

Maura Soares

Assunto: Pedido de Parecer sobre o Projeto de Resolução nº133/XI
Anexos: Incentive Regulation_CEEApIA-A.pdf

De: Tomás Lopes Cavalheiro Ponce Dentinho <tomas.lc.dentinho@uac.pt>

Enviada: 11 de abril de 2019 12:04

Para: Assuntos Parlamentares <assuntosparlamentares@alra.pt>

Assunto: Pedido de Parecer sobre o Projeto de Resolução nº133/XI

Exmos. Senhora Dra. Renata Correia Botelho
Presidente da Comissão

Em resposta ao ofício enviado por Vexa no 1083 de 4 de abril de 2019 sobre o assunto em epígrafe venho dar o seguinte parecer.

Considerando que a investigação científica orientada para as questões cuja resposta importa ao desenvolvimento dos Açores precisa de compatibilizar, por um lado, a segurança do desempenho da profissão de investigador e, por outro lado, a garantia de produtividade científica efetiva por parte do investigador.
Considerando que é necessário salvaguardar a criatividade da produção autónoma de investigação.

Propõe-se que:

- O pagamento do investigador registado no sistema de investigação científica dos Açores seja feito com base na sua produtividade científica aferida pelos artigos, livros e capítulos científicos e outros trabalhos dos últimos três anos, divididos pela percentagem de contribuição do autor para cada artigo, capítulo ou relatório, e ponderado pela relevância da revista, editora ou relatório.
- O pagamento será canalizado através de entidades dedicadas à investigação científica que mediante um overheads inferior a 10% acordarão com o investigador o pagamento da remuneração com contrato ratificado pelo sistema de investigação científico dos Açores.

Justificação

- Se os investigadores tiverem um vínculo semelhante ao dos restantes funcionários públicos reduzirão a sua produtividade;
- Se os investigadores forem enquadrados apenas por entidades públicas tenderão a abandonar a investigação e a dedicar-se a outras tarefas que lhes são solicitadas;
- A história dos institutos públicos de investigação de Portugal desligados do ensino pós graduado não têm dado resultados de investigação.

PS. Junto envio os critérios de distribuição dos fundos do Ceepla que podem orientar os critérios a estabelecer para o pagamento dos investigadores.

Cumprimentos

Tomaz Ponce Dentinho

ASSEMBLEIA LEGISLATIVA DA REGIÃO AUTÓNOMA DOS AÇORES	
ARQUIVO	
Entrada	1044 Proc. n.º 109
Data:	019/04/11 N.º 133/XI

Evaluation/Incentive Scheme

Introduction

The University of the Azores undertook a modification of the way its research activity is carried out, creating internal centers that are the collaboration vehicles with other universities as research organizations.

This alteration led to the establishment of CEEApIA-A, UAc organization to encourage research and participation in CEEApIA, the FCT center.

CEEApIA-A will closely follow the policies undertaken in CEEApIA, namely in what concerns the evaluation of the outputs produced by its members which should be the basis for the incentives provided to researchers.

The evaluation system takes into consideration the evaluation criteria of FCT as expressed in the 2009 and 2015 evaluation reports.

The current scheme differs from the one previously established in CEEApIA in that it limits the attribution of points to publications included in SCOPUS, while limiting credit for *Other Publications* to a maximum of 3 per year.

Otherwise the main objective is to enhance quality publications that might lead to an improvement of the final evaluation of CEEApIA.

1- Objective

The objectives of this new version of the Incentive Scheme are:

- a) To encourage and promote the quality and visibility of the research conducted by its members;
- b) Apply criteria that are similar to those of CEEApIA;
- c) Establish criteria for the admission of new researchers in the center;
- d) Establish criteria for the maintenance of integrated member of the center.

2 - CEEApIA-A's Members

Members can be of four types: Integrated; Collaborators; Counselors and; Honorary.

Only integrated members who are public servants at the service of the University of the Azores are subject to the evaluation considered here.

Integrated members mandatorily comply with the eligibility criteria demanded by FCT (Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia) for accreditation /registration of R&D Units and might be founders, effectives and regulars.

Founder integrated members are those that hold a PhD or the title of “agregado” and are public servants at the service of the University of the Azores and who subscribed the proposal for the foundation of CEEApIAA.

Effective integrated members are those that hold a PhD or the title of “agregado” and are public servants at the service of the University of the Azores as well as those that are retired having previously served in the University of the Azores, who are not founding members.

Regular integrated members are those made equivalent to researchers who hold a PhD or the title of “agregado” and are public servants at the service of the University of the Azores as well as those that are retired including elements from other national and foreign institutions.

The integrated members inform the director of CEEApIA-A, during the month of December, of their interest in maintaining such statute in the following year, thus assuring that their curricular items will contribute exclusively to the respective external evaluation process of the center.

The proposals for admission of integrated effective and regular members are submitted to the director of CEEApIAA, in writing, by any integrated member.

To be admitted, as an integrated member the curricular evaluation has to accumulate 20 points in the immediate previous three year period.

To maintain the status of integrated member a minimum of 15 points has to be achieved in each three year moving average period.

3 – Amount to be distributed as incentive

Annually CEEApIAA will budget the amount of funds to be allocated among integrated members who are public servants at the service of the University of the Azores.

4 – Evaluation /Distribution criteria

4.1 The score attributed to each researcher is a 3 year moving average. The following table establishes the score for each type of publication:

Output	Score
1.Publications in journals and Proceedings	
1.1..AJG15 (A)****	150
1.2.AJG15/ISI– 4 (A)	120
1.3.AJG15/ISI – 3 (B)	50
1.4AJG15/ISI – 2 (C)	20
1.5.AJG15/ISI – 1 (D)	7.5
1.6.SCOPUS Index	3
1.7. Other – (Maximum 9 in each 3 year period)	1.5
2.Author of book or chapter in book	
CERES-A,B levels	20
CERES–C level	7.5
Other	1.5
3.Editor of book	
CERES-A,B levels	25
CERES-C level	12.5
Other	1.5
4.Presentations in Scientific Meetings	
4.1 Conference/Congress	1
4.2 Seminars/Workshops	0.5

5. Supervising (Concluded)	
5.1 Master thesis	2
5.2 PhD	5
6. Organization/scientific committee of scientific events	
National	1
International	1.5
7. Working papers	1
8. Referee from international journal	1
9. Editorial body from scientific journals	
9.1 Editor in chief / Guest editor	
A, B, C, D levels and Scopus reference	2
Other	1
9.2 Member of editorial council/Associate editor/Scientific Council	
A, B, C, D levels and Scopus reference	2
Other	1

Application and Adjustment Norms

- The score given in point 1 will be taken from the AJG ranking available at <http://charteredabs.org/academic-journal-guide-2015/>. For ISI journals, available at <http://admin-apps.webofknowledge.com/JCR/JCR?PointOfEntry=Home&SID=W2UrJtdUh9ynA4DiucT> the score will be attributed, in each ISI category, according to its rank in quartiles, as follows:
 - 4th Q: 75 ≤ percentile < 100..... A level publications
 - 3rd Q: 50 ≤ percentile < 75..... B level publications
 - 2nd Q: 25 ≤ percentile < 50..... C level publications
 - 1st Q: 0 ≤ percentile < 25..... D level publications

As an example we present the quartiles for **Business** journals in 2014:

- a) 4th Q: $75 \leq \text{percentile} < 100$ ($IP \geq 2.075$)..... A level publication
- b) 3rd Q: $50 \leq \text{percentile} < 75$ ($1.400 \leq IP < 2.075$) ... B level publication
- c) 2nd Q: $25 \leq \text{percentile} < 50$ ($0.750 \leq IP < 1.4$).....C level publication
- d) 1st Q: $0 \leq \text{percentile} < 25$ ($IP < 0.750$).....D level publication

Economics journals in 2014:

- a) 4th Q: $75 \leq \text{percentile} < 100$ ($IP \geq 1.362$)..... A level publication
- b) 3rd Q: $50 \leq \text{percentile} < 75$ ($0.860 \leq IP < 1.362$) ... B level publication
- c) 2nd Q: $25 \leq \text{percentile} < 50$ ($0.464 \leq IP < 0.860$).....C level publication
- d) 1st Q: $0 \leq \text{percentile} < 25$ ($IP < 0.464$).....D level publication

In case one journal is included in more than one category the score of the highest quartile will prevail.

In case the above criteria deliver a higher category for a journal already included in AJG, the ISI criteria will prevail. Relative to the AJG ranking, this improvement cannot represent more than one category.

- 2) The score given in point 2 will be taken from the CERES– Research School for Resource Studies for Development, available at: <http://ceres.fss.uu.nl/rating-lists/publishers/>
- 3) The working papers should be available on series, not necessarily subject to referee, but with wide diffusion, such as CEEApIA's Working Papers Series, available online.
- 4) Points 2 and 3.2 do not include the author's editions.
- 5) To encourage co-authorship the following criteria will apply:
 - 5.1) If there is at least one author that does not belong to the University of the Azores

Each member gets $1,3^*$ points of the journal divided by the square root of the total number of authors (example: 2 authors in a B journal– the member of CEEApIAA gets $(1,3*50)/\sqrt{2}=46.0$)
 - 5.2) If there are co-authors from the University of Madeira

Each member gets $1,1^*$ points of the journal divided by the square root of the total number of authors (example: 2 authors in a B journal– each member of CEEApIAA gets $(1,1*50)/\sqrt{2}=38.9$)
 - 5.3) If there are co-authors only from the University of the Azores

Each member gets $1,1^*$ points of the journal divided by the square root of the total number of authors (example: 2 authors in a B journal– each member of CEEApIAA gets $(1,1^*50)/\sqrt{2}=38.9$)

- 6) In case of co-supervising of theses, the points will be divided by the number of co-supervisors.
- 7) To ensure that CEEApIAA's researchers main goal is to publish in high quality journals, the aggregate score that can be obtained from output categories 4 to 9 is set to a maximum of 15 points (that is, the minimum score requirement to remain in the center as a "Researcher").

- 8)** The amount allocated per researcher may be spent in a discretionary manner (missions/trips, software, bibliography, data, etc.) within the expenses admissible for research activities.

- 9)** In cases where a researcher, within the period of a year, does not spend his/her research funds, the remaining amount will be transferred to the following year to be used by the researcher.

- 10)** The amount accumulated by a researcher cannot exceed 20% of the total amount distributed in one year.

- 11)** The maximum amount a researcher is eligible for in any one year is 30% of the total amount budgeted for that year.