

---

# Annes No. 1 to Dean's Directive No. 13/2024

---

## Annex No. 1 to Dean's Directive No. 13/2024: Areas and criteria for Evaluation

The areas and criteria for evaluation vary for different types of employees. The core of the evaluation for academic staff is scientific and teaching activities, for researchers it is scientific activities, for lecturers it is teaching activities.

An employee's performance is assessed over a 5-year period unless otherwise determined by the Assessment Committee. If an employee's employment is for less than 5 years, activities are evaluated for the duration of the employee's employment with the faculty.

Self-assessment and activity reporting is done in an electronic staff appraisal application that structures the areas assessed and automatically downloads data from OBD and SIS. If the application is not available, the evaluation is conducted outside the application using forms supplied by the Career Development and Quality Education Department.

### I. Areas and evaluation criteria

#### A. Publication and other creative activities

One of the pillars of academic staff evaluation is their publication activity. The evaluation committee receives an overview of all publications of the employee from the personal bibliographic database (hereinafter referred to as "OBD") for the last 5 years. As part of the self-assessment, the staff member will select up to 5 of his/her publications over the last 5 years that he/she considers to be the best. In justified cases, these best results can be selected for up to 8 years (e.g. unpaid leave, stay abroad, maternity leave, administrative and expert ). Given that full-time faculty activity is evaluated, only publications reported to the faculty can be included in the 5 selected outcomes. For each selected publication, the employee shall add a commentary explaining the quality of the publication, the reason for its selection, and, if applicable, its acclaim (reviews), etc. In the case of co-authored publications, the staff member shall verbally specify his/her contribution in the evaluation (not only by percentage but also by a precise description of what his/her contribution consisted of).

The employee may include in the self-assessment the number of citations of his/her publications (excluding self-citations) according to one of the methodologies (Web of Science, Scopus, Google Scholar), or he/she may attach a nominal list of references (citations) identified by him/her or the H-index. He/she may add an additional or explanatory comment.

#### Selected best publications

When evaluating scientific and other creative activities, the committee will focus on the best selected results (see above). The evaluation focuses on quality, not quantity.

The ideal in evaluation is an excellent publication that:

- represents a major contribution to research, preferably on an international ;
- it is the result of original research and brings a new perspective on the topic (either in terms of original interpretation or new data and their analysis and interpretation) and is also a publication with a broader thematic or theoretical-methodological impact;
- is typically published by a quality publishing house or periodical with a thorough peer-review process and a high level of competition for texts offered by authors for publication.

The excellent publications are published in a language that is a must-read for international experts on the subject. Usually this will be English, but for some fields it may be other languages (German, French, etc.). On the other hand, an English-language publication published by a Czech publisher without international distribution and without a worldwide response cannot be considered world-class.

Still important are publications that fall short in some criteria, for example, they were published in a less important journal or publishing house, have few responses, are less original or present a rather introductory or partial treatment of the problem. Publications are below average if they are published in a publishing house or journal with only or without formal peer review, or in unreviewed proceedings, etc.

The Committee also considers the structure of the list of publications in relation to the post and the staff member's professional development prospects. In the case of the post of Assistant Professor, the evaluation committee will look at the structure of the publication list to see whether the staff member is realistically on track for the habilitation procedure.

#### Other creative activities

The employee may indicate other results of his/her creative activity. For clarity, the list below briefly indicates the types of outputs monitored. For each category, a maximum of 5 of the most significant outputs in the last 5 may be listed. This is not intended to be a complete list, but to highlight the most significant outputs.

Outputs and activities that have an international or significant research dimension or a broader impact on the academic community (in the case of popularisation on society), or where the employee has had a leading or significant role, are considered significant. For each output or activity, the staff member shall specify the year and, where possible, provide a reference to the output/activity.

- Active participation in a conference or workshop, invited lectures; curated exhibitions (resulting in the creation of an exhibition), etc.
- Project activities (basic and applied research projects, preparation of project applications, especially as principal investigator);
- Organisation of workshops or conferences;
- Expert activities (membership in scientific councils, membership in university, ministerial and other national or international evaluation panels or grant agencies, membership in working and advisory bodies of the government and ministries, review of habilitation theses, review of articles and books for academic periodicals and publishing houses, membership in boards of publishing houses and journals, etc.);
- Popularization activities (CŽV, U3V, media appearances, journalism, popularization events for the public, public lectures, panel discussions, etc.);
- Publication activity of a non-scientific type (popularization works, textbooks or other educational publications, translations of disciplinary significance, author exhibitions, etc.);
- Research activities for the applied sphere (ministries, NGOs, companies).

## **B. Pedagogical activity**

### **Quality of teaching**

- a. Quality teaching practices: we assume that teachers can reflect on the quality of their teaching. The staff member will comment verbally on what he/she considers to be the quality of his/her teaching and what pedagogical methods he/she uses, or what problems he/she faces in teaching and how he/she intends to solve them. It is considered a plus if he/she has innovated his/her courses or uses newly acquired pedagogical practices such as active learning, learning outcomes, etc., or if he/she has attended courses for the development of pedagogical competences.
- b. Evaluation of learners (especially in the SIS survey or in the application for evaluation of teaching by learners). The staff member being evaluated and the supervisor may comment verbally.

### **Scope and volume of teaching**

The purpose of the quantitative indicators (see below) is to approximate the amount of teaching time. Verbal comments, which can be attached to the indicators by both the staff member being assessed and the Head of Department, play an important role here.

Indicators include:

- Summary of all courses taught in ZS and LS in each year; in the case of shared teaching in a course, express the percentage of the employee being evaluated.
- Average number of hours of teaching per week (both with and without shares according to the number of teachers teaching one subject; in the case of multiple subjects taught jointly with other teachers, the committee relies on the comments of the staff member or supervisor [this indicator is only used in the application evaluation]).
- Number of attestations (average number of attestations awarded per semester; also counts the number of attestations awarded in subjects without teaching - board exams, written theses, etc.) [this indicator is only applied in the application evaluation].
- Thesis supervision (the number of theses in the last 5 years that have been (a) defended, (b) unfinished, (c) are currently being supervised, differentiated by level of study: bachelor, master, doctoral; the number and portfolio of supervised theses is assessed in relation to the typical workload of the position and in relation to the average number in the department and the faculty as whole)
- Writing of thesis referees (number of referees according to the level of study: bachelor, master, doctoral, is evaluated in relation to the average number at the given department and faculty as whole)

### **Other**

Here the employee has the opportunity to indicate other teaching activities relevant to the evaluation. The aim is not to provide a complete list, but to highlight the most significant outputs. These may include, for example:

- Participation in the organisation of teaching (e.g. preparation and correction of tests for entrance examinations/state examinations, coordination of modules or major courses, participation in the conception of study programmes);
- guaranteeing study programmes and courses;
- Participation in the preparation and motivation of applicants (organisation of and participation in events for applicants, participation in preparatory courses, etc.);
- project activities for learning or mobility: preparation, management, participation; including Erasmus;
- working with students beyond the classroom (involving students in research, cooperating with associations in their events, helping to organize student workshops, etc.).

## C. Administrative and expert activities in academic bodies

These are mainly activities related to:

- a. operation of the relevant faculty department (head of department, deputy head, etc.);
- b. academic self-government at the faculty or university level (dean/rector, vice-dean/vice-rector, membership in faculty/university bodies - Academic Senate of FHS UK, Academic Senate of UK, faculty or university committees and working groups, e.g. Disciplinary Committee, Research Ethics Committee, etc.);
- c. scientific activities (editorial work in a journal or book series, administration of a grant project, active membership in professional associations and their committees, etc.).

## D. Soft skills and language skills

The evaluation also takes into account the language skills and soft skills of staff.

### Language skills

The UK job catalogue lists language skills as a qualification for each position. Good knowledge of a world language, typically English, is a prerequisite for fulfilling an AP position. Self-assessment and appraisal is an opportunity to reflect on the employee's weaker or excellent language skills and, where appropriate, language skills can be incorporated into an individual career development plan. Otherwise, it is fine to leave the language skills item blank, i.e. do not assess.

### Soft skills

Soft skills include the evaluation of work behaviour and conduct, in particular: communication in the workplace, social skills, responsibility, activity, flexibility, willingness to cooperate and, last but not least, professionalism as a teacher and researcher - respectful behaviour towards students and colleagues and attention to the ethical dimensions of scientific and pedagogical work. Self-assessment and evaluation indicate the strengths and weaknesses perceived by the employee and supervisor being evaluated in this respect. The appraisal is an opportunity to reflect on problems or distinctive qualities in the area of soft skills and to incorporate these into an individual career plan where appropriate.

## II. Differences in AP, L and VP ratings

The above breakdown is typical for the evaluation of male and female employees in AP positions.

### Evaluation of lecturers

The evaluation of lecturers emphasizes teaching activities, where we expect a greater amount of teaching, but also the ability to reflect on the quality of teaching and self-development in this is essential. IT competences needed for teaching (active work with didactic applications, more advanced work with Moodle, MS Teams, etc.) may be important. Feedback from learners and the work of the lecturer is also key.

Publication activity does not need to be reported.

Administrative and expert activities may take the form of, for example, work related to the operation of the relevant department of the faculty of the institute for both L1 and L2. In the case of a lecturer in the L2 pay grade, this may also include activities related to academic self-government at the faculty or university level, or to scientific operations (editorial work in a domestic or foreign journal or book series, administration of a grant project, active membership in associations and their committees, etc.).

Soft skills and language skills are assessed in the same way as for AP.

### Evaluation of researchers

Researchers are not evaluated at all if they have a fixed-term contract and their employment is to be renewed for a fixed term and their performance is evaluated on an ongoing basis in relation to the performance of the projects in which they are involved (see Article 8(5) of Dean's Measure No. 13/2024).

If an evaluation is carried out, it follows the same criteria as the evaluation of academic staff, with the difference that only publications and soft skills (especially in relation to research, fieldwork, etc.) are evaluated.

Prague, 28 November 2024

**doc. Věra Sokolová, M.A., Ph.D.**  
*Dean*