

Survey response for Israel

OECD database of governance of public research policy

This document contains detailed responses for Israel to the survey on governance of public research policy across the OECD. It provides additional background information to the OECD database of governance of public research policy as described in Borowiecki, M. and C. Paunov (2018), "How is research policy across the OECD organised? Insights from a new policy database", *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Policy Papers*, No. 55, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/235c9806-en>. The data was compiled by the OECD Working Party on Innovation and Technology Policy (TIP). Data quality was validated by delegates to OECD TIP Working Party the in the period between March 2017 and May 2018. Additional references that were used to fill out the questionnaire are indicated.

The data is made freely available online for download at <https://stip.oecd.org/resgov>.

Contact:

Caroline Paunov, Senior Economist, E-mail: Caroline.Paunov@oecd.org;

Martin Borowiecki, Junior Economist, E-mail: Martin.Borowiecki@oecd.org.

Abbreviations and acronyms

CHE	Council of Higher Education
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
ISF	Israel Science Foundation
MOST	Ministry of Science, Technology and Space
PRIs	Public Research Institutes
SME	Small and medium-sized enterprise
STI	Science, Technology and Innovation
VATAT	Planning & Budgeting Committee of the Council of Higher Education

Survey of public research policy

Topic 1: Institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations

Table 1. Questions on institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations of universities and PRIs

Question	Response
<p>Q.1.1. Who mainly decides on the scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of budget allocations for a) HEIs and b) PRIs?</p> <p>c) Which are the main mechanisms in place to decide on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of national importance, e.g. digital transition, sustainability? Please describe who is involved and who decides on the priorities (e.g., government, research and innovation councils, sector-specific platforms including industry and science, etc.).</p> <p><i>(This question does not refer to who sets overall science, technology and industry priorities. This is usually done by parliaments and government. The question refers to decisions taken after budgets to different ministries/agencies have been approved. Scientific priorities refer to scientific disciplines, e.g. biotechnology; sectoral priorities refer to industries, e.g. pharmaceuticals; and thematic priorities refer to broader social themes, e.g. digital transition, sustainability, etc.)</i></p> <p>d) From 2005-16, were any significant changes introduced as to how decisions on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic orientation of major programmes are taken (e.g. establishment of agencies that decide on content of programmes)?</p> <p>References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2014 for Israel. Response A2-2-3.</p>	<p>a and b) The Council for Higher Education and the Ministry of Science</p> <p>c) The Council for Higher Education and the Ministry of Science defines general scientific priorities for high education for the academy. Regarding industrial R&D, policy is not having priorities and letting the market lead.</p> <p>d) Missing answer.</p>
<p>Q.1.2. Who allocates institutional block funding to a) HEIs and b) PRIs?</p> <p><i>(Institutional block funds (or to general university funds) support institutions and are usually transferred directly from the government budget.)</i></p> <p>c) Who allocates project-based funding of research and/or innovation for HEIs and PRIs?</p> <p><i>(Project-based funding provides support for research and innovation activities on the basis of competitive bids.)</i></p> <p>d) Is there a transnational body that provides funding to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. the European Research Council)?</p> <p>e) What is the importance of such funding relative to national funding support?</p> <p>f) From 2005-16, were any changes made to way programmes are developed and funding is allocated to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. merger of agencies, devolution of programme management from ministries to agencies)?</p> <p>References: EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Israel. Response A2. EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2014 for Israel. Responses A1 and A2-1-1.</p>	<p>a) The Planning & Budgeting Committee (VATAT) of the Council of Higher Education (CHE) allocates institutional block funding to HEIs and defines budget items, i.e. funds to be used for personnel, equipment, and research infrastructure.</p> <p>b) The Ministry of Science, Technology and Space (MOST) allocates funds to research and innovation activities of PRIs.</p> <p>c) With regard to project-based funding, a national funding agency (Israel Science Foundation, ISF) develops programmes supporting research and innovation at HEIs and PRIs and allocates budget to them (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2014, responses A1 and A2-1-1).</p> <p>d) HEIs and PRIs in Israel can apply for funding of the European Research Council and the European Commission (Horizon 2020)</p> <p>e) Missing answer.</p> <p>f) According to the newly introduced Higher Education Plan for 2011-2016, size of individual grants of the ISF will be doubled while the annual budget of the ISF is to increase to EUR 104 million from the current EUR 56 million (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response A2).</p>

Q.1.3. Do performance contracts determine funding of a) HEIs?

Institutional block funds can be partly or wholly distributed based on performance. (Performance contracts define goals agreed between ministry/agency and HEIs/PRIs and link it to future block funding of HEIs and PRIs.)

b) What is the share of HEI budget subject to performance contract?

c) Do performance contracts include quantitative indicators for monitoring and evaluation?

d) What are the main indicators used in performance contracts? Which, if any, performance aside from research and education is set out in performance contracts?

e) Do HEIs participate in the formulation of main priorities and criteria used in performance contracts?

f) Do the same priorities and criteria set in performance contracts apply to all HEIs?

g) Are any other mechanisms in place to allocate funding to HEIs and PRIs?

h) From 2005-16, were any changes made to funding of HEIs and PRIs?

(In case performance contracts are in place that bind funding of PRIs, please provide information about them.)

References:

STI Outlook Database 2014 survey for Israel. Response "Reform of public research B1".

STI Outlook Database 2016 survey for Israel. Response A2.

I-CORE - Israeli Centers Of Research Excellence (2016). I-CORE - Israeli Centers Of Research Excellence (web page).

Retrieved from <http://www.i-core.org.il/The-Higher-Education-Reform-Plan>, accessed 03.10.2016

Q.1.4. Who decides on the following key evaluation criteria of HEIs and PRIs?

Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of a) HEIs? Who is responsible for b) evaluating and c) monitoring HEIs' performance?

Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of d) PRIs? Who is responsible for e) evaluating and f) monitoring PRIs' performance?

h) From 2005-16, was any institution created for evaluating HEIs and PRIs or were any changes made to criteria applied for evaluations of HEIs and PRIs?

References:

STI Outlook Database 2014 survey for Israel. Response "Reform of public research B1".

EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2014 for Israel. Response "Policy implementation A2-2-6".

I-CORE - Israeli Centers of Research Excellence (2016). I-CORE - Israeli Centers Of Research Excellence (web page).

Retrieved from <http://www.i-core.org.il/The-Higher-Education-Reform-Plan>, accessed 03.10.2016.

Q.1.5. Which recent reforms to institutions that are in charge of priority setting, budget allocations, and evaluations of HEIs and PRIs were particularly important?

a to f) In Israel, funding of HEIs and PRIs is not based on performance agreements.

g) The allocation of institutional block funding for HEIs is based, among others, on the number of competitive grants (34%) and publications in international scientific literature measured by the importance of the journals in which the papers were published (34%) (STI Outlook Database 2014 survey for Israel, **response "Reform of public research B1"**).

h) The Higher Education Plan introduced for 2011-2016 a new allocation mechanisms with a new distribution key intended to encourage HEIs' excellence in research. These give greater weight to publication of scientific papers than before and encourage universities to specialize in particular areas of research.

a to f) In terms of evaluation of HEIs and PRIs, the Planning and Budgeting Committee (VATAT), a sub-committee of the Council for Higher Education, defines performance criteria to be used for evaluations of institutions and conducts the evaluations. The functions of the VATAT were set in accordance with a Government decision from 1977 (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2014, **response "Policy implementation A2-2-6"**).

h) No major changes made.

No major reforms made.

Topic 2: Policy co-ordination mechanisms

Table 2. Questions on research and innovation councils

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.1. a) Is there a Research and Innovation Council, i.e. non-temporary public body that takes decisions concerning HEI and PRI policy, and that has explicit mandates by law or in its statutes to either?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – provide policy advice (i.e. produce reports); – and/or oversee policy evaluation; – and/or coordinate policy areas relevant to public research (e.g. across ministries and agencies); – and/or set policy priorities (i.e. strategy development, policy guidelines); – and/or joint policy planning (e.g. joint cross-ministry preparation of budgetary allocations)? <p>b) What is the name of the main research and/or innovation Council/Committee? Are there any other research Councils/Committees?</p> <p>c) Are there any other research Councils/Committees?</p> <p>References: <i>The Council for Higher Education (2017) General, website, Available at: http://che.org.il/en/%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A2%D7%A6%D7%94-%D7%9C%D7%94%D7%A9%D7%9B%D7%9C%D7%94-%D7%92%D7%91%D7%95%D7%94%D7%94/ (Accessed on 29.05.2017).</i></p>	<p>a and b) The Council for Higher Education is the main research and innovation council in Israel.</p> <p>c) No other research and innovation councils are in place.</p>
<p>Q.2.2. With reference to Q.2.1, does the Council's mandate explicitly include a) policy coordination; b) preparation of strategic priorities; c) decision-making on budgetary allocations; d) evaluation of policies' implementation (including their enforcement); e) and provision of policy advice?</p>	<p>a to e) The Council is responsible for policy advice, evaluation and budget allocations to HEIs.</p> <p>Israel's Higher Education Council is responsible for the evaluation and accreditation of HEIs and the provision of policy advice on higher education policies. It awards academic educational accreditation, oversees the establishment of new universities, and the expansion of existing universities and the division of funding between the various universities.</p>
<p>Q.2.3. With reference to Q.2.1, who formally participates in the Council? a) Head of State, b) ministers, c) government officials (civil servants and other representatives of ministries, agencies and implementing bodies), d) funding agency representatives, e) local and regional government representatives, f) HEI representatives, g) PRI representatives, h) private sector, i) civil society, and/or j) foreign experts</p>	<p>a to j) The Minister for Education and representatives from HEIs participate in the Council.</p>
<p>Q.2.4. With reference to Q.2.1.b., does the Council have its own a) staff and/or its own b) budget? If so, please indicate the number of staff and the amount of annual budget available.</p> <p>c) From 2005-16, were any reforms made to the mandate of the Council, its functions, the composition of the Council, the budget and/or the Council's secretariat? Was the Council created during the time period?</p>	<p>a and b) In 2017, the Council had a staff of 20 and an annual budget of USD 2,303 million.</p> <p>c) There were no changes made to the Council' mandate of functions. New members were elected in 2012. In March 2012, the 12th Council for Higher Education commenced its term of office.</p>

Table 3. Questions on national STI strategies

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.5. a) Is there a national non-sectoral STI strategy or plan? b) What is the name of the main national STI strategy or plan?</p> <p>References: <i>EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2014 for Israel. Response "National STI strategy or plan A1".</i></p>	<p>a and b) In Israel, there is no national STI strategy or plan.</p>
<p>Q.2.6. Does the national STI strategy or plan address any of the following priorities?</p> <p>a) Specific themes and/or societal challenges (e.g. Industry 4.0; "green innovation"; health; environment; demographic change and wellbeing; efficient energy; climate action) - Which of the following themes and/or societal challenges are addressed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demographic change (i.e. ageing populations, etc.) - Digital economy (e.g. big data, digitalisation, industry 4.0) - Green economy (e.g. natural reReferences, energy, environment, climate change) - Health (e.g. Bioeconomy, life science) - Mobility (e.g. transport, smart integrated transport systems, e-mobility) - Smart cities (e.g. sustainable urban systems urban development) <p>b) Specific scientific disciplines and technologies (e.g. ICT; nanotechnologies; biotechnology) - Which of the following scientific research, technologies and economic fields are addressed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agriculture and agricultural technologies - Energy and energy technologies (e.g. energy storage, environmental technologies) - Health and life sciences (e.g. biotechnology, medical technologies) - ICT (e.g. artificial intelligence, digital platforms, data privacy) - Nanotechnology and advanced manufacturing (e.g. robotics, autonomous systems) <p>c) Specific regions (e.g. smart specialisation strategies)</p> <p>d) Supranational or transnational objectives set by transnational institutions (for instance related to European Horizon 2020)</p> <p>e) Quantitative targets for monitoring and evaluation (e.g. setting as targets a certain level of R&D spending for public research etc.)</p> <p>f) From 2005-16, was any STI strategy introduced or were any changes made existing STI strategies?</p> <p>References: <i>EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Israel. Response A2. EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2014 for Israel. Response "National STI strategy or plan A1".</i></p>	<p>a and b) In Israel, there is no national STI strategy or plan.</p> <p>A series of national reports and STI related policy documents are in place. They show an increased investment and greater policy focus on biotechnology, nanotechnology and clean-tech sectors (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2014, response "National STI strategy or plan A1").</p> <p>These strategies identify following national priorities in terms of societal challenges: Demographic change digital economy, green economy, and health; and in terms of key technologies: Biotechnology; Nanotechnology; Marine (technologies); ICT</p> <p>c) The series of strategies do not target specific regions.</p> <p>d) The series of strategies do not include transnational objectives.</p> <p>e) The series of strategies do not include quantitative targets.</p> <p>f) No major changes made.</p>
<p>Q.2.7. What reforms to policy co-ordination regarding STI strategies and plans have had particular impact on public research policy?</p>	<p>No major reforms made.</p>

Table 4. Questions on inter-agency programming and role of agencies

Question	Response
<p>Q.2.8. Does inter-agency joint programming contribute to the co-ordination of HEI and PRI policy?</p> <p><i>(Inter-agency joint programming refers to formal arrangements that result in joint action by implementing agencies, such as e.g. sectoral funding programmes or other joint policy instrument initiatives between funding agencies.)</i></p>	Inter-agency programming is not in place.
<p>Q.2.9. a) Is co-ordination within the mandate of agencies?</p> <p>b) From 2005-16, were any changes made to the mandates of agencies tasked with regards to inter-agency programming? Were new agencies created with the task to coordinate programming during the time period?</p>	<p>a) Agencies do not have the mandate to coordinate across ministries and agencies.</p> <p>b) No major changes made.</p>
<p>Q.2.10. What reforms of the institutional context have had impacts on public research policy?</p>	No major reforms made.

Topic 3: Stakeholders consultation and institutional autonomy

Table 5. Questions on stakeholder consultation

Question	Response
<p>Q.3.1. a) Do the following stakeholders participate as formal members in Research and Innovation Councils? (i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Private Sector – Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations) – HEIs/PRIs and/or their associations 	<p>a) Representatives from HEIs participate in the Council for Higher Education.</p> <p>b) Representatives from HEIs/PRIs, industry and civil society participate in governing boards of HEIs taking decisions on strategic issues informing thematic and scientific priorities of HEIs.</p>
<p>b) Do stakeholders participate as formal members in council/governing boards of HEIs? (i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Private Sector – Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations) 	<p>For instance, the Board of Directors and Academic Committees of the Institute for Advanced Studies and Board of Directors of the Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies include representatives from the private sector, civil society (citizen, NGOs, foundations) and from HEIs/PRIs and their associations. Members of the Executive Committee of the Board of Governors of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the Council of the Israel Institute of Technology "Technion" solely include representatives from HEIs/PRIs and/or their associations.</p>
<p><i>References:</i></p> <p>The Council for Higher Education (2017) General, website, Available at: http://che.org.il/en/%D7%94%D7%9E%D7%95%D7%A2%D7%A6%D7%94-%D7%9C%D7%94%D7%A9%D7%9B%D7%9C%D7%94-%D7%92%D7%91%D7%95%D7%94%D7%94/ (Accessed on 29.05.2017).</p> <p>Israel Science Foundation (2016). Organizational Structure (web page). Retrieved from https://www.isf.org.il/#/organizational-structure, accessed 04.10.2016.</p> <p>The Hebrew University of Jerusalem (2016). Members of the Executive Committee of the Board of Governors (web page). Retrieved from http://new.huji.ac.il/en/page/710, accessed 04.10.2016.</p> <p>Technion Israel Institute of Technology (2016). Technion Council (web page). Retrieved from http://www.technion.ac.il/en/technion-council-2/, accessed 04.10.2016.</p> <p>The Institute for Advanced Studies (2016). Board of Directors and Academic Committees (web page). Retrieved from http://www.as.huji.ac.il/content/board-directors-and-academic-committees, accessed 04.10.2016.</p> <p>The Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies (2016). Staff: Board of Directors (web page). Retrieved from http://www.jiis.org/?cmd=researchers.368#.V_OiGcnVpl0, accessed 04.10.2016.</p>	
<p>Q.3.2. a) Are there online consultation platforms in place to request inputs regarding HEI and PRI policy? b) Which aspects do these online platforms address (e.g. e.g. open data, open science)?</p> <p>c) From 2005-16, were any reforms made to widen inclusion of stakeholders and/or to improve consultations, including online platforms?</p>	<p>a and b) Online platforms for public consultations are not in place.</p> <p>c) No major changes made.</p>
<p>Q.3.3. Which reforms to consultation processes have proven particularly important?</p>	<p>No major reforms made.</p>

Table 6. Questions on autonomy of universities and PRIs

Question	Response
<p>Q.3.4. Who decides about allocations of institutional block funding for teaching, research and innovation activities at a) HEIs and b) PRIs? <i>(National/regional level: If HEIs face national constraints on using block funds, i.e. funds cannot be moved between categories such as teaching, research, infrastructure, operational costs, etc. This option also applies if the ministry pre-allocates budgets for universities to cost items, and HEIs are unable to distribute their funds between these.</i> <i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are entirely free to use their block grants.)</i></p>	<p>a) The Planning & Budgeting Committee (VATAT) of the Council of Higher Education (CHE) allocates institutional block funding to HEIs and defines budget items, i.e. funds to be used for personnel, equipment, and research infrastructure. HEIs are not free to move funds across funding categories.</p> <p>b) MOST allocates funding according to budget items and PRIs are not free to move funds across them.</p>
<p>Q.3.5. Who decides about recruitment of academic staff at a) HEIs and b) PRIs? <i>(National/regional level: If recruitment needs to be confirmed by an external national/regional authority; if the number of posts is regulated by an external authority; or if candidates require prior accreditation. This option also applies if there are national/regional laws or guidelines regarding the selection procedure or basic qualifications for senior academic staff.</i> <i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to hire academic staff. This option also applies to cases where laws or guidelines require the institutions to publish open positions or the composition of the selection committees which are not a constraint on the hiring decision itself.)</i></p>	<p>a) HEIs are free to hire academic staff.</p> <p>b) Missing answer.</p> <p>c) HEIs are bound by national salary bands.</p> <p>d) Missing answer.</p> <p>e) HEIs are free to promote staff.</p> <p>f) Missing answer.</p>
<p>Who decides about salaries of academic staff at c) HEIs and d) PRIs? <i>(National/regional level: If salary bands are negotiated with other parties, if national civil servant or public sector status/law applies; or if external authority sets salary bands.</i> <i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to set salaries, except minimum wage.)</i></p>	
<p>Who decides about reassignments and promotions of academic staff at e) HEIs and f) PRIs? <i>(National/regional level: If promotions are only possible in case of an open post at a higher level; if a promotion committee whose composition is regulated by law has to approve the promotion; if there are requirements on minimum years of service in academia; if automatic promotions apply after certain years in office, or if there are promotion quotas.</i> <i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs can promote and reassign staff freely.)</i></p>	

<p>Q.3.6. Who decides about the creation of academic departments (such as research centres in specific fields) and functional units (e.g. technology transfer offices) at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?</p> <p><i>(National/regional level: If there are national guidelines or laws on the competencies, names, or governing bodies of internal structures, such as departments or if prior accreditation is required for the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, etc.</i></p> <p><i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to determine internal structures, including the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, etc.)</i></p>	<p>a to d) HEIs and PRIs are free to create academic departments and legal entities such as spin-offs.</p>
<p>Who decides about the creation of legal entities (e.g. spin-offs) and industry partnerships at c) HEIs and d) PRIs?</p> <p><i>(National/regional level: If there are restrictions on legal entities, including opening, closure, and restructuring thereof; if restrictions apply on profit and scope of activity of non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.</i></p> <p><i>Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to create non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.)</i></p>	
<p>Q.3.7. Who earns what share of revenues stemming from IP (patents, trademarks, design rights, etc.) created from publicly funded research at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - HEI - Research unit / laboratory within HEI - Researchers 	<p>a and b) HEIs and PRIs set revenue schemes.</p> <p>c) No major changes made.</p>
<p>c) From 2005-16, were any reforms introduced that affected the institutional autonomy of HEIs and PRIs?</p>	
<p>Q.3.8. Which reforms to institutional autonomy have been important to enhance the impacts of public research?</p>	<p>No major reforms made.</p>