COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FUNDING INSTRUMENT

KNOWLEDGE FIELDS DEVELOPMENT

Framework Document

MARCH 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 FUNDING INSTRUMENT TITLE AND DESCRIPTION

1.1 Name
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT FUNDING INSTRUMENT

1.2 Description of Funding Instrument
The Community Engagement Funding Instrument is a competitive funding instrument, which provides the space for research that contributes both to knowledge production within the ambit of community engagement (here community is defined in its broadest sense); as well as research on the processes and dynamics of engagement from the perspective of the higher education sector. To further elaborate, the funding instrument is aimed at supporting and providing enabling conditions for higher education and research institutions to come to grips with some of the philosophical and conceptual challenges associated with the dynamics of community engagement and social responsiveness, as a field of research enquiry.

Key features of the funding instrument:

- Research which contributes to deeper theoretical, philosophical and conceptual orientations of community engagement from a higher education perspective;
- Research which interrogates the complex interplay and processes of engagement; that is, the various ways in which knowledge is produced, assimilated and utilized through interactions and relationships with communities;
- Case studies, typologies, appreciative inquiry about community engagement and community assessments.

Key assumptions underpinning the instrument:

- The conception, definition or meaning ascribed to the notion of "community" is not universal or pre-determined in the funding instrument; it may be the focus of the project; and will depend on how each project defines it.
- An exploration of community engagement implies that communities (however defined) have roles and agency in a reciprocal set of relations.

2 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The *White Paper on Higher Education* (1997) (hereafter "the White Paper") sets out the agenda for the transformation of Higher Education from the segregated, inequitable and highly inefficient apartheid institutions towards a single national system that serves both individual and collective needs. In line with international practice, The White Paper casts community engagement as one of the pillars of the higher education system, along with teaching and learning, and research.

The National Research Foundation (NRF) recognises that the generation of knowledge and advancement of science[1], as well as the development of human capacity, are central activities in the pursuit of its mandate to contribute to the improvement of the quality of life of all people in South Africa. However, historically the NRF had not supported a dedicated funding instrument for community engagement. Such an instrument would specifically begin to address the need for a deeper understanding of the interplay of processes and relationships involved in the transfers of knowledge and innovations. Of course, it would also interrogate the ways in which new knowledge is generated through engagement with communities.

To address this gap, the NRF established the Community Engagement Funding Instrument to support research and activities aimed at improving our understanding of the full spectrum of community engagement and the suite of activities that this implies. This may include, *inter alia*: negotiating the terrain of knowledge production as a site of multiple processes and relations, interrogating the ways in which tacit knowledge is surfaced in the complex process of community engagement; and assessing the impact for, and changes in communities as a result of newly coded knowledge.

3   STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The mandate of the NRF is to support and promote research through funding, human resource development and the provision of the necessary research facilities so as to facilitate the creation of knowledge, innovation and development in all fields of science and technology, including indigenous knowledge and thereby to contribute to the improvement of the quality of life of all the people of the Republic (NRF Act, 1998). In support of its purpose, the NRF recently launched the *NRF Strategy 2020* that has followed on *Vision 2015* extending between 2008 and 2015 both of which aim at two strategic outcomes, namely *a vibrant and globally connected national system of innovation*, and *a representative research and technical workforce* targeting the following four strategic goals:

- A scientifically literate and engaged society;
- World-class benchmarking and grant making systems;
- An internationally competitive and transformed research system; and
- Leading-edge research and infrastructure platforms

3.1   Environmental scan

Along with teaching and learning, and research, community engagement is cast as one of the three pillars of the South African Higher Education system. The transformative *White Paper* called upon universities to "demonstrate social responsibility and their commitment to the common good by making available expertise and infrastructure for community service programmes". A key objective is to "promote and develop social responsibility and awareness

---

[1] This framework adopts an inclusive definition of science and scholarly endeavour, encompassing the humanities, social sciences and the natural sciences

amongst students of the role of higher education in social and economic development through community engagement".

Concomitantly, the Higher Education Act (1997) gave rise to the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC) of the Council on Higher Education (CHE) whose responsibilities include quality promotion, institutional audits and programme reviews and accreditation. The HEQC has identified *"knowledge based community service"* as a basis for programme accreditation and quality assurance. This aspect of the HEQC policy has been operationalized by requiring that as part of the first round of institutional audits, institutions must report against the specific criteria for community engagement.

3.2   Objectives

The objectives of the funding instrument are:

- To sharpen and mainstream the higher education sector's response to community engagement as a third pillar of academic activity (Hall: 2009);
- To facilitate the development of robust theoretical and conceptual positions on community engagement in the South African context; and thereby stimulate and contribute to contemporary debates on the issue;
- To create new forms of knowledge in this area;
- To develop human capacity in the "field" of community engagement.

3.3   NRF Perspective

A marked feature of the redefined strategy *Vision 2015* was the shift from a *demand-driven* to balanced *strategy–push* and *demand-driven agency.* The Research and Innovation Support and Advancement (RISA) business division of the NRF identified a number of strategic investment areas, one of which was community engagement. The decision to initiate investment in this area signalled the commitment of the NRF to align more closely with the higher education mandate of research, teaching and community service/engagement; and also to contribute towards the Department of Science and Technology (DST)'s Human and Social Dynamics Grand Challenge. This Grand Challenge is intended to address an array of social, economic, political, scientific and technological benefits.

The Community Engagement Funding Instrument also - directly, and in part - addresses the following strategic objectives of the *NRF Strategy 2020:*
- Promote globally competitive research and innovation;
- Enhance strategic international engagement; and
- Entrench science engagement.

3.4 Institutional structure

The strategic direction and outcomes of the funding instrument are managed by the Knowledge Fields Development (KFD) Directorate. The Reviews and Evaluation (RE) Directorate is responsible for the review processes up to the recommendations of grant awards. The Grants Management and Systems Administration (GMSA) Directorate's responsibilities include posting of the research call, disbursement of grant funds and ensuring adherence to the conditions of the grant.

3.5 Financing support

The Community Engagement Funding Instrument is made possible through the NRF's Parliamentary Core Funding. As a demand driven funding instrument, there is no limit to the amount an applicant can request. Having said this, the financial requests need to be in line with requirements and as far as possible, accurately reflect the financial needs of the proposed work. Excessive budget requests are not well received by the review panels. Applications will be scored according to a scorecard (see **Annexure 1**), and the top scoring applications will be supported until the available resources are exhausted. The financial requirements of the top scoring applications will determine the final number of applications supported.

3.6 Key stakeholders

The key stakeholders involved in the Community Engagement Funding Instrument are persons based at public research institutions that are recognised by directive of the Minister of Science and Technology. These include mainly, Universities, Museums and Science Councils.

3.7 Information sources

South Africa. 1997. White Paper 3: A programme for the transformation of higher education. Notice 1196 of 1997. *Government Gazette,* 386 (18207)1:55, August 15

South Africa. 1997. The Higher Education Act 101 of 1998. Accessed at http://www.che.ac.za/sites/default/files/publications/act101.PDF

South Africa. 1998. The National Research Foundation Act 23 of 1998. Accessed at http://www.nrf.ac.za/sites/default/files/documents/NTFAct.pdf

South Africa. Department of Science and Technology. 2007. *Innovation towards a knowledge-based economy: Ten-Year Innovation Plan for South Africa, 2008 – 2018.* Pretoria: Department of Science and Technology

South Africa. 2008. *2008 Strategic plan of the National Research Foundation: NRF Vision 2015.* Pretoria: National Research Foundation

South Africa. 2015. *2015 Strategic Plan of the National Research Foundation: NRF Vision 2020.* Pretoria. National Research Foundation

Hall, M. (2009). Community Engagement in South African Higher Education. Paper presented at the CHE Symposium on Community Engagement, 19 March 2009, Pretoria.

The Department of Science and Technology, 2013. *The ministerial guidelines for improving equity in the distribution of DST/NRF bursaries and fellowships.*

4   *MODUS OPERANDI*

4.1   Call for proposals

All application materials **must** be submitted electronically via the NRF's Submission system at
https://nrfsubmission.nrf.ac.za

The **NRF closing date** for endorsed applications is **6 May 2016.** All applications **must** be endorsed by the research office of the principal applicant before submission to the NRF. It is the responsibility of each applicant to familiarise himself / herself with the **internal closing dates**, set by institution in order to meet the NRF closing date.

Incomplete OR late submissions will not be accepted.

Call opens: 7 March 2016
Call closes: 6 May 2016

4.2   Eligibility

- Researchers must be working in the research area of community engagement and be based at public research institutions that are recognised by directive of the Minister of Science and Technology. These include mainly, Universities, Museums and Science Councils.

- Part-time employees on contract at a recognised research institution (as defined above) in South Africa may apply, but on condition that their appointment at the South African institution is for (at least) the duration of the project applied for in the submission. The length of the contract should be stated in the application form. Salaries must be paid by the research institution and the primary employment of the individual concerned must be at that institution. A contract researcher appointed at a research institution on behalf of a third party to fulfill a very specific function for the latter does not qualify for support.

- Successful applicants will be eligible for funding for **three years** (2017 – 2019).

- Retired academics/researchers, provided that they meet all set criteria as stipulated below:
  o are resident in SA;
  o are formally affiliated to a recognised institution (as defined above) e.g., appointed as an emeritus professor, honorary research associate/professor, supernumerary/contract employee;
  o are active researchers with a distinguished track record in research and postgraduate student supervision;
  o are actively mentoring/training postgraduate students/young research staff and
  o the institution ensures that a minimum of reasonable time (6 months minimum) is spent at the facility for the purpose of research and research capacity development.

4.3   Application assessment

The assessment of applications will be guided by a Panel Assessment Scorecard **(see Annexure 1)**, and scored according to the Proposal Grading **(see Annexure 2)**. Application assessment will occur by way of a two-tiered process:

- **Remote [Postal]-peer review**

  The remote peer reviewers will be specialists in the ambit of the respective proposals. Requests for written reviews will be solicited electronically, or through appropriate media / means from peers located at remote locations from the NRF. Applicants will be requested to provide between 6 to 10 possible reviewers. It is in the applicant's best interest to ensure that the selected reviewers are aware of the submission and are likely to respond. It is also in the applicant's best interest to ensure that selected reviewers have no possible conflict of interest in submitting a review, as such review reports are dismissed without consideration. On average, a 30% response rate is achieved by the NRF in requesting postal peer reviews.

- **Panel-peer review**

  The adjudication panel will be broadly constituted to include senior academics, who will be selected based both on their respective knowledge fields and their research standing. The panel meeting will be held at central location or by way of tele- or video-conferencing. Panel members will deliberate on submitted written reviews and will be expected to offer their own expert opinions.

NB: Applicants must ensure that their Curriculum Vitae are updated on the NRF Submission system at

https://nrfsubmission.nrf.ac.za.

These Curriculum Vitae are used in the assessment processes, and incomplete or outdated inputs will jeopardise the application.

4.4   Rules of participation

a) Principal Investigator

Only researchers based at NRF recognized research institutions in South Africa (as defined above) are eligible to apply as a principal investigator.

- The principal investigator (i.e. the applicant) must be an active researcher who takes intellectual responsibility for the project, its conception, any strategic decisions called for in its pursuit, and the communication of results. The principal investigator must have the capacity to make a serious commitment to the project and cannot assume the role of a supplier of resources for work that will largely be placed in the hands of others. He/she will also take responsibility for the management and administration of resources allocated to the grant award, and for the meeting reporting requirements for the project.

- A principal investigator should not submit a funding proposal on behalf of a student where the student in the main will be carrying out the research.

In addition, the research team may also include:

b) Co-investigators

A co-investigator is an active researcher who provides significant commitment, intellectual input and relevant expertise into the design and implementation of the research application. S/he will be involved in all or at least some well-defined research activities within the scope of the application. South African-based co-investigators are eligible to receive NRF funds from the grant if the team's application is successful.

Post-doctoral fellows, students, technical and support staff should NOT be listed as co-investigators

c) Research Associates / Collaborators

These are individuals or groups who are anticipated to make a relatively small, but meaningful contribution to the research endeavours outlined in the application, but who have not actively participated in the research design. They are not considered a part of the core research team, and are not eligible to receive NRF funds from the grant if the team's application is successful.

4.5 Timelines

The Community Engagement grants will be awarded for a period of three years (**2017–2019).**

4.6 Management of funding instrument

The **KFD Directorate** of the NRF – Research and Innovation Support and Advancement (RISA) manages the Community Engagement Funding Instrument and is primarily responsible for:

- Strategic oversight and management of the funding instrument;
- Conceptualizing and developing the funding instrument;
- Coordinating and facilitating activities of the funding instrument;
- Compiling funding instrument research and evaluation reports;
- Stakeholder engagement; and
- Ensuring that the funding instruments delivers on its intended goal(s).

The **RE Directorate** is responsible for managing the adjudication process including:

- sourcing of reviewers both for remote reviews and panels;
- managing the peer review process;
- organizing and managing the review panels as and where appropriate;
- providing feed-back as appropriate; and
- making recommendations of award of grants

The **GMSA Directorate** is responsible for

- Managing the call process, that is,
    - Posting the call;
    - Receiving and assessing applications eligibility;
- Coordinating and facilitating the granting processes;
- Managing the granting including the administration of awards;
- Administering grant payments; and
- Ensuring adherence to conditions of grants

4.7 Lines of authority

The funding instrument Director in the KFD Directorate manages the Community Engagement Funding Instrument. The Director responsible for this instrument reports to the Executive Director of the KFD Directorate. Directors from GMSA and RE will manage the granting and review processes, respectively. The Directors in both the GMSA and the Reviews and Evaluation report to their respective Executive Directors

5   FINANCIALS

5.1   Funding model

The Community Engagement Funding Instrument is made possible through the NRF's Parliamentary Core Funding. These grants are to be primarily used for **research purposes** and development of associated human resources under the auspices of the NRF standard grant and finance policies. The money is released upon acceptance of the conditions of grant, both by the applicant and his/her employing institution. These grants will fall under the NRF audit requirements of beneficiary institutions.

5.2   Funding ranges

Successful applications will receive funding that accommodates the following budget items:

a) Grant holder-linked student support
b) Staff development grants
c) Research-related operating costs, including:

- o   Sabbaticals
- o   Materials and Supplies
- o   Travel and subsistence
- o   Research / Technical / *Ad hoc* Assistants
- o   Research Equipment

The application assessment process will consider proposed budget items in terms of cost, risk and reward ratios. Decisions relating to budget items will also be governed by the overall funding instrument funds available for the period. Awards will be made in line with the NRF funding rules and guidelines as outlined in **Section 5.3.**

5.3   Funding support

The NRF funds the Community Engagement Funding Instrument on an ongoing basis. Science councils, universities, museums and other NRF-recognized institutions are the primary beneficiaries of this funding instrument.

a) Grant holder-linked student support

Grant holder-linked student support will be awarded in accordance with eligibility criteria as detailed in the **Ministerial Guidelines for Improving Equity in the Distribution of DST/NRF Bursaries and Fellowships** (January 2013). The distribution for these bursaries is targeted at the ratios:

- Final year Undergraduate and Honours/BTech student assistantships: 100% SA citizens with a minimum ratio[2] of 1:1 for Black[3] and White participants;
- Masters bursaries: 90% to South Africans and 10% to candidates from other African countries;
- Doctoral bursaries: 80:15:5, SA: Other African: Rest of the World; and
- Postdoctoral bursaries: Open to all who undertake research in South Africa.

The awarding of postdoctoral fellowships will not be guided by, but not governed by, equity targets.

The equity distribution for all Masters and Doctoral bursaries is targeted at the ratio:
- o   80% Black
- o   55% Female
- o   4% Disabled

Values of Student Assistantships

- Final year Undergraduate (Full-time)   R 8 000 pa for one year
- Honours / BTech (Full-time)   R 20 000 pa for one year

Values of Bursaries & Fellowships
- Masters degree (Full-time)   R40 000 pa for two years
- Doctoral degree (Full-time)   R60 000 pa for three years
- Postdoctoral (*pro rata* per month)   R150 000 pa for two years

b) Staff development grants

Applicants may apply for Staff Development grants for South African **staff members** at their own and other institutions, and who are not NRF grant-holders in their own right. These staff members must be registered for either a Masters or Doctoral degree, supervised by the applicant or a co-investigator of the application and must be directly involved in the NRF approved project. These grants can be used to contribute towards the operating costs for research undertaken at the supervisor's facility, as well as the cost of travel and accommodation to enable staff members to meet with (co)supervisors. Grants usually range between R 15,000 and R 30,000 depending on the nature of the research and the proximity of the student in relation to the supervisor. Applicants themselves are **not** eligible for Staff Development Grants. The maximum period of support is three years for a Masters degree and five years for a Doctoral degree.

---

[2] With the emphasis on Black students
[3] Inclusive of Africans, Indians and Coloureds

c) Research-related operating costs

These costs include: materials and supplies, travel (including conferences and subsistence), equipment, and research / technical / *ad hoc* assistance. Sabbaticals to other research organisations and institutions of higher learning may also be included within the context of the project proposals. These costs should be justified and commensurate with the planned outputs.

General guidelines

Sabbaticals

Sabbaticals will be considered for a period from two to six months. The maximum sabbatical amount requested should not exceed R 80,000 for six months. Funding for sabbaticals of less than six months will be reduced pro-rata. Only principal investigators and co-investigators are eligible to apply for sabbatical funding.

Materials and Supplies

Generally, the NRF does not provide financial support for:

- Basic office equipment including computers and consumables unless the computer is required for the research itself.
- Basic office stationery, photocopying costs, printing costs unless these items form part of the research tools.
- Journal publication costs, journal subscription costs and book costs.
- Telephone, fax and internet costs.

Travel and subsistence

- International conference attendance: Generally the NRF restricts this amount to R 25,000 per person to a maximum of R 50,000 per application per year for a team application i.e. for principal investigators and co-investigators (local only) and local post-graduate students.
- International visits: These will be considered on a case by case basis. Such visits must be integral to the research plan and strong motivations should accompany these requests. Realistic funding allocations will be based on the requested activities. Only outgoing visits will be considered depending on the availability of funding.
- Local conference attendance: Generally the NRF restricts expenditure against this item to R 5,000 per person (all costs). Support for local conference attendance could be requested for all listed co-investigators and post-graduate students. The applicant should clearly motivate for the benefit to attend more than one local conference per annum, and for the number of people attending each local conference.

- Local travel: The NRF does not stipulate any rate for mileage as this will depend on the rate which varies per institution/organisation. Applicants are requested to provide details of this rate as well as the estimated distance to be travelled within the given year.
- Local accommodation costs should not exceed a 3* establishment

<u>Research / Technical / *Ad hoc* Assistants</u>

- This instrument does not provide funding for the salaries of the core team members if they are based at organisations/institutions where the salaries are state funded. In cases where the salaries are not state funded, the total salary amount for all core team members will be limited to up to 20% of the overall grant amount. A strong motivation for the salary component must accompany the request.
- Requests for research/technical/*ad hoc* assistance should be treated with caution. Generally the NRF would encourage applicants to engage students to undertake the research rather than employing research consultants. This guideline however does not apply when specific and/or highly specialised research/technical expertise is required. This should be **CLEARLY** motivated for in the application.

<p style="color:red; text-align:center;">**Administrative assistance <u>does not qualify</u> as technical assistance.**</p>

<u>Research Equipment</u>

Funding for equipment will be limited to R 50,000 per year. Requisitions for large equipment items (> R 200,000) should be submitted through the NRF's Equipment Programme.

d) Community Engagement Programme Specific Guidelines

It is acknowledged that community engagement research may require specific types of funding to support research in certain settings or projects. Applicants are advised to provide a clear rationale and justification for this type of expenditure in relation to the proposal and work plan activities. It is incumbent on the applicant to provide commensurate line items in the budget request. Examples include *inter alia*: payment for translators in the field, providing transport to fieldworkers etc. In each case, a clear motivation should be provided, which links to the objectives of the proposal.

e) Funding to cater for disabilities

Additional funding support to cater for disability will be allocated to people with disabilities as specified in the Code of Good Practice on Employment of People with Disabilities as in the Employment Equity Act No 55 of 1998.

5.4 Funding instrument budget

The Community Engagement Funding Instrument is made possible through the NRF's Parliamentary Core Funding.

5.5 Financial control and reporting

Upon receipt of the signed Conditions of Grant letter, the NRF will release the awarded amount for the year. Grant holders will then be required to comply with the standard NRF financial management procedures, including the submission of an Annual Progress Report. These are to be submitted before the end of March of the following year, and are a prerequisite for the release of the subsequent year's funding. Failure to submit the Annual Progress Report will result in the cancellation of the grant award.

6 MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF THE FUNDING INSTRUMENT

The NRF is responsible for monitoring and evaluating the Community Engagement Funding Instrument.

6.1 Reporting

The KFD Director is responsible for reporting quarterly on the contribution of the Community Engagement Funding Instrument Directorate's Key Performance Indicators. In addition, the Director is responsible for reviewing and reporting on the progress of the funding instrument. Grant holders are required as part of the conditions of grant, to make annual progress reports to the National Research Foundation.

6.2. Timeframes for programme review

The Community Engagement Funding Instrument will be evaluated by an appropriate external review panel as appointed by the RE Directorate. KFD will agree to and set timeframes for the review in line with existing guidelines.

6.3 Broad terms of reference for the programme review

The broad terms of reference for the programme review of the Community Engagement Funding Instrument will be determined by the KFD Directorate prior to the evaluation taking place, and in accordance with the tenets set in the NRF's RE Directorate Guidelines.

6.4 Utilisation of programme review findings and recommendations

The results of the evaluation will be used in line with the purposes set in the Terms of Reference for the evaluation. Evaluation results will also be used for funding instrument improvement and development.

QUERIES

REFER ALL QUERIES TO:
TRACY KLARENBEEK
ACTING DIRECTOR: KNOWLEDGE FIELDS DEVELOPMENT
(T) 012 481 4177
Tracy@nrf.ac.za

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CHE	Council on Higher Education
DST	Department of Science and Technology
GMSA	Grants Management and Systems Administration
HEQC	Higher Education Quality Committee
KFD	Knowledge Fields Development
NRF	National Research Foundation
RE	Reviews and Evaluation
RISA	Research and Innovation Support Agency

ANNEXURE 1: Panel Assessment Scorecard – Community Engagement					
Criteria	**Sub-Criteria**	**Details**	**Score / 4**	**Weight**	**Weighted score**
Proposal	Scientific merit	Reflect on the articulation or definition of the concept of community engagement. Reflect on the proposed rationale, approach and methodology		30%	
	Scientific feasibility	Reflect on the proposed conditions for knowledge generation as part of the processes of engagement in communities. Reflect on the scientific, ethical[4] logistics and technical feasibility as proposed		25%	
Track record of applicant	Prior experience in community engagement research	Does the applicant have experience in community-based research, community-based learning or community service		5%	
Equity and redress	Of applicant	Race / Gender / Years post PhD		10%	
Collaboration	International, national and institutional collaborations	Are the appropriate collaborations proposed in the application? Are the roles of the proposed collaborators clearly indicated?		5%	
Impact	Impact on knowledge production	Will the proposed work significantly advance discovery and understanding in the field?		10%	
	Wider impact	Has the possibility for economic, societal or environmental impact been appropriately embedded in the proposal?		10%	

4

[4] Ethical considerations and clearances for grant proposals are the responsibility of the research institute and/or institution of the applicant. Where such ethical considerations and clearances are required, grant applicants will be expected to submit to the NRF signed statements and/or copies of clearance certificates before any grant funds are released.

		Is it clear how such impact will be measured?			
Data management and use	Digital storage	Has appropriate consideration been given to digital data storage for use beyond the immediate project team?		5%	**Data management and use**
			Totals	**100%**	**0.00**

ANNEXURE 2: Proposal Grading		
Score	**Meaning of score**	**Notes**
4	Excellent	Application demonstrates evidence of **outstanding** performance across all the stated criteria, as determined by the panel and relative to the knowledge field under consideration
3	Above average	Application demonstrates evidence of **above average** performance across all the stated criteria, as determined by the panel and relative to the knowledge field under consideration
2	Average	Application demonstrates evidence of **average** performance across all the stated criteria, as determined by the panel and relative to the knowledge field under consideration
1	Below average	Application demonstrates evidence of **below average** performance across all the stated criteria, as determined by panel and relative to knowledge field under consideration
	Poor	There are **major shortcomings or flaws** as relates to the scientific / scholarly merit and feasibility of the proposed work, as determined by the panel.

Context:
Proposal grading is done with sensitivity to the context within which each application is submitted. The score of each criterion for each application will be contextualised to accommodate variability in such things as knowledge fields, institutional capacity, etc. Should a criterion not be applicable to a specific application (e.g. plans for digital data storage; collaborations; etc.), the weighting of that specific criteria will be made to equal zero, and the overall score normalised.