

**Faculty of Science Masaryk University Directive No. 5/2019****Process of Employee Evaluation at the Faculty of Science MU**

(effective as of 1st November 2022)

*In accordance with Act No. 111/1998 Sb., on Higher Education Institutions and the Modification and Amendment of Other Acts (Higher Education Act), as subsequently amended (hereinafter referred to as the "Higher Education Act"), I hereby issue this directive:*

Section 1  
**Initial Provisions**

- (1) This directive is issued to implement the MU directive No. 5/2017 – *Staff Evaluation* at the Faculty of Science Masaryk University (hereinafter referred to as the Faculty).
- (2) The directive specifies the process of individual employee performance assessment in the prior period, setup of short-term and long-term working plans and targets, and the identification of employee education and development needs.
- (3) Provisions of this directive apply to the employees whose main part of work is carried out at the Faculty, and whose employment relationship and associated matters are within the purview of the Dean of the Faculty or the Faculty Bursar. Methods of employee evaluation are specified for respective employees with regard to the profile of their position and the purpose for creating the position (project funding).
- (4) The head of the workplace that carries out the evaluation is, for this directive, defined as the direct superior of the employee as per the organisation regulations of the department/other workplace.

Section 2  
**Employee Evaluation Framework**

- (1) Regular employee evaluation, in line with the MU directive on staff evaluation, is an important instrument of personnel management for further employee development. In accordance with Section No. 302 a) of the Labour Code, superiors are obliged to assess employees' work performance and work results.
- (2) The performance evaluation result is one of the key aspects for the determination of employee's performance premium in the following period, eventually also for a performance bonus, in line with the MU Internal wage regulations and the Faculty instructions on wages of employees. Determination of the premium is based on employee's work results, the complexity of tasks performed, and/or employee's involvement in fulfilment of project-related activities. Furthermore, the quality of performed work is taken into consideration for contract extension or employees' further career development.
- (3) Employees have to be informed in a written form about evaluation criteria and evaluation scale set up for evaluation at their department/other workplace or dean's offices.
- (4) The direct superior is responsible for carrying out the evaluation. In situations, when the direct superior changed within the evaluated period, the former superior is also involved in

the employee evaluation. The head of the workplace always evaluates by following the evaluation criteria set for the respective department/other workplace or dean 's office.

- (5) The design of employee performance assessment takes into consideration the character of work performed by employees carrying out scientific and research activities. Their overall work performance and work results are evaluated in a long-term perspective, typically five years. It takes into consideration the department 's objectives related to the institutional evaluation by Methodology M17+ and employees' development plans. The yearly assessment of the fulfilment of work tasks is carried out in line with this directive.
- (6) The work performance of other Faculty employees is always evaluated yearly.
- (7) The purpose of the employee evaluation is a regular assessment of the main areas of work performed, including assessment of their development needs, adjustment of career plans, or work tasks plans for the following period.

The result of the overall employee evaluation is expressed by a rating scale (verbal or numerical one - at the discretion of the Head of Department or head of the other workplace), and, if needed and agreed upon, by employee's development plan. In accordance with the Faculty Career Code, the evaluation of employees is conducted for all employees regardless of the FTE. Career development plans are set up for employees taking into consideration their actual needs and professional seniority. These plans are mandatory for newly hired employees.

- (8) Process of employee evaluation consists of the following steps:
  - a) Completion of evaluation forms by both the employee (self-evaluation) and the head of the workplace. If needed, additional inputs relevant to the evaluation of the prior period shall be provided, and a development plan for the following period shall be proposed or revised.
  - b) Evaluation interviews (individual discussions with employees), which the evaluator can decide to waive in case the inputs provided by the employee are sufficient, and the employee evaluation rating is positive. However, if an employee requests the evaluation interview, it has to be granted. The employee is also entitled to access the evaluation records.
  - c) Employee 's approval of evaluation results, employee 's approval or disapproval with the evaluation process, or the final rating has to be provided.

### Section 3 Assessed Employees

- (1) Employee evaluation is conducted for the following employees:
  - I. They have been employed for at least six months and continue to be at the time of the evaluation.
  - II. They have not given their notice.
- (2) Employee evaluation is, in line with this directive, conducted for all employees except for non-academic employees employed to carry out project activities of the workplace, and typically founded by the grants.
- (3) The evaluation of non-academic employees employed to carry out project activities of the workplace, typically founded by the grants, can be conducted differently from this directive. Regular performance evaluation – fulfilment of work tasks and continuous feedback

concerning meeting the project milestones and project outputs that are subject to evaluation by the grant provider, or other subjects are the responsibility of the project lead. The right of an employee to request an individual employee interview or development plan is not affected.

- (4) (4) In the case of academic employees working 10 hours per week (0.25 FTE) or less, the Head of Department may decide to waive the evaluation in exceptional justified cases. The right of an individual employee to request an evaluation interview or development plan is not affected.
- (5) Evaluation of employees in the position of the Head of Department and Faculty Bursar are not subject to the process stated in this directive. Their assessment is within the competence of the Dean. Vice-deans are also evaluated in the scope of their agenda by the Dean.

#### Section 4

#### Principles of Evaluation and Their Implementation at the Faculty

- (1) In line with the MU directive on staff evaluation, the following principles apply in the assessment process:
  - a) Transparency – the system of regular evaluation of employees must be transparent (i.e., the evaluation criteria must be set clearly).
  - b) Equality – the evaluation criteria for employees with the same or similar posts within a workplace must be the same.
  - c) Adequacy – the evaluation of work performance must correspond to the assigned position, amount of workload, etc.
  - d) Comprehensive view – the work performances of individual employees must be reviewed comprehensively, i.e., all areas of the performance (e.g., including managerial work, etc.) must be considered.
  - e) Objectivity – the evaluation process must include not only concrete work outputs but also other objective external or internal circumstances that could affect the employee's performance in the evaluated period (e.g., other activities beneficial to the university, internships abroad, preparation of habilitation work, extraordinary personal situation, parental leave, etc.). This applies to both the evaluation of the prior period and setting future tasks and goals.
  - f) Openness – the evaluated employee must have the opportunity to express his/her opinion of the evaluation results.
  - g) Conclusiveness – a written record, summarizing the main conclusions, tasks and goals for the next period, including the personal and professional development plan, is made of the evaluation.
- (2) Following steps are implemented at the Faculty to support the above-mentioned principles of the evaluation process:
  - a) The employee performance evaluation criteria for respective groups of employees are described in Annexes No. 1 a 2. The direct superior can adjust or amend these criteria accordingly.
  - b) EVAK e-application is used for the evaluation and record-keeping. The structure of this application is described in Annex No. 3. There are quantifiable outputs, based on the data available in the internal MU databases (IS, ISEP), filled out automatically in the application for selected indicators in teaching and research.

A different form of evaluation can be used for employees without access to the computer. A written record must be provided.

- c) Direct superiors who conduct the evaluation will be in advance familiarized with the evaluation process, the EVAK e-application, and the evaluation schedule. Additional support, mainly training in communication and conducting an evaluation interview, will be provided to the evaluators, especially to evaluators new to this role.
- d) Direct superiors can request additional inputs and feedback from employee's co-workers (e.g., project leads, vice-deans, etc.) in order to ensure an adequate and comprehensive performance assessment with regards to the additional activities performed by an employee, a change of a position, or involvement in various projects.
- e) Expressions of disagreement with the results of an employee's evaluation shall be forwarded for resolution as follows:
  - a) Disagreements of academic and research staff (non-academic), see Dean's Directive 1/2019 [System of Positions and Job Titles SCI MU](#), are handled by the Vice Dean for Development and Quality.
  - b) Disagreements of support employees, see Dean's Directive 1/2019 [System of Positions and Job Titles SCI MU](#), are handled by the Faculty Bursar.
  - c) The employee's superiors are informed of the employee's expression of disagreement via system notification.
- f) If an employee's request for performance evaluation was denied by the superior, the employee can ask the superior next level up of the organisational structure for a further resolution.

Section 5  
Schedule of Employee Evaluation at the Faculty

(1) Employee evaluation will be conducted following this schedule:

	DATES	PROCESS PHASE	RESPONSIBLE
PREPARATION	15.1. -	Setting up EVAK tool for data collection – application set up based on the agreed-upon list of employees to be evaluated	HR Department Head of Department/other workplace/Faculty Bursar
	31.1.	Familiarizing the evaluators with the evaluation procedure and conducting evaluation interviews. Individual adjustments of EVAK forms at workplaces	Direct superiors
REALIZATION	1.2.	The start of the evaluation, and data and inputs collection in the evaluation forms	Employees Direct superiors
	till 1.3.	Inputs review, the start of evaluation interviews	Direct superiors
	till 15.4.	Familiarizing employees with the evaluation results; approval by employees	Direct superiors Employees
	till 30.4.	Resolution of disagreements	Dean of the Faculty

OUTPUTS	till 31.5.	Submitting proposals for performance premiums for the following period to the HR department and the Faculty management, including the details from the conducted evaluation	Heads of Departments/other workplaces
		Review of the evaluation status in the EVAK application	HR Department

Section 6  
**Temporary Provisions**

- (1) The employee evaluation, in line with this directive, will start in 2021. The preparation phase is going to take place in 2020.
- (2) In order to conduct adequate academic and research employees' evaluation in the EVAK e-application, it is necessary to ensure that correct data in relevant databases providing entries to the application are available – see the description of recommended indicators in Annex 1. The Heads of Departments shall ensure the correctness and completeness of these data and their entry into the databases no later than the start of the yearly evaluation in line with this directive.

Section 7  
**Concluding Provisions**

- (1) Interpretation of this directive and its updates are the responsibility of the Vice-Dean for Development and Quality (for academic employees) and the Faculty Bursar (for non-academic employees).
- (2) Verification of compliance with this directive is the responsibility of the Head of the HR Department.
- (3) Following annexes are an integral part of this directive:
  - No. 1 - Recommendations for academic and research employees' evaluation
  - No. 2 - Recommendations for support employees' evaluation
  - No. 3 - Structure of the EVAK e-application
- (4) This Directive is effective from the day of its publishing and enters into force on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2022.

Brno, 1<sup>st</sup> November 2022

Prof. Mgr. Tomáš Kašparovský, Ph.D.  
Dean

## Annex No. 1 Recommendations for academic and research employees' evaluation

Main areas of responsibility that are subject of the performance evaluation of academic and research employees are:

- I. Teaching
- II. Science and Research
- III. Organisational activities
- IV. Work behaviour

Specific evaluation criteria (recommended EVAK indicators) are setup for employees with regards to their position profiles and job duties, in line with the Faculty System of Positions and Job Titles (e.g. employees working as Lecturers are evaluated only in the area of teaching).

Pedagogy	Domains: <b>Volume of teaching, Quality of teaching</b> (indicatory as per the students' course evaluation), <b>Thesis supervisory, Advancement of teaching.</b>	
Recommended EVAK indicator	EVAK indicator description (values loading)	Note
<b>Number of courses featuring the employee</b>	Courses listing the employee as lecturer, seminar tutor, alternate examiner or assistant during the evaluated period are included in the calculation. At least one student must be enrolled in the course.	
<b>Number of lessons scheduled according to the lecture timetable</b>	Courses listing the employee as lecturer during the evaluated period are included in the calculation. Only lessons recorded in the faculty Lesson plan are taken into account. Each commenced lesson is counted. In case the employee teaches e.g. from 7:40 to 9:15, a total of 2 lessons are counted. An employee is only recorded once per lesson, even in the case of e.g. parallel teaching in several lecture rooms.	If the lecturer is specified for a concrete lecture in the Lesson plan, lecture hours will be considered only for this lecturer, though there are more lecturers assigned to the subject.
<b>Number of lessons of seminar teaching (workshops, laboratory work, etc.) according to the lecture timetable</b>	Course seminar groups listing the employee as seminar tutor during the evaluated period are included in the calculation. Only lessons recorded in the faculty Lesson plan are taken into account. Each commenced lesson is counted. In case the employee teaches e.g. from 7:40 to 9:15, a total of 2 lessons are counted. An employee is only recorded once per lesson, even in the case of e.g. parallel teaching in several lecture rooms.	If the lecturer is specified for a concrete lecture in the Lesson plan, lecture hours will be considered only for this lecturer, though there are more lecturers assigned to the subject.
<b>Number of supervised Bachelor's theses</b>	Bachelor's theses listing the employee as supervisor are counted. These are taken into account from initial topic registration to thesis delivery.	
<b>Number of supervised Master's theses</b>	Master's theses listing the employee as supervisor are counted. These are taken into account from initial topic registration to thesis delivery.	
<b>Number of doctoral candidates</b>	Doctoral candidates who have studied with the employee (listed as supervisor) for at least one day of the evaluated period are taken into account. Each student is counted only once in the evaluated period. Data are automatically generated by the Basic Information on Doctoral Studies IS MU application.	
<b>Outstanding doctoral candidates</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Please list outstanding doctoral candidates you supervise or have substantially collaborated with who have achieved extraordinary results. Please provide a justification for your choice.	
<b>Number of Bachelor's/Master's /doctoral/advanced Master's/habilitation theses reviews</b>	Number of Bachelor's/Master's/doctoral/advanced Master's/habilitation theses listing the employee as reviewer. A thesis review is counted only in case a reviewer's report file was created in the thesis archive by the employee.	An overview of considered thesis sorted by their type (bachelor, master, ect.) will display in the part "Specify".

<b>Students evaluate understandability of a teacher's lectures</b>	Average value of course opinion poll ratings in the "The teacher's presentation of the subject matter was always clearly intelligible." category for all courses taught by the employee in the evaluated period. Student responses are converted to numerical values on a scale ranging from 1 to 6; a higher value constitutes a better rating (strongly agree – 6, agree – 5, somewhat agree – 4, somewhat disagree – 3, disagree – 2, strongly disagree – 1). In case "no answer" is provided, the response is not taken into account. Survey completion is not compulsory for students.	
<b>Teaching innovation</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Provide a list of innovations introduced in courses you taught in the evaluated period (e.g. new teaching methods, innovative teaching aids, innovated study content, interdisciplinary outreach, internationalization – development of study resources in English, introduction of ICT components in teaching).	

<b>Science and Research</b>	Domains: <b>Publications, Other research results, Ensuring research fundings Development of research cooperation.</b> International impact of research work is indicated by the achievements in international publications and international research grants.	
<b>Recommended EVAK indicator</b>	<b>EVAK indicator description (values loading)</b>	<b>Note</b>
<b>Number of articles in scholarly journals</b>	Type J results (articles in scholarly journals regardless of their inclusion in databases such as WoS, SCOPUS or ERIH) issued (utilized) in the evaluated period and marked for RIV inclusion are counted.	Details about journals (e.g. name of the journal, impact factor) will display in part "Specify".
<b>Number of scholarly book publications and chapters in scholarly book publications</b>	Type B and C results issued (utilized) in the evaluated period and marked for RIV inclusion are counted.	Specification of the result type B/C will display in part "Specify".
<b>Number of articles published in proceedings</b>	Type D results issued (utilized) in the evaluated period and marked for RIV inclusion are counted.	
<b>Number of applied results</b>	Type V, P, H, Z, G, F, N, R results issued (utilized) in the evaluated period and marked for RIV inclusion are counted.	Concrete types of applied results will display in the part "Specify".
<b>Most significant scientific results</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Please list no more than three scientific results you (co)authored during the evaluated period. Please provide a justification for your choice.	
<b>Number of implemented projects</b>	Number of projects listing the employee as principal investigator, co-principal investigator or team member during the evaluated period. Only external projects which do not feature Masaryk University as an investor are counted. An individual project is counted in each calendar year of its implementation within the evaluated period.	Information about the grant provider (e.g. EU, MŠMT) will display in the part "Specify".
<b>Number of newly processed project proposals</b>	Number of project proposals listing the employee as proposer, principal investigator or co-principal investigator during the evaluated period. The project proposal is counted in case its ISEP status is either "submitted for approval" or "approved at MU and submitted for the investor's approval" during the evaluated period. The project is counted once for the entire evaluated period.	Information about the grant provider (e.g. EU, MŠMT) will display in the part "Specify".
<b>Awards conferred by the academic community</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Provide a list of awards conferred by the academic community during the evaluated period. Please list a value indicating the number of awards conferred by the academic community.	

<b>Organisational</b>	Indicative overview of appointed faculty or university activities/functions or other expert activities. Assessment of activities in <b>popularization of science and teaching.</b>	
<b>Recommended EVAK indicator</b>	<b>EVAK indicator description (values loading)</b>	<b>Note</b>
<b>Senior employee</b>	Number of senior positions held in the evaluated period. The following positions are applicable: Rector, vice-rector, dean, vice-dean or senior employee (institute director, department head, division head, etc.).	Details about the position held (start date) will display in part "Specify".
<b>Board membership</b>	Number of boards listing the employee as a chair or member during the evaluated period. The employee is associated with a given board/committee only once per evaluated period. The following boards are counted: doctoral board; doctoral committee; MU Scientific Board; faculty scientific board; MU Academic Senate; faculty academic senate; final state examination board for Bachelor's, Master's and doctoral studies; thesis defence board for Bachelor's, Master's and doctoral theses; MU habilitation board; MU evaluation board.	Details on the memberships in different faculty/university boards will display in part "Specify".
<b>Promotional events (teaching)</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Provide a list of events dedicated to promote studies at MU which you contributed to during the evaluated period (e.g. open days, education fairs, etc.). Please list a value indicating the number of such promotional events.	
<b>Awards conferred by the academic community</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Provide a list of awards conferred by the academic community during the evaluated period. Please list a value indicating the number of awards conferred by the academic community.	
<b>Popularisation of science</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Provide a list of events to which you contributed to during the evaluated period (e.g. open days, education fairs, etc.). Please list a value indicating the number of such activities.	

<b>Personal</b>	Assessment of the quality of performed working tasks, competencies and work behaviour.	
<b>Recommended EVAK indicator</b>	<b>EVAK indicator description (values loading)</b>	
<b>Employee's competence and expertise</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Assess your skills and expertise in performing your work, highlighting your strengths and weaknesses.	
<b>Employee initiative</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Assess your work initiative and provide examples of actions you initiated with respect to entrusted agendas.	
<b>Employee motivation</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Describe which activities you personally find most/least fulfilling in your current position. Please indicate what kind of support from the head of your unit/employer might help increase your performance and motivation with respect to activities carried out in the evaluated period.	
<b>Collaboration and communication</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Describe your involvement in work conducted within your workplace (e.g. division or department), at your constituent part of MU (e.g. faculty) and at other constituent parts of the university in the evaluated period, specifying your personal experience with this work format (whether it suits you, whether you have encountered any obstacles or whether you have suggestions for improvements, etc.). Please also list your collaborations with external institutions and assess results you achieved thanks to these contacts.	
<b>Room for improvement of the employee</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Please indicate any areas with potential room for improvement and suggest relevant solutions (e.g. training, internships, etc.) or describe obstacles which hinder improvement.	



## Annex No. 2 Recommendations for support employees' evaluation

Support employees assessed by the EVAK application are mainly, in line with Section No. 3 of this directive, support employees on technical, operational and administrative positions.

Their performance assessment is focused on the quality of performed working tasks, competencies and work behaviour.

Concrete criteria of evaluation (recommended EVAK indicators) are setup for employees with regards to their position profiles and job duties, in line with the Faculty System of Positions and Job Titles.

<b>Personal</b>	Assessment of the quality of performed working tasks, competencies and work behaviour.
<b>Recommended EVAK indicator</b>	<b>EVAK indicator description (values loading)</b>
<b>Employee's competence and expertise</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Assess your skills and expertise in performing your work, highlighting your strengths and weaknesses.
<b>Employee initiative</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Assess your work initiative and provide examples of actions you initiated with respect to entrusted agendas.
<b>Employee motivation</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Describe which activities you personally find most/least fulfilling in your current position. Please indicate what kind of support from the head of your unit/employer might help increase your performance and motivation with respect to activities carried out in the evaluated period.
<b>Collaboration and communication</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Describe your involvement in work conducted within your workplace (e.g. division or department), at your constituent part of MU (e.g. faculty) and at other constituent parts of the university in the evaluated period, specifying your personal experience with this work format (whether it suits you, whether you have encountered any obstacles or whether you have suggestions for improvements, etc.). Please also list your collaborations with external institutions and assess results you achieved thanks to these contacts.
<b>Room for improvement of the employee</b>	Unable to generate from IS. Please indicate any areas with potential room for improvement and suggest relevant solutions (e.g. training, internships, etc.) or describe obstacles which hinder improvement.

A simplified template can be used to evaluate certain positions of support employees.

<b>Personal</b>	<b>Assessment of the quality of performed working tasks, competencies and work behaviour.</b>
<b>Recommended EVAK indicator</b>	
Do you follow the set working hours and workplace rules?	
Are you diligent and responsible in your work?	
How do you get along with colleagues and other staff in your workplace?	
Which of your work activities fulfill you? Which ones are less fulfilling?	
Have you proposed anything new in the past year that was seen as beneficial in the workplace?	
In which of your work activities would you like to improve? What would help you to do so?	

### **Annex No. 3 Structure of the EVAK e-application**

The EVAK application is a supporting tool for recording respective steps of evaluation process which enables to collect the data in the evaluation form, to carry out basic evaluation and to archive the data.

The record-keeping form in the application is divided into several sections that can be edited or commented by the employee or evaluator (including the automatically generated data):

#### **Section Pedagogy, Science, Organisational:**

- To collect data about the performance of academic and research employees in the main areas of their scope of work. To conduct the evaluation in these areas, criteria (indicators) are pre-set for the employees in line with this directive, these criteria can be edited or amended by the evaluator. If relevant, the application collects available data for selected indicators and also processes a basic evaluation as per the selected variable (e.g. size of FTE, position, indicator importance). Both employee and evaluator can edit generated data or provide a comment.

#### **Section Personal**

- To assess the selected areas of work behaviour and competencies – used mainly in assessment of non-academic employees.

#### **Section Final evaluation**

- Assessment of an employee's performance in a past period – assessment of work achievements and fulfilment of the duties (successes/failures, professional development, career growth, overall performance evaluation)
- Plans for an upcoming period – a setup for work activities (development/career growth/work activity plans)

A final part of this section is **employee's comment on conclusions of evaluation.**

The following manual is available for working with the EVAK e-application:

[https://is.muni.cz/auth/do/rect/metodika/personal/35019432/10\\_evak/Employee\\_manual\\_for\\_the\\_EVAK\\_application\\_in\\_IS\\_MU\\_2022\\_EN.pdf](https://is.muni.cz/auth/do/rect/metodika/personal/35019432/10_evak/Employee_manual_for_the_EVAK_application_in_IS_MU_2022_EN.pdf)