

Principles and rules of evaluation of academic and research staff at FSci USB

I. Basic rules and principles of evaluation

- a) The activity of academic and research workers is to be evaluated during hiring and during regular evaluation on the basis of criteria set by the Career Regulations of FSci USB.
- b) The aim of the evaluation is to guarantee that academic and research workers are assigned to appropriate job positions and are or are not granted an incentive supplement in the amount stipulated by the internal methodology of FSci regarding MP USB.
- c) The evaluation is to be based on data entered into the electronic Academic Staff Evaluation Portal (HAP), which is supplemented by other relevant information so that it is possible to assess the overall performance of the employee and their prospects for development within the Faculty in the next five years. WoS data according to ResearcherID/ORCID are also used for academics and researchers.
- d) The employee is to be informed that they will be evaluated in a timely manner and that they have the right to supplement HAP and other missing documents relevant to their evaluation within the time limit set by the evaluation committee.
- e) The evaluation usually takes place in five-year cycles or before the expiration of the period for which the employment contract is agreed with the employee. In the event of non-compliance with the set criteria, the employee may be assigned an extraordinary evaluation in a shorter than five-year cycle on the basis of the committee's recommendation.
- f) Outside the regular evaluation cycle, an employee may be awarded an extraordinary one-off reward, for example for:
 - an excellent publication (author D1 or first or correspondent author Q1)
 - an evaluation of outputs in modules M1 M17 +
 - a registered international patent
 - a (excellent) book (or one published in a prestigious publishing house)
 - pedagogical activity according to SHV
 - their contribution to the Faculty in the field of science or pedagogy
- g) If the employee meets the conditions for assignment to another job position, they may request an evaluation outside the regular period. If their immediate superior does not allow this, they have the right to request the initiation of an evaluation procedure by the Dean of the Faculty.
- h) The evaluation is not to apply to:
 - the Dean of FSci USB, Vice-Deans
 - visiting workers from other workplaces
 - professors emeritus
 - researchers employed exclusively to conduct projects
 - workers on notice
 - workers undergoing a probationary period

- workers on parental leave
- workers on creative or unpaid leave, workers during long-term incapacity for work

II. Principles of evaluation of academic and scientific staff

- a) The evaluation is to be focused on the evaluation of work activities, fulfilment of tasks, goals and competencies of the employee.
- b) The evaluation is to follow the following principles:
 - transparency and openness (the criteria for evaluating employees are generally known, the results of the evaluation are kept in writing)
 - an equal and individual approach (comparable evaluation rules apply to employees in comparable positions; evaluation takes into account the circumstances that may have influenced the employee's career development)
 - completeness (all activities performed by the University employee are to be taken into account)
 - objectivity (in addition to work performance, the evaluation is to take into account external and internal circumstances that may have affected work activity in the given period)
 - openness (the employee has the right to comment on the evaluation)
- c) **The evaluation is to be performed by a committee of at least three members** appointed by the Dean. The members of the commission are to be the direct superior (head of the department), two other experts outside the evaluated workplace (these may also be persons who are not employees of USB). Furthermore a member of the leadership of FSci USB – academician is present at the evaluation. The assessee has the right to know the composition of the committee and to request its change once.
- d) The evaluation committee has the right to view the results of HAP and SHV and can request information from the personnel department about the contractual workload of the evaluated employee.
- e) The evaluated employee is obliged to cooperate in the evaluation and provide true and relevant data.
- f) The output of the evaluation must include a proposal for measures that will support the further career growth of the evaluated worker. The proposal is to be written by the head of the department and in the case of the evaluation of the head of the department by the Dean or a member of the committee authorised by him/her.
- g) The evaluated employee has the right to appeal against the evaluation results. In this case, the appeal is to be assessed by the Dean.

III. Areas of evaluation

- a) For academic staff, the following in particular is to be evaluated:
- Educational activities, including involvement in life-long learning
 - Research activities, including popularisation
 - National and international grants, contract research, etc.
 - Activities related to academic, organisational, and management functions
 - Language skills
 - Work behaviour
- b) For researchers, the following in particular is to be assessed:
- Research activity
 - National and international grants, contract research, popularisation, involvement in promotion, etc.
 - Activities related to organisational and management functions
 - Language skills
 - Work behaviour

IV. Description of areas of evaluation

In the area of "Educational Activities", the following is to be evaluated:

- The number of subjects, their character (compulsory, compulsory-optional, optional)
- Student evaluation results (SHV)
- The number of teaching hours per semester and course students
- Innovation in teaching (new didactic methods, content innovation, innovation of study aids, etc.)
- Student supervision (Bc., Mgr., Ph.D.)
- Opponent opinions and membership in committees
- Participation in lifelong learning
- Work with high school students (e.g. SOČ)

In the area of "Research Activities", the following is to be evaluated depending on the field:

- Published results for the evaluated period in articles registered in the WoS database and in articles registered in the SCOPUS database (Jimp-type results according to the evaluation methodology of research organisations)
- Type J results according to the evaluation methodology of the research organisations
- Monographs and chapters in books in reputable publishers (type B and C results),
- Articles in proceedings (results type D)
- Applied outputs (patents and licences, methodologies, maps, utility models, etc.; results of type V, P, H, Z, G, F, N, and R)
- Numbers of citations in WoS and SCOPUS databases
- Popularisation work

In the area of "Activities related to academic, organisational and management functions", the following is to be assessed:

- Accreditation preparation, career growth
- Guarantorship of Bc./Mgr./Ph.D. programmes
- Management functions (department management, laboratories, research groups)
- Academic functions (membership in the senate, CoR, RpVH, etc.)
- Opponent opinions

In the area of "Membership in Relevant Committees outside USB" is assessed membership in GA evaluation panels, methodology M2017 +, NAU, RVŠ, in advisory bodies of state institutions and their working groups, membership in editorial boards, review activities, membership of the board of professional societies, membership in study field councils of other academic institutions, etc.

V. Criteria for assigning academic and scientific employees to job positions

- a) Achieved education and scientific-pedagogical ranks
- b) The basic evaluation criteria are to be scientific and research work and pedagogical activities.
- c) For part-time workers, the evaluation criteria are to be reduced in proportion to the contractual workload.
- d) The criteria are general and strict fulfilment of the criteria in all areas of evaluation is not a condition. If the employee does not reach the minimum value of the criteria in one area of evaluation, but significantly exceeds the minimum value in other areas, he/she may be positively evaluated.
- e) If the assessed employee does not meet the criteria, this may be considered unsatisfactory performance of the prescribed tasks or a breach of the employee's obligations related to his/her job classification. **However, in making this assessment, the other activities of the employee for the benefit of the Faculty are to be taken into account.**
- f) **The criteria are to be evaluated with regard to the scientific field, length of time spent in the job position, and job position of the evaluated employee.** In the evaluation, it is appropriate/necessary to take into account, in relation to the length of time spent in the job position, the contractual workload and also the factors limiting the employee's performance (maternity and parental leave, difficult life situation, etc.).

EVALUATION OF EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Auxiliary criterion for evaluating the time burden of employees in educational activities
Educational activities include teaching (frontal teaching, preparation for teaching, evaluation, and testing of students) and supervision of qualification theses.

The criterion is only indicative and recommends minimum requirements for the given job position.

Academic position		Academic position		Research position	
Job position	Share of working time *	Job position	Share of working time *	Job position	Share of working time *
Lecturer	80-90 %	—	—	—	—
Assistant	60-80 %	Scientific, Research, and Development Assistant - Academic	5 – 20 %	Scientific, Research, and Development Assistant	0
Assistant professor	40-60 %	Scientific, Research, and Development Assistant - Academic	5 – 20 %	Scientific, Research, and Development Worker	0
Associate professor	30-40 %	Scientific, Research, and Development Assistant - Academic	5 – 20 %	Scientific, Research, and Development Worker	0
Professor	30-40 %	Scientific, Research, and Development Assistant - Academic	5 – 20 %	Independent Scientific, Research, and Development Worker	0

* Including care for exercise rooms, ordering exercise material etc.

EVALUATION OF RESEARCH/PUBLISHING ACTIVITIES

Oriental recommendations of requirements for publishing activity at 100% contractual workload.

Academic Workers

Lecturer	0		
Assistant	0	Scientific, Research, and Development	He/she is a co-author of a J-type article

		Assistant - Academic	
Assistant Professor	1-2 type J results per year as a long-term average, (RVO 1 -if the calculation changes, then this number is also to change)	Scientific, Research, and Development Worker - Academic	2-3 type J results per year as a long-term average, (RVO 1 - if the calculation changes, then this number is also to change)
Associate Professor	2-3 Jimp results per year on a long-term average, taking into account the role of the employee in the authorship team *	Scientific, Research, and Development Worker - Academic	3-4 Jimp results per year on a long-term average, taking into account the role of the employee in the authorship team *
Professor	(RVO 1.5 - if the calculation changes, then this number is also to change)	Independent Scientific, Research, and Development Worker - Academic	(RVO 2 - if the calculation changes, then this number is also to change)

Researcher Workers

Scientific, Research, and Development assistant	He/she is a co-author of a J-type article
Scientific, Research, and Development worker (MT 11)	2 Jimp publications per year as a long-term average (RVO 1.5 - if the calculation changes, then this number is also to change)
Scientific, Research, and Development Worker (MT 12)	3-4 Jimp publications per year as a long-term average, taking into account the role of the employee in the authorship team
Independent Scientific, Research, and Development Worker	(RVO 3-4 - if the calculation changes, then this number is also to change)

Comments:

- The table shows RVO points – to take into account different types of results other than Jimp articles. Other types of results are evaluated similarly to articles with regard to their importance in the field with a higher weight (books, extensive chapters in books, significant patents, and sold licences), similar (patents, software), or lower (utility models, functional samples, certified methodologies, maps and other applied outputs, articles without IF in Web of Science, articles indexed only in the Scopus database, non-impact articles, proceedings,...).

- *1 RVO point = 1 article with an IF equal to the median of the respective category with three authors regardless of their order. The score decreases with a higher number of authors and mentioned affiliations.*
-