Academic evaluation FI MU 2024

The 2024 evaluation of academic staff of the Faculty of Informatics (FI MU) will be carried out at the departments, under guidance of the respective Heads of departments, and in English language. Detailed instructions and additional information will be given by the Heads of departments. This document defines the core principles and the outcomes of the evaluation.

Evaluated persons

- All regular academic staff of FI MU (L,OA,D,P), including part-time employees, and
- Assistants (A) and Researchers (R) selected at the discretion of the Head of department.

Scope of evaluation

Each individual staff member will be evaluated in two parts over the specified evaluation periods - for **teaching** and for **research** performance. The evaluation period for teaching is the past 8 semesters (typically ending with the current Spring semester), and for research it is the past 5 calendar years (not including the year of this evaluation). Lecturers (L) and Researchers (R) are an exception and will be evaluated, due to their contract, only for teaching (L) or research (R) performance. Each part of evaluation then defines three branches as follows:

- **Teaching performance evaluation**
  - teaching duties
  - supervising students
  - service for the faculty and the university
- **Research performance evaluation**
  - research publications
  - citations and H-index
  - project activities and academic service

Evaluation results

In each of the two parts (one for Lecturers and Researchers), the evaluated staff members shall list all relevant information in the given questionnaire and, optionally, provide a self-assessment of their performance in each branch using the scale "*C-level / B-level / A-level*" (formerly "minimal / expected / outstanding"). Subsequently, the Head of department will process and check the self-evaluation documents of each department member against the C-, B- and A-level criteria specifications written below, and assign a *category (grade)* **A**, **B**, **C** or **D** in each of the two parts, on the basis of the following meta-rules:

- **A.** Conforms to B, and in at least one branch shows performance clearly meeting the A-level criteria (this should be in addition to a possible compensation of shortcomings as in B).
- **B.** Conforms to C and meets, on average, the B-level criteria in each branch (i.e., shortcoming in one branch may be compensated by (nearly) A-level performance in another branch[1]).
- **C.** In each branch, at least the C-level criteria (which might be empty) are met.
- **D.** Default.

Additionally, the awarded category will be coupled with a *prospective attribute*, namely "stable", "prospective increase" or "prospective decrease". In the future, the category of an evaluated staff member may drop down only after receiving a "prospective decrease" warning the previous year.

---

[1] For example, a high number of supervised students may compensate for less teaching, etc.

The A,B,C levels of performance

- Teaching performance evaluation

  All teaching performance criteria assume full-time (100%) contract during all semesters of the evaluation period. In case of a part-time contract or semesters off (e.g. sabbatical), the corresponding fractions of the numeric criteria apply (rounded up). When a criterion has increased (or decreased) over time, the old values remain in effect for the past semesters.

  - **Teaching duties**

    The *expected* teaching duties are as follows
      - 16-20 hours per week for Lecturers (L),
      - 8-10 hours per week for Assistants and Assistant Professors (A,OA),
      - 6-8 hours per week for Associate Professors (D),
      - 4 hours per week for Professors (P).

    The *A-level* performance is not strictly defined, for the *B-level* at least the expected numbers should be met and for the *C-level* the teaching duties are at least half of these numbers.

    These duties are counted on average (possibly weighted) per semester across the whole evaluation period, and are proportional to the "teaching" part of the contract (if part-time). In case of an interval value of expected hours, the lower bound is particularly offered to those teaching lectures of large courses. The role of an organiser of tutorials for a large course counts as teaching 2 hours per week (one organiser per course). Except for Assistants (A), the expected duties include participation at the state exams. Teaching in seminars, particularly in those in which students are the main presenters, is counted only at 50%. Quality of teaching and teaching in English, as individually evaluated by the Head of department, is also taken into account.

  - **Supervising students**

    Each bachelor/master thesis student, supervised during the evaluation period counts as 1, after submitting his/her thesis (including those graded F). This concerns all students supervised during any semester of the evaluation period. If a student's work has been awarded a prize at higher than faculty level (rector's prize, a competition such as SVOČ or ACM), then this counts as 2. Every doctoral student supervised during any semester of the evaluation period, regardless of whether they are current students, counts as 2. A doctoral student who passed the doctoral exam counts as 4 and a doctoral student who graduated during the evaluation period counts as 8 (these numbers are divided between a supervisor and a consultant, based on mutual agreement, but the sum must stay the same).

    The *B-level* count is, on average, at least 1 per semester of the evaluation period, and for the *A-level* performance these numbers should be at least doubled (or include nontrivial care for a student laboratory) and should include doctoral students for Assoc. Professors and Professors (D,P). The *C-level* count is at least 3 for the evaluation period.

  - **Service for the faculty and the university**

    The *C-level* and *B-level* criteria are empty, and the evaluation is at the discretion of the Head of department. Evaluation criteria (counting towards *A-level* performance) include care for industrial partners (SPP), being students' counsellor, membership in academic senates, doctoral board, disciplinary committee, lectures at high schools, propagation of FI, participation in Researchers' night, Open days, students' competitions, etc.

  - *Special provision for the Lecturers of AGD+M*

    The expected teaching duties for the Lecturers (L) affiliated with the Studio of Graphic Design and Multimedia (AGD+M) are equal to those of OA. The Lecturers in AGD+M must at minimum provide service for the faculty and the university (such as poster printing, 3D printing, graphic design, photography) and it is expected that their achievements at national as well as international levels are listed in the Register of Artistic Works (https://www.iruv.cz/).

- Research performance evaluation

  The research performance criteria are normally the same for part-time as for full-time contract staff, but in well-justified cases the Head of department may agree to count the criteria proportionally to the contract. When a person is promoted to a higher academic level before this evaluation, the higher criteria apply to him for the whole evaluation period.

  - **Research publications**

    The *expected* publication count is, on average, at least 1 high-quality publications per year, and for Researcher, Assoc. Prof. and Prof. (R,D,P) this is at least 2 per year. A high-quality publication is a paper in a journal in JCR (with IF) or a paper in the "standard" competitive program of a conference[2] with rank B or higher.

    For *B-level* performance, at least the expected publication count is required, and at least 2 of the papers over the whole evaluation period should be in a journal in JCR or an A-ranked conference. For *A-level* performance, the publication count should be at least twice the expected number, out of which the expected number should appear in at least A-ranked conferences or JCR journals, and include at least some paper(s) in Q1/D1 journals by AIS or in A*-ranked conferences (the last requirement can be in exceptional and well-justified cases replaced by a publication in a top/flagship venue of the research area). To meet the *C-level* performance criterion, a person must have at least 2 refereed publications over the whole evaluation period, which are recognized by one of the established publication databases (WoS, Scopus) or are at C- or higher ranked conferences.

    All the counted publications, except publications prepared prior to the employment at FI MU, are expected to be attributed 100% to FI in the IS. If it is not the case, and the publication(s) is included in the evaluation, then this must be stated and only the fraction of the publication attributed to FI (not to the author alone) will be counted.

    In special cases, possible other research outcomes (such as those with significant impact on society) can be considered instead of publications at the discretion of the Head of department. Other research outcomes may also include books and book chapters.

  - **Citations[3]**

    For *B-level* performance, the non-self citation count in the WoS or Scopus database should be at least 30 during the whole evaluation period. For *A-level* performance, this number should exceed **90**. Furthermore, for Researchers, Assoc. Prof. and Prof. (R,D,P), it is expected on the *B-level* to have the h-index at least 5 (R,D) and 8 (P), and on the *A-level* to have the h-index at least 8 (R,D) and 12 (P), all in the WoS or Scopus database (the higher number of these two databases counts). Citation and h-index data may be, at the discretion of the Head of department, considered also from Google Scholar with appropriate scale.

    On *C-level,* the minimum count is at least 4 non-self citations in refereed publications during the evaluation period, according to any established database or own records.

  - **Project activities and academic service**

    For Researchers, Assoc. Prof. and Professors (R,D,P), to meet the *B-level* performance criteria it is required to be the principal investigator of at least one research project on the national or international levels (regarding the university level, only "large" GAMU projects such as the interdisciplinary ones are counted in this criterion), or to be a key collaborator[4] of at least two such projects, during the evaluation period. To meet the *C-level* performance (again for R,D,P), ordinary participation in a research project on the same level, or organization or PC-

---

[2] Conference ranking and "standard" conference papers are explained in a separate section below. The ranking basically follows the established CORE ranking. A paper in the standard conference program, approximately, refers to a citable paper which is not too short and which underwent a review process similarly competitive to the main/highest track of this ranked conference. It is up to the author(s) to justify that a paper conforms to such criteria.

[3] To clarify things, a "*citation during the evaluation period*" is a citation that appeared in some paper published during the period, but may refer to one's paper which is much older than the evaluation period.

[4] The role of a "key collaborator" must be justified (e.g., a workpackage leader), and *not every* project member qualifies for such a role.

membership of an established international conference during the evaluation period is required. Further evaluated criteria, counting towards *A-level* performance, include investigation of international projects, especially within the Horizon Europe framework, PC membership or organization of top-level international conferences or schools, key invited lectures or tutorials at international conferences, workshops or schools, membership in grant panels, supervision of postdocs, etc.

For Assistants and Assistant Prof. (A,OA), the criteria are "shifted" by one level. That is, the *C-level* criteria are empty, the *B-level* criteria are as the C-level criteria for R,D,P above, and the *A-level* criteria are as the B-level criteria of the former.

Definition of a high-quality publication (FI MU)

For the purpose of academic evaluation at FI MU, and for the purpose of evaluation of doctoral students at FI MU, the following types of papers are considered as **high-quality publications**:

- A research paper published in a journal with *impact factor* that is listed in one of the SCIE, SSCI, or AHCI ranking (https://jcr.clarivate.com/jcr/browse-journals).
- A research paper published in a *standard session* (see the definition below) of a CS conference with the CORE rank or FI-rank *B or higher*, or
- a research paper *exceptionally* recognized by the Head of the department (or the Doctoral board in case of doctoral students) as equivalent to one of the two previous items - in such case necessary supporting material must be submitted by the author(s).

By being a "paper published in a **standard session**" of a conference we mean the conjunction of the following criteria:

a) It is a citable paper of length at least 4 pages, containing final results (e.g., not only "work in progress"), presented at the respective conference (can be an oral or a poster presentation), and published in the main proceedings of the conference. It is OK if the main proceedings of this conference consist of several volumes.
b) The session in which the considered paper is accepted belongs directly to the ranked conference (i.e., it is not an associated workshop or another co-located conference) and has been open for submissions from everyone (e.g., not a student/young session or a strictly local session of the conference).
c) The paper underwent in its session a standard review process fully comparable to the main/highest form of submission at the same conference. In particular, its review process has not been significantly shorter than that of any other sessions of the same conference, and the acceptance rate of its session has not been much higher than that of the main/highest session of the same conference.

The internal **FI-rank** of conferences is semi-automatically based on selected established conference ranks. As a result of this internal ranking, your conference papers in IS have been given special labels *"firank_1"(A*)*, *"firank_A"*, "*firank_B*", or nothing, which you should take as the source of your classification. If you want to claim a *rank-C* conference, then please check the CORE database for the rank yourself.

Ranks A or B are based on the CORE 2023 rank and the GGS Conference Rating. CORE 2023 is the primary source, but if GGS gives rank at least B and it is better than CORE, then GGS is used, and if a conference has h5-index at least 10 in Google Scholar, then it gets at least rank B. FI-rank A* is only CORE A*.