

Charles University, Faculty of Arts

Dean's Directive No. 17/2022

Evaluation of Academics, Researchers, and Lecturers at the Faculty of Arts of Charles University*

Article 1

Introductory Provisions

1. This directive, in accordance with Article 3 of Rector's Directive No. 28/2021, Framework Principles of Career Growth of Academics, Researchers, and Lecturers at Charles University, as amended, and Dean's Directive No. 16/2022, Career Code of the Faculty of Arts of Charles University, as amended (hereinafter also referred to as the "Career Code"), regulates the evaluation procedure of employees in an employment relationship who perform pedagogical and/or scientific and research, developmental, and innovative, artistic or other creative activities (hereinafter referred to also as "creative activities"), i.e., academics, researchers, and lecturers employed at the Faculty of Arts of Charles University (hereinafter referred to as the "Faculty").
2. The evaluation procedure of employees has the following objectives:
 - a) it provides the evaluated employees with regular opportunities for self-reflection and for reassessing their further professional and research development; it motivates them towards meaningful professional growth; and it sets the general culture of high-quality academic and research work at the Faculty;
 - b) it helps each employee, by means of the Career Growth Plan (hereinafter referred to also as the "Plan"), to better plan his professional growth, and it allows the employee's supervisor to discuss this growth with the employee at regular intervals and to provide him with the necessary support;
 - c) it provides source data for the remuneration of employees;
 - d) it helps ensure that all employees across the Faculty will work in their work positions in a comparable manner, and it allows regular evaluation of whether the work position assignment of each employee corresponds to the employee's actual performance;
 - e) it sets the conditions and parameters for the extension and termination of employment.
3. The Dean of the Faculty, the Board of the Dean of the Faculty, an evaluation commission, the evaluated employee, and the supervisor of the evaluated employee who is the head of the basic unit of the Faculty to which the evaluated employee is assigned, or the head's deputy (hereinafter together referred to as the "supervisor"), are involved in the evaluation of employees. If the evaluated employee is the head of the basic unit of the Faculty, the duties of the head are performed by his deputy throughout the entire evaluation.
4. For the purposes of this directive, an academic is an employee who performs creative and pedagogical activities in the work position of an assistant in the AP1 pay band, assistant professor in the AP2 pay band, associate professor in the AP3 pay band, or professor in the AP4 pay band.

* Translator's note: Words importing the masculine include the feminine, and unless the context otherwise requires, words in the singular include the plural, and words in the plural include the singular.

5. For the purposes of this directive, a researcher is an employee who performs creative activities and is classified in the work position of a researcher in the VP1, VP2, and VP3 pay bands.
6. For the purposes of this directive, a lecturer is an employee who performs primarily pedagogical activities and is classified in the work position of a lecturer in the L1 and L2 pay bands.
7. The same rules which apply to the work position of an associate professor also apply to the work position of an extraordinary professor.
8. For the purposes of this directive, long-term sick leave means a temporary incapacity for work for at least six months or temporary incapacity for work which, in total, reaches twelve months during the period for the commencement of the next evaluation of the given employee.
9. This directive does not apply to employees who perform employment activities defined in Article 4 (4) (b) of the Internal Wages Regulation of Charles University, as amended, (the so-called other employees).

Part I

Range of Evaluated Employees, Evaluation Schedule

Article 2

Groups of Evaluated Employees

1. All academics, researchers, and lecturers with an employment contract for a fixed term are subject to the evaluation, with the exception of:
 - a) academics who have agreed to weekly working hours of up to and including 16 hours, provided that their employment contract is to be extended for a fixed term;
 - b) lecturers who have agreed weekly working hours of up to and including 16 hours provided that their employment contract is to be extended for a fixed term;
 - c) researchers provided that their employment contract is to be extended for a fixed term;
 - d) employees who are not interested in extending the term of their employment contract or whose employment contract should not be extended on the basis of their supervisor's proposal;
 - e) employees whose employment is due to end during their maternity or paternal leave, or during their unpaid leave immediately following a parental leave or during their long-term sick leave, provided that their employment contract should be extended for a fixed term.[†]
2. All academics, researchers, and lecturers with an employment contract for an indefinite time, except for researchers whose salary is largely paid from external financial means (see Article 12 (1) (a) of the Career Code), and the Dean of the Faculty and the Rector of the University for the period of their term of office, are subject to the evaluation.

[†] An employment relationship which is due to end while the employee is on maternity or parental leave, or on unpaid leave immediately following a parental leave or on long-term sick leave, may be extended for an indefinite time only if the employee requests to take part in the evaluation according to this directive.

3. In absolutely exceptional circumstances, the Dean of the Faculty may decide that an employee who should be evaluated in accordance with this directive will not be evaluated. The Dean of the Faculty must justify his decision.

Article 3 Evaluation Schedule

1. The evaluation schedule of individual employees is determined by the period for the commencement of the next evaluation which is specified in accordance with Article 16 of this directive. The length of this period is dependent on the result of the previous evaluation and on other circumstances specified in this directive.
2. The evaluation of an employee will not take place before the expiry of the period for the commencement of the next evaluation, except for an employee with an employment contract for a fixed term where the evaluation must be commenced no later than six months before the agreed termination of the employment.
3. The approval of the Dean of the Faculty, based on the supervisor's opinion, is necessary for the commencement of the evaluation of employees with an employment contract for a fixed term. If a supervisor proposes not to extend the employment contract of an employee (e.g., due to non-compliance with the supervisor's instructions, behaviour which constitutes a serious violation of academic work ethics, changes in the concept of the relevant Faculty department, etc.), he is obliged to justify this proposal in writing.

Part II Subject Matter of Evaluation

Article 4 Types of Evaluated Activities and Evaluation Criteria

1. The evaluation concerns 4 types of activities:
 - a) publication activities;
 - b) pedagogical activities;
 - c) other creative activities;
 - d) administrative activities.
2. Academics are evaluated in all 4 types of activities, researchers are evaluated only in those activities which are specified in paragraph 1 under (a), (c) and (d), lecturers are evaluated only in those activities which are specified in paragraph 1 under (b), (c) and (d).
3. The basis for the overall evaluation of academics is the evaluation of publication activities on a five-point scale. The result of this evaluation may be increased or decreased by up to two points on the basis of a comprehensive evaluation of the employee's activities given in paragraph 1 under (b), (c) and (d). In the case of employees who are members of the Faculty or University bodies, heads of the basic units of the Faculty, or are appointed to management or other positions within the University or Faculty, the final evaluation may, in justified cases, be up to three points higher when compared to the evaluation for publication activities.

4. The basis for the overall evaluation of lecturers is the evaluation of pedagogical activities on a five-point scale. The result of this evaluation may be increased or decreased by up to two points on the basis of a comprehensive evaluation of the employee's activities given in paragraph 1 under (c) and (d). For the purpose of the evaluation of lecturers, other creative activities (according to paragraph 1 (c)) also include possible publication activities.
5. The basis for the overall evaluation of researchers is the evaluation of publication activities on a five-point scale. The result of this evaluation may be increased or decreased by up to two points on the basis of a comprehensive evaluation of the employee's activities given in paragraph 1 under (c) and (d).
6. The evaluation will take into account, among others, the following aspects:
 - a) the range of activities of the employee will be compared with the typical job description of the employee as defined in the Catalogue of Jobs and Work Positions (Appendix No. 1 to the Career Code), and an assessment will be made as to whether the employee fulfils the conditions for the work position;
 - b) an assessment will be made as to whether the employee fulfils the objectives and tasks laid down in the Plan, or possibly in the job description of the given employee;
 - c) the employee's activities will be assessed in relation to the typical activities of other employees in the same work position within the Faculty or its relevant basic unit;
 - d) both the quantity of activities (yes/no, or how many) and the quality of activities (innovative pedagogical practices, interesting popularization activities, prestige of a grant, etc.) and their importance for the functioning of the given department or the Faculty as a whole will be taken into account.
7. A more detailed description of the activities evaluated and evaluation criteria is provided in Appendix No. 1 to this directive.
8. Details concerning the evaluation of publication activities are provided in Appendix No. 2 to this directive.
9. Evaluation requirements for employees with agreed shorter weekly working hours will be reduced proportionately.

Article 5

Evaluated Periods

1. The employee's activities are evaluated only within an evaluated period. The evaluated period is 5 years unless stated otherwise below.
2. The evaluated period includes:
 - a) in the case of publication activities, other creative activities, and administrative activities, the part of the calendar year in which the evaluation was commenced and then 5 calendar years which preceded the year in which the evaluation was commenced;
 - b) in the case of pedagogical activities, 5 academic years which preceded the academic year in which the evaluation was commenced and also the winter semester of the academic year in which the evaluation was commenced if it was commenced in the summer semester.
3. If the employment of an employee is shorter than 5 years, his activities are evaluated only for the period for which he has been employed at the Faculty.

4. If an employee is given a period of fewer than 5 years for the commencement of the next evaluation, publications which the employee used or could have used in the previous evaluation may also be used in this evaluation, up to a maximum of one publication for each year by which the period for the commencement of the next evaluation is shorter than the evaluated period (e.g., an employee may use two publications from the previous evaluation if he is evaluated again after three years and not after five years).
5. An employee who has been absent from work for a part of the past five years because of maternity or parental leave or long-term sick leave will be evaluated only for the period during which he performed work. In this case, the evaluated period is 7 years and it includes both the period before the start of the maternity or parental leave or long-term sick leave and the period after the end of the maternity or parental leave or possibly unpaid leave immediately following parental leave or long-term sick leave. The provision of the preceding paragraph of this Article will not apply.
6. An employee has the right to apply to the Dean of the Faculty for an extension of the evaluated period on the grounds of long-term obstacles at work on the part of the employee or in other cases when the fulfilment of work tasks is significantly affected by difficult personal or family circumstances of the employee.

Part III

Panel of Evaluators, Evaluation Coordinator, and Evaluation Commission

Article 6

Panel of Evaluators

1. The panel of evaluators is a body whose task is to guarantee the comparability of evaluation across different fields. The members of the panel chair the individual evaluation commissions and, at the same time, they meet for the purpose of unified application of the evaluation criteria in the course of the entire evaluation.
2. The members of the panel of evaluators are appointed and removed from office by the Dean of the Faculty after consideration by the research commission and after approval by the Research Board of the Faculty.
3. The members of the panel of evaluators are selected from persons who fulfil the following conditions:
 - a) they are employees of the Faculty, but no more than two members may come from one basic unit of the Faculty;
 - b) except in exceptional and justified cases, they are qualified for associate professorship or have commenced the procedure for the granting of associate professorship;
 - c) they have experience in the evaluation of research (from grant panels, from evaluation panels in the Research, Development and Innovation Council, etc.) or at least with reviewing of articles/monographs for foreign publishers;
 - d) they have published at least one internationally significant publication (according to the definition given in Appendix No. 2 to this directive) in the last 5 years.
4. The term of office of the members of the panel of evaluators is 4 years, and members may be appointed repeatedly. Apart from removal from office, membership in the panel of evaluators

is also terminated by a written resignation of the member delivered to the Dean of the Faculty and by termination of employment at the Faculty.

5. Meetings of the panel of evaluators are convened and presided over by the Dean of the Faculty or by a Vice-Dean authorized by the Dean.

Article 7 **Evaluation Coordinator**

1. The Dean of the Faculty may appoint an evaluation coordinator for the purpose of ensuring the uniform application of the evaluation criteria across the Faculty; to ensure the effective functioning of the panel of evaluators, he may also authorize the evaluation coordinator to preside over the meetings of the panel of evaluators.
2. The evaluation coordinator is selected according to the same conditions as the members of the panel of evaluators which are specified in Article 6 (3) of this Directive, but he is not a member of the panel of evaluators.
3. The term of office of the evaluation coordinator is 4 years and he may be appointed repeatedly. In justified cases, the Dean of the Faculty may remove the evaluation coordinator from office even before the expiry of his term of office. The office of the evaluation coordinator is also terminated by the evaluation coordinator's written resignation delivered to the Dean of the Faculty and by termination of his employment at the Faculty.

Article 8 **Composition of the Evaluation Commission**

1. The Dean will appoint a separate evaluation commission for every employee or for every group of employees if the employees in the group are to be evaluated according to similar criteria.
2. The evaluation commission has at least 3 members of which no more than one member may be from the basic unit of the Faculty to which the evaluated employee is assigned. At least two members must be from the field of the given employee (i.e., they must be educated in this field or they must publish in this field). If an employee publishes in two fields, representatives of both these fields may be members of the evaluation commission. Fields are typically understood in a broad way in the sense of fields used in the classification of sciences (linguistics, literature, etc.), however, in justified cases, the Dean may decide on another definition of a field (e.g., territorial) if it better corresponds to the research profile of the evaluated employee.
3. The general composition of an evaluation commission is as follows:
 - a) at least one member is selected from the panel of evaluators, one of these members is appointed chair of the evaluation commission by the Dean of the Faculty;

- b) at least one member is selected from among the Faculty employees who are members of the boards of the individual research fields in the programme Cooperatio[‡] or from among the members of the Research Board of the Faculty;
 - c) if it is not possible to fulfil the composition parameters of the evaluation commission specified in paragraph 2 of this Article by selecting its members from among the employees of the Faculty on the basis of (a) and (b) of this paragraph, an expert active in the given field, who is not employed at the Faculty, may be selected to be a member of the evaluation commission.
4. Instead of a member according to (b) of the previous paragraph of this Article, the evaluation commission for assessing lecturers may include as a member a head of another basic unit of the Faculty to which a lecturer of a similar type belongs, or a didactic methodologist.
 5. In principle, an evaluation commission is composed of the same members for the entire period of an employee's evaluation; this applies also to any additional evaluation. If this is not possible, the Dean of the Faculty will appoint new members of the evaluation commission at any time during an already ongoing evaluation in order to maintain its composition according to the previous paragraphs of this Article.
 6. The evaluated employee and his supervisor are informed of the proposed composition of the evaluation commission in advance and they may ask the Dean of the Faculty to remove any member from the evaluation commission on the grounds of bias.
 7. Members of the evaluation commission must maintain confidential any information which they gain in executing the office of the members of the evaluation commission or in connection with it.

Article 9

Meetings of the Evaluation Commission

1. The evaluation commission conducts the evaluation of employees on the basis of written documents; the employee is not personally present during the evaluation. Nevertheless, an employee is entitled to present his self-evaluation report in front of the evaluation commission.
2. Meetings of the evaluation commission are not public. Apart from in-person meetings, the evaluation commission may also hold remote meetings, i.e., by means of remote communication devices which allow members of the evaluation commission to participate by sound and video in meetings in real time, and to hold hybrid meetings, i.e., a combination of in-person and remote forms of a meeting for some of the members. The chair of the evaluation commission may also announce that voting will be held outside the meeting of the evaluation commission ("remote voting").
3. A meeting of the evaluation commission has the following parts:
 - a) assessment of the documents for evaluation;
 - b) deciding on the overall result of the evaluation and preparation of the evaluation report.These parts of the meeting may be preceded by a methodological part.

[‡] Details of the programme are available at: <https://cuni.cz/UK-11165.html>

4. The Vice-Dean for Quality Evaluation and Accreditations and the evaluation coordinator have an advisory vote when it comes to the specific application of the evaluation criteria in relation to their uniform use across the Faculty and they may participate in the meetings of the evaluation commission with the exception of the part according to paragraph 3 (b) of this Article.
5. The supervisor of the evaluated employee has an advisory vote, he does not evaluate the employee directly, and he always participates in the meetings of evaluation commission according to paragraph 3 (a) of this Article and may participate in the methodological part of the meetings of the evaluation commission.
6. Members of an evaluation commission may participate in the meetings of other evaluation commissions if these evaluation commissions conduct an evaluation of employees from the same department of the Faculty, except for meetings where there could be a conflict of interest.
7. When appointing the evaluation commission, the Dean of the Faculty is entitled to determine, in justified cases, that other persons, in particular the guarantor of the field of study, the head of the specialization, or the former head of the basic unit of the Faculty are to attend the meetings of the evaluation commission, except for the part referred to in paragraph 3 (b) of this Article.
8. The evaluation commission decides by a simple majority of all its members.

Part IV Course of Evaluation

Article 10 Evaluation Application

1. The evaluation is carried out in an electronic evaluation application (hereinafter referred to as the “application”).
2. Unless this directive states otherwise, the time limits for the individual steps in the application begin to run on the day when the person concerned receives a notification email.
3. The time limits for the individual steps in the application will be extended by the period of short-term absence which is understood as an absence of the employee for at least 3 working days due to an obstacle on the part of the employee, i.e., in particular leave, temporary sick leave, quarantine, nursing of a child, etc.

Article 11 Commencement of Evaluation

1. The employee must confirm the commencement of the evaluation within 14 calendar days. Alternatively, the employee may refuse to commence the evaluation if:
 - a) he does not wish to extend his employment contract for a fixed term;
 - b) he is planning to sign an employment termination agreement;
 - c) he is planning to submit a notice of resignation from the employment.

2. The supervisor must give his opinion on the employee's refusal as specified in the previous paragraph within 14 calendar days.
3. If the supervisor approves, by means of the application, the employee's refusal to commence the evaluation, the evaluation will not be commenced provided that the employee submits an employment termination agreement or a notice of resignation to the Faculty within 14 calendar days.
4. The evaluation is commenced:
 - a) as soon as the employee confirms the commencement of the evaluation in the application;
 - b) upon the expiry of the time limit specified in paragraph 2 of this Article;
 - c) upon the expiry of the time limit specified in paragraph 3 of this Article;
 - d) as soon as the supervisor rejects the employee's refusal to commence the evaluation.

Article 12

Self-Evaluation of the Employee

1. The employee must fill in and send the forms of the self-evaluation report and Plan within 30 calendar days of the commencement of the evaluation.
2. In the self-evaluation report, the employee has the opportunity to declare any long-term obstacles to work on the part of the employee or difficult personal or family circumstances which have affected his performance of work tasks. The evaluation commission takes these circumstances into account when evaluating the employee. The evaluation commission will also take into account the absence of the employee from the workplace, for example, because of a long-term business trip abroad or because of a sabbatical.
3. If, during the filling in of the self-evaluation report, the employee comes to the conclusion that he does not fulfil the conditions of the work position which are specified by the Career Code, he may propose an amendment to the content of his employment contract: either a transfer to a different work position or a reduction of the employee's weekly working hours. The employee will be evaluated according to the evaluation criteria for his current work position, and the evaluation commission will take the amendment of the content of the employment contract into account if it was carried out in the course of the evaluation.

Article 13

Evaluation Performed by the Supervisor

1. The supervisor must give his opinion on the employee's self-evaluation report and Plan within 30 calendar days of the moment when the employee sent the forms. If the supervisor decides to return the self-evaluation report or Plan to the employee for additional information (see paragraph 3 of this Article) or he proposes an amendment of the content of the employee's employment contract (see paragraph 4 of this Article), the time limit for the sending of the forms is extended by 10 calendar days.
2. The supervisor gives his opinion on the self-evaluation of the employee and the employee's proposal according to Article 12 (3) of this directive, and submits his own evaluation of the

employee. In addition, the supervisor specifies work tasks for the employee in the Plan, taking into account the needs of the given field and the relevant department at the Faculty.

3. The supervisor is authorized to return the self-evaluation report to the employee for additional information. The employee must provide the additional information within 10 calendar days.
4. If on the basis of the employee's self-evaluation report the supervisor reaches the conclusion that the employee does not fulfil the conditions of the given work position, the supervisor may propose an amendment to the employee's employment contract: either a transfer to a different work position or a reduction of the employee's weekly working hours. If the supervisor does so, the application will inform the employee of this by email and will inform him that he should give his opinion on the proposed amendment. The employee must give his opinion on the proposed amendment within 10 calendar days. The employee will be evaluated according to the evaluation criteria for his current work position, and the evaluation commission will take the amendment of the content of the employment contract into account if it was carried out in the course of the evaluation.

Article 14

Evaluation Performed by the Evaluation Commission

1. The evaluation commission must carry out the evaluation of the employee within 60 calendar days of the day on which the chair of the evaluation commission received a notification email. This time limit may not be extended unless the Dean of the Faculty specifies otherwise.
2. Using the materials submitted, the evaluation commission will evaluate all employees who are subject to evaluation, compare their range of duties with the typical job description defined in the Career Code and assess the extent to which the objectives and tasks set out in the Plan or in the employee's job description were fulfilled. On the basis of the self-evaluation report completed by both the employee and his supervisor, the evaluation commission will prepare the overall evaluation of the employee in the form of an evaluation report.
3. The chair of the evaluation commission is entitled to return the form of the self-evaluation report to the employee or supervisor for additional information, but no later than 30 calendar days before the expiry of the time limit under paragraph 1 of this Article.
4. If the self-evaluation report is returned to the employee, the employee must provide the additional information within 10 calendar days.
5. If the self-evaluation report is returned to the supervisor, the supervisor must provide the additional information within calendar days.

Article 15

Evaluation Report

1. The evaluation report is the output of the evaluation. The evaluation report is not public, and it is accessible, in the application, only to the evaluated employee, the supervisor, employees of the Dean's Office of the Faculty whose cooperation is required in the evaluation, and the Dean of the Faculty.

2. In the case of academics and researchers, the result of the overall evaluation of the publication activities, including evaluation of the individual publications, is also accessible to Faculty members of the boards of the individual research fields under the Cooperatio programme.
3. The evaluation contained in the evaluation report consists of a summative and, where appropriate, formative verbal commentary on the employee's evaluated activities and of an overall evaluation based on the following scale:
 - a) Excellent: The employee has fulfilled and significantly exceeded the requirements given by his Plan and job description;
 - b) Very Good: The employee has fulfilled and exceeded the requirements given by his Plan or possibly by his job description;
 - c) Satisfactory: The employee has fulfilled the requirements given by his Plan or possibly by his job description;
 - d) Satisfactory with qualifications: The employee has partially failed to fulfil the requirements given by his Plan or possibly by his job description;
 - e) Unsatisfactory: The employee has failed in a fundamental way to fulfil the requirements given by his Plan or possibly by his job description.
4. The evaluation report may include employment recommendations:
 - a) extension of employment of an employee who has an employment contract for a fixed term and has received the overall result of "excellent", "very good" or "satisfactory";
 - b) non-extension of employment of an employee who has an employment contract for a fixed term and has received the overall result of "satisfactory with qualifications" or "unsatisfactory";
 - c) transferring the employee by one work position, or one pay band within the same work position, higher if the employee fulfils its requirements;
 - d) transferring the employee one work position, or one pay band within the same work position, lower if the employee fulfils its requirements better than the requirements of the original work position, or the work position within the pay band (however, demotion may not be proposed in the case of the work positions of "assistant" and "researcher" in the VP1 pay band);
 - e) transferring from the work position of an academic to the work position of a researcher, from the work position of an academic to the work position of a lecturer, from the work position of a lecturer to the work position of a researcher, provided that the employee fulfils the requirements of the given work position better than the requirements of his original work position;
 - f) adjustments to the agreed weekly working hours, i.e., reduction of the employee's working hours in cases where the scope of activities of an employee with an open-ended employment contract and an overall result of "excellent", "very good" or "satisfactory" does not correspond to the requirements for full-time employment, but nevertheless his activities are of high-quality and necessary for the relevant department at the Faculty;
 - g) requesting that the employee improves unsatisfactory work performance if the employee with an open-ended employment contract received the overall result of "satisfactory with qualifications" or "unsatisfactory" or if the employee has not agreed to the change specified under (d), (e) and (f) of this paragraph;
5. The recommendations specified under (a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of the previous paragraph of this Article may be implemented only with the consent of the employee, except for the

change in the pay band within the work position of a researcher. The employee and the supervisor must give their opinion on the recommendation of the evaluation commission via the application within 10 calendar days.

6. In the case of an employee in the work position of an assistant professor who is evaluated at a time when it is no longer possible to extend his employment contract for a fixed term and who has not yet been appointed an associate professor, but whose number and quality of publications show the prospect of an early start of the procedure for the granting of associate professorship, the evaluation commission may recommend the extension of his employment contract to an open-ended contract under the condition that in the next evaluation his tasks will be set to correspond to the requirements for the commencement of the procedure for the granting of associate professorship. If the employee fails to complete these tasks within the specified time, the highest overall result which he may receive in the next evaluation will be “satisfactory with qualifications” and, at the same time, he may be asked to improve unsatisfactory work performance. The only exceptions are the following categories of employees who may be given a higher result even if they fail to fulfil these tasks, and the tasks corresponding to the requirements for commencing the procedure for the granting of associate professorship may be assessed within the following evaluation:
 - a) an employee who in the course of his employment spent more than one year on maternity and/or parental leave, or on unpaid leave following on the parental leave, or was on sick leave for a total of at least three years;
 - b) an employee who has spent more than five years in the work position of an assistant (or other work position from which he made a career change, e.g., a researcher in the VP1 pay band) under an employment contract for a fixed term which has been extended or repeated for a total of nine years, and therefore has actually had fewer than nine years to commence the procedure for the granting of associate professorship;
 - c) an employee who has agreed weekly working hours of less than 30 hours immediately after the end of maternity or parental leave or unpaid leave following maternity or parental leave.
7. In the evaluation report, the evaluation commission may recommend an adjustment of the employee’s Plan, including of the objectives and tasks for the period of time which has been set for the employee for the commencement of the next evaluation, and it may do so in both the non-binding part completed by the employee and the binding part in which the supervisor assigns work tasks to the employee. Both the employee and the supervisor are required to give their opinion on the evaluation commission’s proposal via the application within 10 calendar days. Details of the content and updating of the Plan are laid down in the Career Code.

Article 16

Time for the Commencement of the Next Evaluation

1. The time for the commencement of the next evaluation in accordance with this Article of the directive is determined:
 - a) by the evaluation commission in the evaluation report if the employee received the overall result of “excellent”, “very good”, or “satisfactory”;

- b) by the evaluation commission in the evaluation report if the employee received the overall result of “satisfactory with qualifications” and, at the same time, the evaluation commission does not issue a recommendation that the employee should be asked to improve unsatisfactory work performance;
 - c) by the Dean of the Faculty (according to Article 18 (1) (a) of this directive) if the employee received the overall result of “satisfactory with qualifications” or “unsatisfactory” and the evaluation commission recommended that the employee should be asked to improve unsatisfactory work performance, or by the evaluation commission within the additional evaluation (according to Article 19 (8) of this directive).
2. The start of the period for the commencement of the next evaluation will be calculated from the moment of the commencement of the previous evaluation.
 3. In the case of employees who have an employment contract for a fixed term, the period for the commencement of the next evaluation is:
 - a) usually three years if the employee’s employment is extended for a fixed term and the employee has received the overall result of “excellent”, “very good”, or “satisfactory”, but the provision of Article 3 (2) of this directive must be fulfilled;
 - b) five years if the employee’s employment is extended to an open-ended contract and the employee has received the overall result of “excellent”, “very good”, or “satisfactory”;
 - c) three years if the employment of the employee in the work position of assistant professor is extended to an open-ended contract and the employee has not yet been granted associate professorship; in such a case, the five-year period for the commencement of the next evaluation may be set only for an employee who:
 - i. has spent a part of his employment on maternity and/or parental leave, or on unpaid leave following parental leave;
 - ii. has been on long-term sick leave;
 - iii. has spent a part of his fixed-term employment which has been extended or repeated for a total of nine years in the work position of an assistant (or other work position from which he made a career change, e.g., a researcher in the VP1 pay band), and therefore has actually had fewer than nine years to commence the procedure for the granting of associate professorship;
 - iv. has been employed for the greater part of his employment with fewer than 30 working hours per week;
 - v. is significantly involved in the organizational matters at the Faculty, e.g., as a head or Vice-Dean;
 - vi. in other similarly justified cases.
 4. In the case of foreign employees whose employment contract is repeatedly concluded or extended in accordance with the provision of s. 39 (3) of Act No. 262/2006 Sb., the Labour Code, as amended,[§] the period for the commencement of the next evaluation is three years provided that if more than one employment contract is concluded with the employee during this period, then their duration will be added together for the purpose of determining the period for the commencement of the next evaluation. The provision of Article 3 (2) of this directive must be complied with.

[§] This applies to employees hired on the basis of an employment permit in accordance with Act No. 435/2004 Sb., regulating Employment, as amended, or on the basis of a residence or employment authorization in accordance with Act No. 326/1999 Sb., regulating the stay of foreigners in the territory of the Czech Republic and amending certain laws, as amended.

5. In the case of employees who have an open-ended employment contract, the period for the commencement of the next evaluation is:
 - a) five years if the employee has received an overall result of “excellent”, “very good”, or “satisfactory”;
 - b) one to three years if the employee has received an overall result of “satisfactory with qualifications” provided that the employee has not been subject to additional evaluation under Article 19 of this Directive;
 - c) two to three years if the employee has received an overall result of “satisfactory with qualifications” or “unsatisfactory” provided that he has been subject to additional evaluation under Article 19 of this Directive.
6. In exceptional cases, the Dean of the Faculty may set a different period for the commencement of the next evaluation.
7. An employee is entitled to apply to the Dean of the Faculty for an extension of the period for the commencement of the next evaluation on the grounds of long-term obstacles to work on the part of the employee or in other cases when the performance of work tasks is significantly affected by difficult personal or family circumstances of the employee.
8. The period for the commencement of the next evaluation will not include the time when the employee is absent from work due to maternity or parental leave, unpaid leave immediately following parental leave or long-term sick leave. In this case the period for the commencement of the next evaluation will be extended by two years.

Article 17

Termination of Evaluation

1. An ongoing evaluation may be terminated at any time if:
 - a) the Faculty and the employee have concluded an agreement on termination of employment,
 - b) the Faculty has terminated the employee’s employment by a notice or the employee has resigned,
 - c) the Faculty has terminated the employee’s employment with immediate effect.
2. The employee has the right to submit objections to the evaluation report within 14 calendar days of the moment he read the evaluation report. The employee submits his objections in writing to the Dean of the Faculty and, at the same time, he informs the supervisor of the submission.
3. After the time limit for the submission of objections has expired, the evaluation is closed.
4. After discussing the employee’s objections in the Dean’s Board, the Dean of the Faculty will deal with the objections as follows:
 - a) if the employee’s objections are justified, the Dean of the Faculty will grant the employee’s objections and may change the overall result of the employee’s evaluation or set a different time for the commencement of the next evaluation;
 - b) if the employee’s objections are unjustified, the Dean of the Faculty will reject the employee’s objections. The evaluation is closed once the employee’s objections have been addressed.

Article 18

Dean's Decision on the Request for Improvement of Unsatisfactory Work Performance

1. If the evaluation commission recommends that the employee should be asked to improve unsatisfactory work performance, the Dean will, after a discussion in the Dean's Board and no later than within 30 days, decide that:
 - a) the employee will not be asked to improve unsatisfactory work performance, in this case the Dean may change the overall result of the employee's evaluation and will specify the period for the commencement of the next evaluation;
 - b) the employee will be asked to improve unsatisfactory work performance, in this case an additional evaluation will follow in accordance with Article 19 of this directive.
2. The employee whose objections have been granted by the Dean of the Faculty may be asked to improve unsatisfactory work performance only if the justified objections did not concern the circumstances for which the employee should be asked to improve the unsatisfactory work performance.

Article 19

Additional Evaluation

1. If an employee is asked to improve unsatisfactory work performance, he will, at the same time, receive a list of work tasks, the so-called binding performance objectives (hereinafter referred to also as "objectives") which he has to fulfil within a specified period of time, but no later than within 8 months of receiving the notice asking him to improve unsatisfactory work performance.
2. An additional evaluation of the employee will be carried out after the expiry of the time limit specified in the previous paragraph of this Article, and the evaluation commission will verify if the objectives have been fulfilled.
3. In the additional evaluation, the employee gives his opinion on the fulfilling of the objectives via the application within 30 calendar days. The supervisor then assesses the fulfilment of the objectives within 30 calendar days.
4. The evaluation commission conducts the additional evaluation within 30 calendar days of the date when the supervisor submitted the form for the additional evaluation. The chair of the evaluation commission is entitled to return the form for the additional evaluation to the employee or supervisor for additional information, but no later than 14 calendar days before the expiry of the time limit specified in the previous sentence of this paragraph, and, at the same time, the time limit is then extended by 7 calendar days.
5. If the form for the additional evaluation is returned to the employee, the employee must fill in the additional information within 10 calendar days of receipt of the form.
6. If the form for the additional evaluation form is returned to the supervisor, the supervisor must fill in the additional information within 7 calendar days of receipt of the form.
7. The result of the additional evaluation is an additional evaluation report which is accessible, in the application, to the evaluated employee, supervisor, employees of the Dean's Office at

the Faculty whose cooperation is required in the evaluation, and to the Dean of the Faculty. In the additional evaluation report, the evaluation commission gives its opinion on whether the objectives have been fulfilled.

8. If the result of the evaluation is that the objectives have been fulfilled, the evaluation commission will set the period for commencement of the next evaluation (in accordance with the provision of Article 16 (5) (c) of this directive) and, at the same time, it may change the overall result of the employee's evaluation and possibly recommend an adjustment of the Plan.
9. If the result of the evaluation is that the Objectives have not been fulfilled, the evaluation commission will recommend the Dean of the Faculty to decide on terminating the employment of the employee by a notice of termination.
10. The employee has the right to submit objections to the additional evaluation report within 14 calendar days of the moment when he read the additional evaluation report. The employee submits his objections in writing to the Dean of the Faculty and, at the same time, he informs the supervisor of the submission.
11. The additional evaluation is terminated after the expiry of the time limit for the submission of objections.
12. After discussing the employee's objections in the Dean's Board, the Dean of the Faculty will deal with the employee's objections. The evaluation is closed once the employee's objections have been addressed.
13. After a discussion in the Dean's Board, the Dean of the Faculty decides on serving the employee with a notice of termination.
14. The Dean of the Faculty will return the additional evaluation report to the evaluation commission with a requirement for a proposal of adjustment of the Plan and specifying a period for commencement of the next evaluation (in accordance with the provision of Article 16 (5) (c) of this directive) if:
 - a) the employee has submitted objections which the Dean of the Faculty has granted;
 - b) the employee has submitted objections which the Dean of the Faculty has not granted, but at the same time he has decided not to terminate the employment of the employee with notice;
 - c) the employee has not submitted objections and the Dean of the Faculty has decided not to terminate the employment of the employee with notice.
15. The evaluation commission must carry out the required changes of the additional evaluation report within 14 calendar days. In this case, the supervisor must update the employee's Plan in accordance with the proposal of the evaluation commission.
16. If the Dean decides to serve the employee with a notice of termination, the following procedure will be in accordance with Act No. 262/2006 Sb., the Labour Code, as amended.

Part V
Special, Transitional and Final Provisions

Article 20

Initial Evaluation

1. In order to set the entire evaluation system, an initial evaluation will be commenced no later than within 3 months of the date of effect of this directive.
2. The aim of the initial evaluation is to assess the activities of the employee to date with regard to the newly defined typical job duties of the individual work positions (see Annex No. 1 of the Career Code) and to help the given employee build a Plan which will assign him tasks for the coming period to be evaluated.
3. The assessment conducted within the initial evaluation will take place according to this directive with the following exceptions:
 - a) Only publication activities will be evaluated within the initial evaluation in the case of academics and researchers whose employment has been shorter than 1 year;
 - b) Only the Plan will be created within the initial evaluation in the case of lecturers whose employment has been shorter than 1 year; their activities will not be evaluated;
 - c) Only the self-evaluation of the employee and the evaluation by the supervisor will be carried out via the application;
 - d) The period for the commencement of the next evaluation of an employee who is employed on an open-ended contract and who has received an overall result of "satisfactory" may be shorter than 5 years;
 - e) Employees will be asked to improve unsatisfactory work performance only in exceptionally serious cases of long-term failure to fulfil their job duties;
 - f) An employee with an open-ended employment contract who holds the work position of an assistant and has not completed a doctoral programme of study will have his work assignments in the Plan defined so that one of the assignments will be to submit a study which will fulfil the parameters of a dissertation within the given research field and he will be typically given a three-year period for the commencement of the next evaluation. A five-year period for the commencement of the next evaluation will be possible only in the case of an employee who has spent a part of his employment on maternity/parental leave or on unpaid leave following parental leave or has been on long-term sick leave. Alternatively, if an employee gives his consent and after the Dean of the Faculty approves it, the employee may be transferred to the work position of a lecturer (pay band L1);
 - g) A five-year period for the commencement of the next evaluation according to Article 16 (3) (c) of this directive may be set in other justified cases, except for those referred to in (i) to (vi).
4. An employee who signed an employment contract by 1 October 2020 will be eligible for an extension of employment which is due to end by 30 September 2024 if he receives the overall result of "excellent", "very good", or "satisfactory" within the initial evaluation.

Article 21

Transitional Provisions

1. If the classification of an employee to a work position which corresponds to the definition referred to in Article 1 (2) of this directive is not clear from the employment contract, the work position will be inferred from the pay band of the employee as follows:
 - a) pay band AP1 – assistant;
 - b) pay band AP2 – assistant professor;

- c) pay band AP3 – associate professor;
- d) pay band AP4 – full professor;
- e) pay band VP1, VP2 and VP3 – researcher;
- f) pay band L1 and L2 – lecturer.

Article 22
Final Provisions

1. The following appendices form an integral part of this directive:
 - a) Appendix No. 1 – Evaluation Criteria,
 - b) Appendix No. 2 – Specification for Evaluation of Publication Activities.
2. The draft of this directive was discussed with the trade union which is active at the Faculty on 31 May 2022 in accordance with the provision of s. 287 (2) (g) of the Labour Code. This discussion is recorded in the Faculty's records management system under ref. no. UKFF/368892/2022.
3. The Academic Senate of the Faculty gave an approving opinion on the draft of this directive on 9 June 2022.
4. This directive comes into force on 1 July 2022.
5. This directive comes into effect on 1 July 2022.

In Prague on 30 June 2022

Ref. no.: UKFF/.../2022

Mgr. Eva Lehečková, Ph.D.
Dean of the Faculty of Arts of Charles University

Appendix No. 1 – Evaluation Criteria

I

Criteria for Evaluation of Academics

1. The basis for the overall evaluation is the assessment of publication activities on a five-point scale. Subsequently, the result of this evaluation may be increased or decreased by up to two points on the basis of a comprehensive evaluation of the employee's activities in the field of pedagogical activities and other creative activities exceeding the scope of publication activities and administrative activities. In the case of heads of the basic units of the Faculty or members of the Faculty management, the overall evaluation may, in justified and exceptional cases, be higher by up to three points when compared to the evaluation of the employee for publication activities.
2. **Publication activities**
 - 2.1. As part of his self-evaluation, an employee will state and physically or electronically submit five of his publications from the last 5 years which he considers to be his best. The evaluation commission will receive an overview of all publications of the employee from the personal bibliographic database (hereinafter referred to as the "OBD"), so that it may take into account also the overall publication activities of the employee and may possibly change the selection of publications for evaluation in order to improve the result of the evaluation.
 - 2.2. The evaluation commission's task is to assess the quality of the publications and to classify them into the following categories: (A1) excellent internationally relevant publication, (B1) significant internationally relevant publication, (C1) standard internationally relevant publication, (D1) below-average internationally relevant publication, (A2) excellent nationally relevant publication, (B2) significant nationally relevant publication, (C2) standard nationally relevant publication, (D2) below-average nationally relevant publication. Categories A1-D1 evaluate publications which are written in languages that the evaluation commission for the given field considers to be world languages (i.e., it is commonplace for world experts on the given subject to read in these languages); categories A2-D2 evaluate publications in languages which are understood to be national (for more details see Appendix No. 2 to this directive). This evaluation is based on Methodology 17+ of the Research, Development, and Innovation Council, but differs from it by making a clearer distinction between publications in world and national languages. By virtue of this distinction, the rules for the evaluation of the individual publications will be clearer and the risk that high-quality Czech publications will be rated lower than standard English publications solely on the grounds of language will be reduced.
 - 2.3. The evaluation is field-specific, i.e., the significance of a given publication is always assessed according to the standards common in the given field, while taking into account that every field may perceive different types of publications as the most prestigious.
 - 2.4. In addition to the evaluation of individual publications, the evaluation commission will also award an overall rating of publication activities on the scale of A-E. This scale corresponds to the "international relevancy" scale of A1-D1, i.e., if there is a significant proportion of excellent internationally relevant publications rated A1, the employee

will receive an overall A rating for his publication activities; if there is a predominance of below-average internationally relevant publications, the employee will receive an overall D rating for his publication activities. The “national relevancy” scale A2–D2 will be moved one point lower compared to the “international relevancy” scale; if there is a significant proportion of excellent nationally relevant publications rated A2, the employee will receive an overall B rating for his publication activities; if there is a predominance of below-average national publications (or in the absence of publications), the employee will receive an overall E rating for his publication activities. At the same time, it is true that the higher the quality of the publication, the more weight it has in determining the overall rating of publication activities.

- 2.5. The type of the given publication (monographs, articles, book chapters, annotated translations, etc.) is also taken into account. Qualitative evaluation is the same for all types (i.e., the A1 rating may be awarded to both an excellent internationally relevant monograph and to an excellent internationally relevant article), but the difference is taken into account when determining the overall rating of the publication activities (A1 for a monograph will often be more significant than A1 for an article).
- 2.6. Since the evaluation is primarily intended to foster the quality of publications, not their quantity, it is not necessary that an employee actually produce five publications in five years. Five publications are required if the employee publishes mainly in the C1/D1/C2/D2 categories. By contrast, the higher the quality of the publications, the fewer publications the employee needs to show in five years. In addition, a monograph may (but does not have to) be worth several articles depending on its importance and impact.
- 2.7. It is recommended that the evaluated employee himself should propose the classification of his publication in the categories specified in Appendix No. 2 as a part of his self-evaluation, ideally always with a justification as to why he includes the publication in that particular category. As a part of the justification, the employee may also provide examples of any reception concerning the selected publications (not only citations, but also reviews, reactions of other researchers, awards, peer-review opinions or evaluation of non-bibliometrically processed outputs according to Methodology 17+, etc.). Examples of reception should not be understood in quantitative terms, but primarily in qualitative terms, i.e., giving the numbers of citations is not as important as showing which authors, in which types of publications, and in what ways react to the employee’s research (direct quotes from this reception are welcome). At the same time, a citation index is not necessary, in many fields five years are too short a time for citations.
- 2.8. It is also recommended that the employee should explain why he has chosen the given periodical or publishing house for each publication. He may also describe the experience he had with publishing in the given media, e.g., he may describe the demanding nature and benefits of the review procedure. If the publication is not written in a world language, the employee should also explain why he chose a national language for the publication. In this way, the evaluation procedure fosters self-reflection regarding the publication strategy and constitutes a qualitative alternative to the mechanical following of “quartiles”: the quality of a journal is assessed not only on the basis of its overall citation rate but also on the basis of its suitability for the given subject (sometimes it may make more sense to publish in a specialized journal with a lower quartile). If the real prestige of the journal is higher than its quartile would

suggest, it is in the interest of the employee to point this out in his comments on the publication.

- 2.9. In the case of co-authored publications, the employee will verbally describe his contribution (not only in percentage terms, but also by describing exactly what his contribution consisted of). Based on this description, the evaluation commission will determine the weight of the given publication for the overall evaluation of his publication activities.
- 2.10. If the evaluation commission is not sufficiently competent to evaluate the content (e.g., it does not speak the relevant national language), it may ask an external evaluator to assess the publications.
- 2.11. The evaluation commission also assesses the structure of the publication portfolio in relation to the typical job description for the given work position, e.g., its global dimension (which is a part of the typical job description of the work position of all academics and researcher) or whether it is “showing a clear prospect for professional growth” (which is a part of the typical job description for the work positions of assistant, assistant professor, and researcher).
- 2.12. In the case of the work position of an assistant professor, the evaluation commission also assesses, within the structure of the publication portfolio, if the employee has been successfully and realistically working towards associate professorship since the beginning of his academic career. This criterion of potential associate professorship plays a fundamental role in determining the overall evaluation of his publication activities.
- 2.13. A scientific annotated translation or publication of a text, preparation of an edited collective monograph, software, public database (corpus), and specialized map are also evaluated as a scientific (publication) output. The evaluation commission always assesses if such output corresponds to an article or a monograph in terms of the complexity of its production and in which category of quality it belongs. The key evaluation criterion is the reception and number of users (if the nature of the software or database allows it to be used by other people).
- 2.14. If necessary, the evaluation committee may also consult employee’s older publications recorded in the OBD in order to take into account the long-term development of his research activities. At the same time, the evaluation commission may ask the employee to provide further comments if there are any doubts.
- 2.15. The evaluation commission also assesses if the employee has a legible scientific profile and may make recommendations regarding the future publication activity of the evaluated employee (e.g., a warning that it does not make sense to write some types of publications in Czech, etc.). In this respect, the evaluation should contribute to the long-term improvement of an employee’s publication habits.
- 2.16. During the self-evaluation, the employee may also indicate up to one publication not attributed to the Faculty but which was published during the employee’s employment at the Faculty.

3. Pedagogical activities

3.1. Quantity of teaching

- a) Average teaching hours per week
 - The number of hours is automatically generated, but the employee has the opportunity to provide verbal comments.

- Teaching is assumed to be within the scope of the employee's job description; a lower number of hours taught may be compensated for by higher performance in other relevant criteria. Attention is paid primarily to determining whether the numbers of hours taught are not significantly lower than is typical for the given department at the Faculty and other similar departments at the Faculty.
 - In the case of a large number of courses taught together with other teachers, the evaluation commission does not resort to quantitative calculations but relies on the comments of the employee or his supervisor. At the same time, this is only necessary when the employee's independent teaching activity is significantly lower than what is the norm for the given department at the Faculty.
- b) Number of awarded results in courses without teaching (exams in front of a commission, written papers, etc.)
- This criterion is only taken into account where assessment in courses without teaching forms a significant part of the job and compensates for any lower number of hours taught than is required for the work position of the given employee.
- c) Supervision of successfully defended final theses differentiated according to the degree of study
- The portfolio of theses is assessed in relation to the typical job description (ratio of undergraduate theses and dissertations) and the number of theses is evaluated in relation to the average number in the department, but, at the same time, the evaluation commission also takes into account that supervision of a large number of theses in major fields represents a significant workload which reduces the employee's opportunities to engage in other activities. In the case of dissertations, even dissertations which have not been successfully defended so far and which are unfinished are also taken into consideration.
- d) Writing of reviewer's reports on final theses (bachelor's theses, master's theses, dissertations)
- The number of theses is evaluated in relation to the average number in the given department of the Faculty.

3.2. *Quality of teaching*

- a) High-quality pedagogical procedures
- The employee will provide a verbal commentary describing why he thinks that his teaching is of high quality and which pedagogical methods and innovative elements he would like to highlight.
- b) Evaluation
- The employee and his supervisor will receive the results of the evaluations with a summary of the comments relating to the courses which the given employee has taught in the evaluated period; in the event of repeated below-average results or repeated critical comments both the employee and the supervisor may give their opinion on these results or comments. Special attention is paid to evaluations which have been low for a longer period of time. In contrast, a high evaluation is taken into account only if it is commented on verbally by the supervisor who is able, among others, to compare the evaluation with the evaluation of other courses of the same type at the given department of the Faculty.
- c) Innovation of the existing courses and creation of new courses
- The employee will list his main new or upgraded courses in the last five years (name, compulsory course/elective course/optional course) and will explain how and to what extent the course has been upgraded from the previous one.

3.3. Other:

- a) participation in the organization of teaching (establishing what and how often the employee does in this field, e.g., preparing and correcting of tests for entrance examinations/state examinations, examining at entrance examinations/state examinations, participating in various types of examinations in front of a commission);
- b) participation in the preparation and motivation of applicants for study (organization of events for applicants and participation in them, participation in preparatory courses, etc.);
- c) project activities aimed at education or mobility: preparation, guidance, participation;
- d) international dimension of teaching (teaching in foreign languages, teaching abroad, etc.)
- e) mentoring or teaching doctoral students;
- f) communication with students (writing recommending opinions, etc., helping students beyond direct teaching, involving students in research, collaborating with societies in their events, helping to organize student workshops or conferences, etc.);
- g) organization of professional excursions and practices (field research, professional training of students in the field, etc.).

4. Other creative activities (other than publication activities):

- a) conferences or workshops (active participation, guest lectures, etc.);
- b) international cooperation (joint publications or projects, joint conferences or workshops, guest lectures abroad of a non-conference type, etc.);
- c) project activities (projects of fundamental and applied research), including the preparation of major project applications (ERC, Operational Programme Research, Development and Education (OPVVV), Horizont, etc.);
- d) organizing activities (organization of workshops or conferences);
- e) expert activities (membership in the Research Boards of the Faculty of Arts and Charles University, membership in university, ministerial and other national or international evaluation panels and grant agencies, reviewer's reports of dissertations qualifying for the associate professorship appointment, reviews of articles and books for academic publishing houses, membership in commissions for evaluation of Faculty employees, membership in publishing boards and boards of journals);
- f) popularization activities (Lifelong Education, University of the Third Age, appearing in the media, opinion journalism, popularization events for the public, public lectures, panel discussions, round tables, civic engagement, etc.);
- g) publication activities other than the publication of research (popularizing works, textbooks or other teaching publications, translations which are significant in a given field, etc.);
- h) awards received;
- i) professional self-education (workshops, language courses, etc.).

Both the quantity of activities and their quality (prestige of a grant, interesting popularization, etc..) are evaluated in comparison with typical standards at the Faculty.

5. Administrative activities and expert activities in academic bodies

It concerns primarily activities which are connected with:

- a) the operation of the relevant department of the Faculty (head of the basic unit, deputy head, head of a section of the basic unit, secretary to the basic unit, local SIS

- administrator, web administrator, admissions procedure guarantor, coordinator of foreign exchange stays, etc.);
- b) the academic self-governance on the level of the Faculty or University (Vice-Dean/Vice-Rector, membership in Faculty/University bodies – Academic Senate of the Faculty of Arts, Academic Senate of Charles University, Faculty or University commissions, etc.);
 - c) the organization of research activities (editorial work in a domestic or foreign journal or book series, administration of a grant project, active membership in associations and their committees, etc.).

II

Criteria for Evaluation of Lecturers

1. The basis for the evaluation is assessment of pedagogical activities on a five-point scale both regarding the quantity and the quality of these activities. The result of this evaluation may be subsequently increased or decreased on the basis of a comprehensive evaluation of the employee's activities in the field of other creative activities and administrative activities; in the case of lecturers in the L1 pay band this increase or decrease is usually by one point, and in the case of lecturers in the L2 pay band it is by one to two points (because the work position of a lecturer in the L2 pay band differs from the work position of a lecturer in the L1 pay band among others by participation in other activities, including publication activities).

2. Pedagogical activities

2.1. Quality of teaching

- a) The evaluation is based on teacher observation assessed according to a standardized teacher observation record with fixed items common to all fields of teaching and variable items specific for individual fields of teaching.
 - Two teacher observations must be carried out for every employee in the course of the semester before the evaluation. If the lecturer teaches several courses of different types, the teacher observations must be carried out for two different types.
 - The teacher observation is typically carried out by the head of the given department of the Faculty, but it may be carried out also by anyone else whom the head authorizes. At the same time, it is important that both the methodological aspect of the teaching and the content of the teaching can be evaluated during the teacher observation; thus, if the given evaluator cannot evaluate both these aspects (e.g., he does not know the language taught or is not an expert in the teaching of languages), he must cooperate with another expert.
 - If the head of the given department carries out regular teacher observations of his subordinate employees, he may use the results from these observations for the evaluation provided that these results comply with the standardized teacher observation record and they are not older than 18 months from the date of the commencement of the evaluation. The Vice-Dean for Quality Evaluation and Accreditation must approve the template of the field-specific part of the record for every field.
 - The evaluation will be determined on the basis of the scoring of the individual categories of the teacher observation record.
- b) The second main criterion for evaluation is the employee's pedagogical self-evaluation for the evaluated period.

- In the self-evaluation, the employee will describe why he thinks that his teaching is of high quality and which pedagogical methods and innovative elements he would like to highlight.
 - At the same time, the employee will describe the creation of new courses and the upgrading of existing courses or assessment in courses without teaching.
- c) The employee and his supervisor will also receive the results of the evaluations with a summary of the comments relating to the courses which the given employee has taught in the evaluated period; in the event of repeated below-average results or repeated critical comments both the employee and the supervisor may give their opinion on these results and comments.
- Special attention is paid to evaluations which have been low for a longer period of time.
 - Results of evaluations may be taken into account also in cases where it will be possible to compare them with teaching of a similar type by other teachers in the relevant department. In such a case, the comparison is carried out by the head of the given department of the Faculty, who has knowledge of comparable types of teaching in the given department. The head will receive an overview of the evaluation results for the given department over the last three years as a source document.

2.2. *Quantity of teaching*

- a) Average weekly hours of teaching
- The number of hours is automatically generated, but the employee has the opportunity to provide verbal comments.
 - Teaching is assumed to be within the scope of the employee's job description; a lower number of hours taught may be compensated for by higher performance in other relevant criteria. Attention is paid primarily to determining whether the numbers of hours taught are not significantly lower than is typical for the given department at the Faculty and other similar departments at the Faculty.
 - In the case of the work position of a lecturer in the L2 pay band, the portfolio of courses which should also include courses whose teaching requires broader knowledge of the field is also important.
 - In the case of a large number of courses taught together with other teachers, the evaluation commission does not resort to quantitative calculations but relies on the comments of the employee or his supervisor. At the same time, this is only necessary when the employee's independent teaching activity is significantly lower than is normal for the given department at the Faculty.
- b) Number of awarded results in courses without teaching (exams in front of a commission, written papers, etc.)
- This criterion is only taken into account where assessment in courses without teaching forms a significant part of the job and compensates for any lower number of hours taught than is required for the work position of the given employee.
- c) Supervision of successfully defended final theses differentiated according to the degree of study (only in the case of the work position of a lecturer in the L2 pay band)
- The number of theses is evaluated in relation to the average number in the given department of the Faculty, but the evaluation commission also takes into account that supervision of a large number of theses in major fields represents a significant workload which reduces the employee's possibilities to be involved in other activities.

- d) Writing reviewer's reports of final theses
 - The number of theses is evaluated in relation to the average number in the given department.

2.3. *Other:*

- a) participation in the organization of teaching (establishing what and how often the employee does in this field, e.g., preparing and correcting of tests for entrance examinations/state examinations, examining at entrance examinations/state examinations, participating in various types of examinations in front of a commission);
- b) possible other types of teaching provided by the given department of the Faculty for other institutions, etc.;
- c) participation in the preparation and motivation of applicants for study (organization of events for applicants and participation in them, participation in preparatory courses, etc.);
- d) project activities focused on education or mobility: preparation, guidance, participation;
- e) international dimension of teaching (teaching in foreign languages, teaching abroad, etc.);
- f) professional self-education (workshops, language courses, etc.);
- g) mentoring of teaching doctoral students (only in the case of the work position in the L2 pay band);
- h) communication with students (writing of recommending opinions, etc., helping students beyond direct teaching, involving students in research, cooperation with societies during their events, helping to organize student workshops or conferences, etc.);
- i) IT competences required for teaching (active work with didactic applications, advance work with Moodle and MS Teams, etc.).

3. **Other creative activities**

- a) publication activities (not obligatory for a lecturer included in the L1 pay band). For example:
 - standard scientific publications;
 - popularizing works;
 - teaching publications (e.g., textbooks, articles on the didactic methods in a given field, worksheets and methodological sheets published on educational portals);
 - translations significant in a given field; and
 - the lecturer's own literary activities.
- b) active participation in conferences, workshops, training, lectures in specialist associations, etc., or their conceptual preparation and supervision;
- c) sharing of experience within the particular department of the faculty (new didactic methods, activities in online teaching, e-learning, sharing of information from completed trainings);
- d) international cooperation (joint publications or projects, joint conferences or workshops, foreign internships, etc.);
- e) project activities (projects of fundamental and applied research);
- f) didactic competitions;
- g) organizing activities (organizing of workshops or conferences);
- h) popularizing activities (Lifelong Education, University of the Third Age, appearing in the media, opinion journalism, popularization events for the public, public lectures, panel discussions, round tables, etc.).

4. **Administrative activities and activities in academic bodies**

It concerns primarily activities which are connected with:

- a) in the case of a lecturer in the L1 and L2 pay bands – the operation of the relevant department of the Faculty (head of the basic unit, deputy head, head of a section of the basic unit, secretary to the basic unit, local SIS administrator, web administrator, admissions procedure guarantor, coordinator of foreign exchange stays, etc.);
- b) in the case of a lecturer in the L2 pay band – academic self-governance on the level of the Faculty or University (Vice-Dean, membership in Faculty/University bodies – Academic Senate of the Faculty of Arts, Academic Senate of Charles University, Faculty or University commissions, etc.);
- c) in the case of a lecturer in the L2 pay band – organization of research activities (editorial work in a domestic or foreign journal or book series, administration of a grant project, active membership in association and their committees, etc).

III

Criteria for Evaluation of Researchers

1. The basis for the evaluation is the assessment of publication activities on a five-point scale. The result of this evaluation may be increased or decreased by up to two points on the basis of a comprehensive evaluation of the employee's activities in the field of other creative activities exceeding the scope of publication activities and administrative activities.
2. **Publication activities**
 - a) As part of the self-evaluation, an employee will state and physically or electronically submit five of his publications from the period of the last 5 years which he considers to be his best. The evaluation commission will receive an overview of all publications of the employee from the OBD, so that it may take into account also the overall publication activities of the employee and may possibly change the selection of publications for evaluation in order to improve the result of the evaluation.
 - b) The evaluation commission's task is to assess the quality of the publications and to classify them into the following categories: (A1) excellent internationally relevant publication, (B1) significant internationally relevant publication, (C1) standard internationally relevant publication, and (D1) below-average internationally relevant publication; (A2) excellent nationally relevant publication, (B2) significant nationally relevant publication, (C2) standard nationally relevant publication, (D2) below-average nationally relevant publication. Categories A1-D1 evaluate publications which are written in languages that the evaluation commission for the given field considers to be world languages (i.e., it is commonplace for world experts on the given subject to read in these languages); categories A2-D2 evaluate publications in languages which are understood to be national (for more details see Appendix No. 2 to this directive). This evaluation is based on Methodology 17+ of the Research, Development and Innovation Council, but differs from it by making a clearer distinction between publications in world and national languages. By virtue of this distinction, the rules for the evaluation of the individual publications will be clearer and the risk that high-quality Czech publications will be rated lower than standard English publications solely on the grounds of language will be reduced.
 - c) The evaluation is field-specific, i.e., the significance of a given publication is always assessed according to the standards common in the given field, while taking into account that every field may perceive different types of publications as the most prestigious.

- d) In addition to the evaluation of individual publications, the evaluation commission will award an overall rating of publication activities on a scale of A–E. This scale corresponds to the “international relevancy” scale of A1–D1, i.e., if there is a significant proportion of excellent internationally relevant publications rated A1, the employee will receive an overall A rating for his publication activities; if there is a predominance of below-average internationally relevant publications, the employee will receive an overall D rating of his publication activities. The “national relevancy” scale A2–D2 will be moved one point lower compared to the “international relevancy” scale; if there is a significant proportion of excellent nationally relevant publications rated A2, the employee will receive an overall B rating for his publication activities; if there is a predominance of below-average national publications (or in the absence of publications), the employee will receive an overall E rating for his publication activities. At the same time, it is true that the higher the quality of the publication, the more weight it has in determining the overall rating of publication activities.
- e) The type of the given publication (monographs, articles, book chapters, annotated translations, etc.) is also taken into account. Qualitative evaluation is the same for all types (i.e., the A1 rating may be awarded to both an excellent internationally relevant monograph and to an excellent internationally relevant article), but the difference is taken into account when determining the overall rating of the publication activities (A1 for a monograph will often be more significant than A1 for an article).
- f) Since the evaluation is primarily intended to foster the quality of publications, not their quantity, it is not necessary that an employee actually produce five publications in five years. Five publications are required if the employee publishes mainly in the C1/D1/C2/D2 categories. By contrast, the higher the quality of the publications, the fewer publications the employee needs to show in five years. In addition, a monograph may (but does not have to) be worth several articles depending on its importance and impact.
- g) It is recommended that the evaluated employee himself should propose the classification of his publication in the categories specified in Appendix No. 2 as a part of his self-evaluation, ideally always with a justification as to why he includes the publication in that particular category. As a part of the justification, the employee may also provide examples of any reception concerning the selected publications (not only citations, but also reviews, reactions of other researchers, awards, peer-review opinions or evaluation of non-bibliometrically processed outputs according to Methodology 17+, etc.). Examples of reception should not be understood in quantitative terms but primarily in qualitative terms, i.e., giving the numbers of citations is not as important as showing which authors, in which types of publications, and in what ways react to the employee’s research (direct quotes from this reception are welcome). At the same time, a citation index is not necessary, in many fields five years are too short a time for citations.
- h) It is also recommended that the employee should explain why he has chosen the given periodical or publishing house for each publication. He may also describe the experience he had with publishing in the given media, e.g., he may describe the demanding nature and benefits of the review procedure. If the publication is not written in a world language, the employee should also explain why he chose a national language for the publication. In this way, the evaluation procedure fosters self-reflection regarding the publication strategy and constitutes a qualitative alternative to the mechanical following of “quartiles”: the quality of a journal is assessed not only on the basis of its overall citation rate but also on the basis of its suitability for the given subject (sometimes it may

make more sense to publish in a specialized journal with a lower quartile). If the real prestige of the journal is higher than its quartile would suggest, it is in the interest of the employee to point this out in his comments on the publication.

- i) In the case of co-authored publications, the employee will verbally describe his contribution (not only in percentage terms, but also by describing exactly what his contribution consisted of). Based on this description, the evaluation commission will determine the weight of the given publication for the overall evaluation of his publication activities.
- j) If the evaluation commission is not sufficiently competent to evaluate the content (e.g., it does not speak the relevant national language), it may ask an external evaluator to assess the publications.
- k) The evaluation commission also assesses the structure of the publication portfolio in relation to the typical job description for the given work position, e.g., its global dimension (which is a part of the typical job description of the work position of all academics and researcher) or whether it “shows a clear prospect for professional growth” (which is a part of the typical job description for the work positions of assistant, assistant professor, and researcher).
- l) In the case of the work position of an assistant professor, the evaluation commission also assesses, within the structure of the publication portfolio, if the employee has been successfully and realistically working towards associate professorship since the beginning of his academic career. This criterion of potential associate professorship plays a fundamental role in determining the overall evaluation of his publication activities.
- m) A scientific annotated translation or publication of a text, preparation of an edited collective monograph, software, public database (corpus) and specialized map are also evaluated as a scientific (publication) output. The evaluation commission always assesses if such output corresponds to an article or a monograph in terms of the complexity of its production and in which category of quality it belongs. The key evaluation criterion is reception and number of users (if the nature of the software or database allows it to be used by other people).
- n) If necessary, the evaluation committee may also consult the employee’s older publications recorded in the OBD in order to take into account the long-term development of his research activities. At the same time, the evaluation commission may ask the employee to provide further comments if there are any doubts.
- o) The evaluation commission also assesses if the employee has a legible scientific profile and may make recommendations regarding the future publication activity of the evaluated employee (e.g., a warning that it does not make sense to write some types of publications in Czech, etc.). In this respect, the evaluation should contribute to the long-term improvement of employees’ publication habits.
- p) During the self-evaluation, the employee may also indicate up to one publication not attributed to the Faculty but which was published during the employee’s employment at the Faculty.

3. Other creative activities (other than publishing activities):

- a) conferences or workshops (active participation, guest lectures, etc.);
- b) international cooperation (joint publications or projects, joint conferences or workshops, guest lectures abroad of a non-conference type, etc.);
- c) project activities (projects of fundamental and applied research), including preparation of major project applications (ERC, Operational Programme Research, Development and Education (OPVTV), Horizont, etc.);

- d) organizational activities (organization of workshops or conferences);
- e) expert activities (membership in the Research Boards of the Faculty of Arts and Charles University, membership in university, ministerial and other national or international evaluation panels and grant agencies, reviewer's reports of dissertations qualifying for the associate professorship appointment, reviews of articles and books for academic publishing houses, membership in commissions for evaluation of Faculty employees);
- f) popularization activities (Lifelong Education, University of the Third Age, appearing in the media, opinion journalism, popularization events for the public, public lectures, panel discussions, round tables, etc.);
- g) publication activities other than the publication of research (popularizing works, textbooks or other teaching publications, translations which are significant for a given field, etc.);
- h) professional self-education (workshops, language courses, etc.).

Both the quantity of activities and their quality (prestige of a grant, interesting popularization, etc..) are evaluated in comparison with typical standards at the Faculty.

4. Administrative activities and expert activities in academic bodies

These are mainly activities which are connected with:

- a) the operation of the relevant department of the Faculty (head of the basic unit, deputy head, secretary to the basic unit, web administrator, etc.);
- b) organizing of research activities (editorial work in a domestic or foreign journal or book series, administration of a grant project, active membership in associations and their committees, etc.).

Appendix No. 2 – Specification for Evaluation of Publication Activities

I.

Question of Language

1. In general, internationally relevant publications are those publications which are written in languages in which it is commonplace for world experts to read about a given subject. Thus, while for certain subjects the world language will be English only, for others it will also be German and French, and for others Spanish or Russian. In the case of nationally specific subjects, publications written in national languages, including Czech, may also fall in the category of internationally relevant publications.
2. At the same time, however, international relevancy cannot be determined solely on the basis of language, and other factors must be also taken into account: the prestige of the publishing house, the availability of the publication, and its reception. Thus, even a publication written in English may be classified in the category of a nationally relevant publication if it is published by a Czech publishing house without international distribution and has received no positive reception abroad. In the case of languages which are commonly regarded in the academic world as world languages, a sufficiently high-quality journal or publishing house with a standard international availability will be enough for including a publication in the category of internationally relevant publications. In the case of national languages, a publication may be considered to be an internationally relevant publication only if it has convincing international reception in any of the world languages.

II

Other General Requirements

1. If the majority of the employee's publications are rated in categories C1 and higher or B2 and higher, the evaluation commission may evaluate his publications mainly on the basis of formal criteria (the prestige of the journal, etc.). However, if the evaluation falls within the borderline range and there is a risk that the employee could end up with the overall D or E rating of his publication activities, the evaluation commission must assess the publications particularly carefully; if the evaluation commission does not know the language of the publications, it may ask an external evaluator to assess them, this external evaluator will be proposed by the evaluation commission and appointed by the Vice Dean for Quality Evaluation and Accreditation.
2. At the same time, the evaluated employees will be instructed to characterize how exactly their publications are ground-breaking and significant in the field and they will be asked to propose their own classification of the publications in the scale and provide their reasoning therefor. As a part of the reasoning, they may also provide examples of any reception of the selected publications (not only citations, but also reviews, reactions, awards, etc.). Employees may also describe the demanding nature and the benefits of the review procedure.
3. The evaluation will be field-specific, i.e., the significance of a given publication will always be evaluated according to standards which are common in the given field.
4. If the use of bibliometric criteria makes sense in the given field and type of publication, the evaluation commission will take them into account. In the end, however, the evaluation

commission will use them to again assess the quality of the publication according to the scale of A1–D1/A2–D2.

5. The following criteria for evaluating individual publications are formulated in relation to the most common types of publications. In addition, there is a number of less typical publications or other outputs to which the criteria are not applicable in their literal meaning (critical editions, annotated translations, software, databases, etc.). These outputs are always considered by the evaluation commission on an *ad hoc* basis in the context of the field and they are assigned to categories A1–D1/A2–D2 by analogy.

III.

Internationally Relevant Publications

(A1) Excellent internationally relevant publication

- a) A publication which represents a fundamental contribution to world research which cannot be avoided by anyone who will work on the given subject and which represents the best which has been published on the given subject in the world.
- b) The publication is the result of original research (not a compilation) and brings a new perspective on a given issue either in terms of an original interpretation or collected data and their processing or in terms of a major synthesis which has not been done before (or was done long ago or poorly). At the same time, it is also a publication with a broader thematic or theoretical and methodological impact.
- c) The publication is typically published in one of the world's leading prestigious periodicals or publishing houses with a thorough review procedure and a high competition of texts offered by authors for publication.
- d) If the publication is more than two years old, it is usually possible to document its fundamental contribution to the field by citations, reviews, or other form of reception. In the case of reception, it is not a question of quantity, but of relevance, i.e., of showing which authors, in which types of publications, and in what way react to the publication. A lack of reception may be compensated for by the prestige of the journal or publishing house (especially in the case of newer publications) or by the strong originality of the publication (which often means that reception is much slower). Moreover, the rate of reception is also field-specific (some fields are slow from the perspective of citation).

(B1) Significant internationally relevant publication

Significant international publications fulfil similar criteria as excellent publications, but they are deficient in one of these criteria: they were published in a less important journal or publishing house, they have limited reception, etc.

(C1) Standard internationally relevant publication

- a) Standard internationally relevant publications typically fulfil only one of the criteria for excellent publications and are deficient in the other criteria.
- a) This category typically includes: (i) publications whose content is of high-quality, but has limited reception, publications published in less famous publishing houses (especially those where review procedure is absent or just a formality), in unreviewed collections, etc.; (ii) publications which lack originality, which are mostly descriptive, bring only introductory or partial treatment of a problem, or have a too specific theme without a general relevancy.

(D1) Below-average internationally relevant publication

A publication which significantly falls short of most of the criteria for excellent publications.

IV.

Nationally Relevant Publications

(A2) Excellent nationally relevant publication

- a) A publication which is a fundamental contribution to national scholarship, it is among the best that has been published on the subject in a given national setting and for the next decade it will represent the “state of the art” which cannot be avoided by anyone working on the subject in the given national setting.
- b) The publication is the result of original research (not a compilation) and brings a new perspective on the given issue either in terms of an original interpretation or collected data and their processing or in terms of a major synthesis which has not been done before (or was done long ago or poorly). At the same time, it is also a publication with a broader thematic or theoretical and methodological impact.
- c) If the subject of the publication does not have only a limited national relevancy, it may be assumed that if it had been published in a world language, it would also have a considerable reception abroad.
- d) The publication is typically published in one of the prestigious national periodicals or publishing houses with a thorough review procedure and a high competition of texts offered by authors for publication, provided that it is possible to distinguish prestige in this sense given the size of the academic community for the given field in this country.
- e) If the publication is more than two years old, it is usually possible to document its major contribution to the field by citations, reviews, or other reception. Given the inferior possibilities of electronic counting, the weight of the reception is smaller than in the case of internationally relevant publications, and it is also proportional to the size of the national academic community for the given subject. Any sporadic reception recorded in international scholarly literature underlines the excellence of any nationally relevant publication.
- f) The language of the publication is appropriate to its subject, i.e., there is a national academic community for the subject for whom it makes sense to write such publications (instead of publishing it in a world language).

(B2) Significant nationally relevant publication

Significant nationally relevant publications fulfil similar criteria as excellent publications, but they are deficient in one of these criteria: they were published in a less important periodical or publishing house, they have smaller reception, they were less demanding to prepare, they are a high-quality text but they provide only a summary, they are texts without a broader thematic or theoretical and methodological impact, etc.

(C2) Standard nationally relevant publication

- b) Standard nationally relevant publications typically fulfil only one of the criteria for excellent publications and are deficient in the other criteria.
- c) This category typically includes: (i) publications whose content is of high-quality, but has limited reception, publications published in less important periodicals or publishing houses with superficial review procedure and limited distribution, in unreviewed

collections, etc.; (ii) publications which lack originality, which are mostly descriptive, which bring only introductory or partial treatment of a problem, or have a too specific theme without a general relevancy.

(D2) Below-average nationally relevant publication

A publication which significantly falls short of most of the criteria for excellent publications.