite (both in industry, politics, and public administration). But it is also due to the fact that Norway has built up the image of itself as the good guy in the world, and therefore we do research on so many "good" topics and in so many "good" fields that most of our research is very fragmented and second class and we will stay second class if we're not able to give priority to what is excellent. This goes for all levels, from high school to under graduate, to master and PhD levels in universities, and research groups elsewhere.

R/I	Generally, governmental research institutions depend too much on funding from NRC and EU funds. Ideally, NRC and EU funds should facilitate collaboration with other scientific communities and provide the basis to develop excellence within the scientific communities, which these funding agencies also do. However, there is a downside to this when the fraction of external funding within an institution become so large that it is difficult to maintain the scientific priorities and an own strategy for its activity, especially when most of externally funded research projects also allocate a considerable fraction of own funding. My research directors strongly emphasize the strategic specific priorities of our institution and encourage us to apply for more external funding. I rhetorically answer them that if we are going to apply for more external money we should forget about our own strategy and adopt the external funds strategy.
R/I	The RCN policy on independent research institutes has become increasingly problematic, regarding e.g. limits to overhead funding, views on how basic funding for institutes should be distributed, and so on. The RCN does not seem to encourage basic research in the institute sector. For us researchers, the RCN funding decisions are not transparent. The scientific evaluation is transparent enough, but the final decisions are made by the programme boards -- which seem to be dominated by government ministries and what they find immediately "useful". That part of the decision-making is not transparent at all. The reporting ("framdriftsrapport") is too time-consuming. One basic problem is that the same forms are used for all kinds of research and development, so that they don't fit what we actually do. Publication activities are, for example, very different in natural and social sciences. But the form and its categories are the same, and the result is that a social scientist does not know where his/her publications fit in (the form might be designed for the natural sciences).
R/I	In my field some important research is located and performed in Australia. However there is no funding for collaboration. The review process seems random for BIA, and it seems that research excellent is not important.
R/I	Concerning my own research, funding from so called "BIP" projects have been very useful and a pre-requisite for being able to develop and maintain a large user forum related to a particular type of safety systems. It has also been a pre-requisite for being able to develop guidelines and handbooks related to the same systems!
R/I	1. Det viktigste for forskningsfremdrift og å sikre interessen for forskningsyrket er å ha minst 50% basisfinansiering ved hvert institutt så ikke søknadstyreriet stjeler all tid og energi fra det som er igjen til reell forskning. Akkord og gratis overtid holder ikke i lengden 2. NFR er en viktig institusjon som må opprettholdes. MEN det er en svært tung og ressurskrevende bedrift som bør slankes. I tillegg bør en enda større andel av NFR's midler gå direkte til instituttene, gjerne med føringer.
R/I	I just wanted to say that my overall impression is that the RCN does a good job and that it is good that this institution with an overall focus on funding Norwegian research exists, compared to e.g. research funding in Sweden, which is much more divided in different fractions depending on your research area. I think a challenge is to come up with well-formulated and adequate calls that capture the actual research needs. This is a continuous challenge! An additional challenge is how to come up with recommendations/demands in calls that concern how to form a strong and potentially international research group in a project. An ambition must always be to connect with the best and most dedicated researchers and industrial partners. Ideally, this should be regardless of where these researchers or industries are located, but there may also be more "political" requirements on what geographic areas are given priorities. These requirements are fully understandable, but there must be a balance between research quality and what areas in the world the RCN wishes that Norwegian researchers should connect to.
R/I	There are too many people that like to decide on what I should do research on. The amount of time and money used for evaluation and administration of the RCN is too high. It is funny that you can be appointed to a position and publish a number of papers but still there is no basic funding for your research.
R/I	Challenge #1 is to create a system where researchers can spend their time carrying out high quality research and not running after money. The number of "forskerårsverk" that are yearly spent on application writing and reporting is totally out of proportion to the funds that are available through the RCN. A surge in the rejection rate does not only signal high quality of the applications that receive funding: it also means that a lot of potentially talented and important research projects do not receive funding. Furthermore, the administrative cost and highly competent reviewers' time that go into these processes should also give raise to concern. Challenge #2 is what I perceive as an increasing overlap between Norwegian national and foreign policy on the one hand, and the research programmes that are established within the NFR on the other. To secure good and independent long term core research, we need to keep a long-term perspective.
R/I	The funds for large/wide interdisciplinary research programmes is not large enough to give possibilities for 'deep research' (only room for 'superficial' touch) and most of all it results in substantially increased costs for project management (administration at the expense of research).
R/U	NFR is a closed world with no contact with the reality of bleeding edge research in my field. The mechanisms offered are not useable. I have been independent academic expert for the EU for more than 12 year and evaluated 400 ++ project, (...) etc. All my research and doctoral support is financed from abroad with ZERO attention from NRF. I have been asked 1 time in my life to evaluate NRF application. I think NFR's scheme for the Humanities, as it is, is a catastrophe. I think NFR should be dismantled and reorganized from the ground.
R/U	I would have liked - and expected - to give my evaluation of the RCN's evaluation of the Universities, faculties, and the research groups. In short: it had many shortcomings.
R/U	RCN and implications for strategy: a) ambivalent. E.g. the latest funding scheme, "fellesløftet", takes away a lot of the strategic room from the units. b) sceptical towards too much coordination of funding to EU/RCN and the units. This takes away the opportunities that lie in having several funding bodies and different processes and might end up in streamlining research.* EU-funding and RCN Of course we are happy to receive this - my department has just taken over an ERC-grant. However, the extra funding for the runners up from the RCN (which we have also received and of course are grateful for on one level) are also a part of letting go of our own control over the research budget and streamlining of research.* RCN and quality? In my experience this is variable.* SFFs attractive Again as HoD I'm happy about our SFF and try to get our staff to apply for more. This is absolutely necessary in the current climate - not least the internal budgeting and bonuses at the universities, but I do find the scheme not particularly suited for the humanities where I think a lot could be done with smaller groups and schemes.

R/U	It would be helpful to have more accessible information in English (for foreign researchers working in Norway) regarding funding opportunities from the RCN.
R/U	The RCN should give more funding to basic research projects and to talented good projects (not only to large institutions and groupings) especially in biomedical areas. The RCN should increase the overall investment in research from current 1% (the lowest in developed Europe) to approx. 3% of the BNP of Norway, as other Nordic countries have done over the past decades. The argument that the total amounts of capital investment in the research is the same in Nordic countries despite the percentage differences - is lame - because it squeezes the competitive edge, talent is lost from Norway, and no innovation can be used in translational research to develop new products. Thus, by supporting the ideas, basic research, and giving more flexibility to young researchers to establish smaller focused groups would be a great advance and eventually profitable: This means the project leader should be able to hire good personnel (interested in project), best equipment (and not wait for the institutions to buy them, thereby losing competitive results) and buy all necessary consumables to fulfill the project (and not to be bogged down by waiting for the allowance from the RCN). Independence of ideas and projects should be guaranteed by the RCN, protected and evaluated by the panel of such specialists (coordinated by RCN, and selected by national interests - i.e. government) that have proven themselves by publishing their results in good journals (i.e. being leaders in the field).
R/U	When attracting foreign talents, the RCN/the government of Norway should have measures in place that foreign talents are not marginalized at the Norwegian Universities/Institutions. In practice, the work floor has difficulties accepting internationalization when it means including foreign researchers. The idea of 'fellesløftet' might not work properly in practice. It seems somewhat futile to carry out profound project evaluations when in the end a large part of the grant money will be distributed by local administrators who tend to look more at local prominence than scientific competence. As the distribution of these funds is not supervised by the RCN it will result in support of 'bredde' research that lacks the quality to obtain funding on its own - this seems to contradict the intention to advance excellence in Norwegian research.
R/U	It is not easy distribute funds - make as simple as possible and with a good mixture of times-scales and measures.
R/U	The major challenge for RCN is to get input from Norwegian researcher around the country. It is to dominated by people localized around Oslo. RCN should be split into sectors localized in Bergen, Trondheim, Tromsø, Stavanger and Oslo
R/U	When responding to this survey I realize that a series of (mainly) negative experiences with RCN over the last 10 years have not only resulted in a fairly negative attitude to RCN on my part, but have also been clearly de-motivating in relation to continuing a career in research in Norway.
R/U	To keep the bureaucracy on a efficient level, and to establish fair competition processes (especially evaluation processes) among different fields of research/disciplines - in light of the importance of the research field in society. For instance the competition between social sciences and law (FRISAM).
R/U	The NRC spend an awful lot of their funding on detailed strategic processes, going into to way to much detail when it comes to the research topics. These processes also takes a lot of time, and when it comes to the details a lot may have changed from the time the strategies are made to the point when the research is done. These processes show little respect to the researchers own ability to define details when it comes to important research questions/topic.
R/U	I think many professors find that it is a waste of time to get involved with the research council. it is full of big programmes where there is little room for individual professors to become involved, the premises are already set. the challenge for a professor is to find funding for a good student. There are not many Norwegian students that want to take a doctoral degree. when they turn up it is too late to contact the research council and they go elsewhere, to work in the industry. there is a mismatch in what the research council wants and what an individual professor needs. the people at the research council are very nice and competent, but the administration of the programmes is too heavy.
R/U	RCN has good intentions to create partnerships between higher education and industry, but in practice the options are sometimes not attractive enough to SMEs.
R/UC	International collaboration depends on individual contacts and earlier collaboration. My experiences are that working in the same field and known by publishing are more important. I have been staying three years in UK, and have had been in international network/collaborations since 1998.
R/UC	I am really impressed by RCN regarding personal service (friendliness), qualifications (staff) and effectively (lead times in application processes). I cannot see any major challenges for the RCN and i hope I still will become a "customer" of your excellent services for many years
R/UC	increase dissemination seminar

Source: NIFU survey for the evaluation of RCN 2012 – Free text comments at the end of the questionnaires.

\*R=survey to researchers (question 25); L=survey to leaders of Norwegian researcher institutions (question 23); M= survey to participants in RCN meeting places (question 12).

\*\*U=University; UC=University college; SUI= Specialised university institution; I=Institute sector; H=University hospital; G=Government/Public service; T=Trade and industry; O=Other.

**NIFU**

Nordic Institute for Studies in  
Innovation, Research and Education