

Charles University

Rector's Directive No. 17/2024

Name: Strategy for the Evaluation of Creative Activities at Charles University for the period from 2019 to 2023

Lead Office:
Research Support Office

Effect:
26 March 2024

Strategy for the Evaluation of Creative Activities at Charles University for the period from 2019 to 2023

Part I FUNDAMENTAL PROVISIONS

Article 1 Introductory Provisions

1. In accordance with its aim¹, Charles University (hereinafter referred to as the “University”) strives continually to increase the quality of scientific and research activities, developmental and innovative activities, and artistic and other creative activities (hereinafter referred to as the “creative activities”).
2. In order to support the development of a wide range of fields at the Faculties and higher education institutes (hereinafter referred to as the “units”), to help them meet the level of international standards according to the Strategic Plan of Charles University for 2021-2025,² and to strengthen the position of the University as an important European research institution, the University has introduced the evaluation of creative activities (hereinafter referred to as the “evaluation”) in accordance with Article 7 of the Rules for the System of Internal Evaluation and Quality Assurance of Charles University (hereinafter referred to as the “Rules”).
3. The evaluation also concerns an assessment of the progress in fulfilling the purposes of the Cooperatio Programme for the support of science and research (hereinafter referred to as the “Cooperatio Programme”) as set out in Article 6 of Rector’s Directive No. 22/2023, Principles of the Cooperatio Programme.³

Article 2 Basic Principles and Definition of the Evaluation

1. The aim of the evaluation is to obtain correct and verifiable information through international comparison with regard to the quality of the creative activities at the University and to form, on the basis of such information, recommendations for the future development of these activities.
2. The evaluation is carried out for a period which is defined by entire calendar years, specifically for the period from 2019 to 2023.
3. The evaluation is carried out in accordance with international activities relating to the responsible evaluation of creative activities (internationally it is known as *responsible research* assessment as described in *Agreement on Reforming Research*⁴, to which the University is a signatory and the fulfilment of which is the aim of the *Coalition for Advancing Research Assessment (CoARA)*, of which the University is a member. It is, therefore, based primarily on qualitative assessment and recognizes the diversity of research activities. It is independent and transparent.
4. The unit of evaluation is research areas, according to the structure of the University Cooperation Programme (hereinafter referred to as the “research areas”).⁵
5. The course of the evaluation is governed by the schedule which forms Appendix No. 1 to this Directive.

Part II

¹ Article 2 (1) of the Constitution of Charles University, as amended.

² <https://cuni.cz/UK-11185.html>

³ Rector’s Directive No. 22/2023, Principles of the Cooperatio Programme.

⁴ https://coara.eu/app/uploads/2022/09/2022_07_19_rra_agreement_final.pdf.

⁵ Rector’s Directive No. 22/2023, Principles of the Cooperatio Programme.

ORGANIZATION OF THE EVALUATION

Article 3

Creative Activities Evaluation Board

1. The Creative Activities Evaluation Board (hereinafter referred to as the “Board”) is the supreme body governing the evaluation procedure.
2. The responsibilities of the Board are, in particular:
 - a) to supervise the course of the evaluation from the point of view of compliance with its principles, rules, and organization;
 - b) to notify, if necessary, the panelists of any deficiencies, in particular of any factually incorrect information, internal contradictions, or differences in requirements made in evaluating the level of individual research areas;
 - c) to decide on contentious issues;
 - d) to participate in On-Site Visits according to the conditions set out in Article 10 of this Directive;
 - e) to carry out the calibration of evaluations proposed by the Panels, to prepare a Summary Evaluation Report on a given research field, and to award the final grade on the basis of the grading scale provided in Appendix No. 2 to this Directive; and
 - f) to prepare the Summary Final Report and submit it to the Rector of the University according to Article 13 of this Directive.
3. The following provisions apply to the establishment of the Board:
 - a) Its composition guarantees professional competence for evaluating research areas;
 - b) Its members are eminent scientists working abroad; and
 - c) The members are not in a conflict of interest with regard to the evaluated research areas and units (see Appendix No. 3 to this Directive).
4. The members of the Board are appointed and removed by the Rector of the University after a prior discussion in the Research Board of the University.
5. The meetings of the Board are governed by the code of procedure which is approved by the Board.
6. The first meeting of the Board is convened by the Rector of the University.
7. A meeting of the Board may be attended by a member of the Internal Evaluation Board of the University who will be in the role of an observer.

Article 4

Expert Panels

1. The main executive component of the evaluation procedure are Expert Panels (hereinafter referred to as the “Panel”). The following Panels are established on the basis of the structure of the research areas:
 - a) Humanities;
 - b) Social Sciences;
 - c) Medicine; and
 - d) Natural Sciences.
2. The following provisions apply to the establishment of a Panel:
 - a) The number of its members is derived from the number of research areas which fall within its competence;
 - b) Its members are eminent scientists working abroad; and
 - c) Its members are not in a conflict of interest with regard to the evaluated research areas and units (see Appendix No. 3 to this Directive).
3. The chairpersons and deputy chairpersons of the Panels are appointed and removed by the Rector of the University from among the members of the Board.
4. Other members of the Panels are appointed and removed by the Rector of the University.
5. The Internal Evaluation Board of the University nominates one member for every Panel who may participate in the meetings of the Panel in the role of an observer.

6. The division of the research areas between the Panels corresponds to the internal classification of the University⁶.
7. The Panels carry out the evaluation of the level of the research areas on the basis of the individual evaluation tools, in particular the Self-Evaluation Reports of the Research Areas⁷ (hereinafter referred to as the “Self-Evaluation Reports”).
8. The evaluation of the level of the research areas by the individual Panels results in the preparation of written assessments and a proposal for the overall grade for the given research area according to Article 11 of this Directive. These outputs are submitted to the Board and the Board of the Research Area.

Article 5 Research Area Boards

1. The Research Area Board (hereinafter referred to as the “RA Board”)⁸ is responsible for the preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report according to the form specified in Appendix No. 4 to this Directive.
2. The coordinator of the RA Board⁹ ensures the cooperation of its members from all units involved in a given research area.
3. The members of the RA Board communicate with the management of the individual units while working on the Self-Evaluation Report.
4. The RA Board submits the Self-Evaluation Report for consideration to the research boards of the relevant participating units or possibly to analogous bodies of these units and incorporates their comments. Once the text of the Self-Evaluation Report has been discussed, the RA Board presents the Self-Evaluation Report for opinion and final approval to the Dean/director of the relevant unit.
5. The RA Board answers additional questions of the Panels regarding the Self-Evaluation Report.
6. The RA Board participates in On-Site Visits with the members of the Board.

Article 6 Units

1. The units provide the cooperation necessary to ensure the course of the evaluation according to the requirements set out in this Directive; in particular:
 - a) They participate in ensuring that the information on the basis of which the evaluation is carried out is correct and complete;
 - b) They cooperate with the RA Board in preparing the Self-Evaluation Report; and
 - c) Their representatives participate in On-Site Visits with the members of the Board.
2. The units may submit motions to the Board regarding any non-compliance with the evaluation rules or their violation.

Article 7 Administrative and Technical Support

1. Administrative and technical support for the evaluation on the University level is provided by:
 - a) The Research Support Office of the Rectorate of the University (hereinafter referred to as the “RSO”);

⁶ Part II of Rector’s Directive No. 40/2021, Registration of Creative Activities, Projects and Employee’s Mobility at Charles University.

⁷ Report discussed in Article 7 (9-16) of the Rules.

⁸ Articles 7 to 10 of Rector’s Directive No. 22/2023, Principles of the Cooperatio Programme.

⁹ Ibid.

- b) Analyses and Strategies Department of the Rectorate of the University (hereinafter referred to as the “ASD”); and
 - c) Computer Science Centre of the University (hereinafter referred to as the “CSC”).
2. The RSO is responsible for:
 - a) Providing guidance for the participants in the evaluation who include the Board members, the Panel members, the RA Board members, and the representatives of the evaluated units;
 - b) Providing facilities for the activities of the Board and the Panels;
 - c) Preparing a document containing summary information and basic data on the University according to Article 8 of this Directive;
 - d) Providing support during the organization of On-Site Visits according to Article 10 of this Directive; and
 - e) Preparing contracts for cooperation with the members of the Board and the Panels.
 3. The ASD is responsible for:
 - a) Processing of bibliometric data given in a Self-Evaluation Report (see Appendix No. 5 to this Directive); and
 - b) Processing of data for the calculation of the weights used for the purpose of converting the grades of the research areas to the units involved according to Appendix No. 6 to this Directive.
 4. The CSC is responsible for:
 - a) Preparation of data for the creative activities indicators listed in the Self-Evaluation Report (see Appendix No. 5 to this Directive),
 - b) Preparation of data for the calculation of the weights used for the purpose of converting the grades of the research areas to the units involved according to Appendix No. 6 to this Directive; and
 - c) Providing technical support for the units in recording data in the “Věda” information system database which are used in the course of the evaluation.

Part III EVALUATION TOOLS

Article 8

Summary Information and Basic Data of the University

1. Summary information and basic data of the University are presented to the evaluators in the form of a document which contains the following information and overviews:
 - a) Basic information about the University;
 - b) Organizational structure of the University; and
 - c) Summary overviews:
 - i. of the persons participating in creative activities;
 - ii. of the outputs of creative activities;
 - iii. of the basic financial indicators; and
 - iv. of the doctoral programmes of study and numbers of students and graduates of these programmes.
2. This document is prepared on the level of the Rectorate of the University and presented to the Panels and the Board.

Article 9

Self-Evaluation Report of a Research Area

1. The Self-Evaluation Report of the Research Area (hereinafter referred to as the “Self-Evaluation Report” or “Report”) is prepared by the RA Board according to the template which forms Appendix No. 4 to this Directive and with regard to the division of the research areas into the relevant categories according to Appendix No. 7 to this Directive.
2. The Report is prepared in the English language.

3. The Report describes and provides a commentary on:
 - a) The basic data of the given research area, i.e., its structure, cooperation within the University, publication structure, objectives in the field of creative activities, etc.;
 - b) The staffing situation in the research area, with an emphasis on junior researchers and the listing of key persons;
 - c) The outputs of the creative activities, including the listing of specific outputs and comments on them;
 - d) The financial means provided for the research area, including the listing of the most important investigated grants and projects;
 - e) The applied research and societal impact of creative activities in the given research area, including the listing of the most important results, their impact, and application;
 - f) The strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and risks in the given research area; and
 - g) The aim of further development of creative activities in the research area.
4. The Report includes key data indicators on which the RA Board provides a commentary. These indicators are prepared according to the methodology set out in Appendix No. 5 to this Directive.
5. The Report is discussed by the research boards of the relevant units and approved by the deans/directors of all units involved in the given research area before it is submitted to the RSO which provides it to the Panels.

Article 10 On-Site Visit

1. The Board organizes an On-Site Visit in order to complete the source documents necessary for a proper evaluation of the level of the research area.
2. An On-Site Visit is attended by the members of the Board sitting on the relevant Panel, the members of the RA Board, and the representatives of each unit involved in the evaluated research area, as well as by the observer sitting on the relevant Panel who is nominated by the Internal Evaluation Board of the University according to Article 4 (5) of this Directive.
3. All information relating to an On-Site Visit, including the details and subject matter of the meeting, is provided to the RA Boards and units by the Board sufficiently in advance, usually one month before the On-Site Visit is to take place.

Part IV EVALUATION OUTPUTS

Article 11 Written Assessments of the Research Areas

1. At least two written assessments are prepared for each research area, giving component grades for the individual parts of the Self-Evaluation Report and summary grades, as well as at least two additional evaluations in the form of component and summary grades without written assessments.
2. The assessments are prepared by the assigned members of the Panel on the basis of their review of the Self-Evaluation Report.
3. The assessments and grades are discussed by the Panel and an overall grade for the given research area is proposed on the basis thereof. The overall grade is based on the arithmetic mean of all the summary grades proposed by the main and secondary panelists, excluding the single worst grade proposed and allowing a possible adjustment by one intermediate grade based on the Panel's decision and justification (the grading scale and the grading range are described in Appendix No. 2 to this Directive).
4. The assessments are prepared in the English language.
5. The assessments and grades are submitted to the Board and the RA Board prior to the On-Site Visit.

6. Grades are awarded according to the grading scale which forms Appendix No. 2 to this Directive.

Article 12
Summary Evaluation Report on a Research Area

1. The Board will prepare a Summary Evaluation Report on each research area evaluated.
2. The Summary Evaluation Report on each individual research area is based on the written assessments of the panelists and on the discussion held during the On-Site Visit.
3. The Summary Evaluation Report on a given research area includes the final grade for the research area which, based on a justification, may be adjusted by the Board by one intermediate grade from the overall grade proposed by the Panel.
4. The Summary Evaluation Reports on the individual research areas form an appendix to the Summary Final Report for the University as required by Article 13 of this Directive.

Article 13
Summary Final Report on the Evaluation of Creative Activities at the University

1. The Board will prepare a Summary Final Report on the Evaluation of Creative Activities at the University which will summarize the evaluation process and its main outputs.
2. The Summary Final Report on the Evaluation of Creative Activities at the University also includes recommendations for further development of creative activities at the University.
3. The Summary Final Report on the Evaluation of Creative Activities at the University is submitted by the Board to the Rector of the University, upon whose proposal it is further discussed by the International Board of the University, the Research Board of the University, and the Internal Evaluation Board of the University.
4. The Summary Final Report on the Evaluation of Creative Activities at the University is made available to the members of the academic community after it has been discussed by the University bodies according to paragraph 3, and its main conclusions are published in the publicly accessible part of the University website.
5. The evaluation results presented in the Summary Final Report on the Evaluation of Creative Activities at the University are used as sources for:
 - a) The preparation of strategic documents;,
 - b) The development of fields and research areas;
 - c) The internal governance of the University and its units;
 - d) The preparation of programmes for the support of science in accordance with Article 7 (1) to (5) of the Rules;
 - e) Decision-making on the funding of creative activities from the resources of institutional support;¹⁰
 - f) Support for excellence; and,
 - g) The development of the University's educational activities.

Part V
FINAL PROVISIONS
Article 14

1. The methodology set out in Appendix No. 6 will be followed for the conversion of the overall grades of the research areas to the units involved.
2. The following appendices form an integral part of this Directive:
 - a) Appendix No. 1 – Schedule of the Evaluation Process;
 - b) Appendix No. 2 – Grading Scale for the Evaluation of a Research Area;

¹⁰ Section 3 (3) (a) of Act No. 130/2002 Sb. to regulate support of research, experimental development, and innovations from public resources and to change other laws, as amended.

- c) Appendix No. 3 – Conflict of Interest of Participants in the Evaluation;
 - d) Appendix No. 4 – Template for the Preparation of a Self-Evaluation Report;
 - e) Appendix No. 5 – Methodological Rules for the Development of Creative Activities Indicators;
 - f) Appendix No. 6 – Conversion of Research Area Grades to the Units Involved; and
 - g) Appendix No. 7 – Division of the Research Areas into Categories.
3. The Internal Evaluation Board of Charles University gave its opinion on the draft of this Directive on 28 February 2024 in accordance with the provision of Article 7 (19) of the Rules.
 4. This Directive comes into force on the day of its signature and into effect on 26 March 2024.

In Prague on 22 March 2024

Prof. MUDr. Milena Králíčková, Ph.D.
Rector of Charles University

Appendix No. 1 – Schedule of the Evaluation Process

The progress of the evaluation from the point of view of the evaluators:

- By 30 June 2024
 - Establishment of the Creative Activities Evaluation Board – to be appointed by the Rector.
- By 15 November 2024
 - Establishment of the Expert Panels – to be appointed by the Rector.
- By 30 November 2024
 - Kick-off meeting of the Board.
 - Selection of at least 2 main panelists for each research area who will prepare written assessments.
 - Selection of at least 2 secondary panelists who will grade the research areas.
- 1 December 2024 – 15 January 2025
 - The panelists for the given research area will read the Self-Evaluation Report in detail and, if necessary, they will submit additional questions and forward them to the RA Board coordinators.
- 1 March – 30 April 2025
 - The main panelists will prepare written assessments on the given research area and propose component grades and a summary grade.
 - The secondary panelists will propose component grades and a summary grade for the research area; they will not prepare a written assessment.
 - The panel will propose an overall grade for the research area.
- 1 – 31 May 2025
 - Evaluation by the Panel – During the meeting, the Panel will discuss the assessments and the proposed overall grades for all research areas within the competence of the Panel.
 - The Panel may propose a change in the overall grade by up to one intermediate grade but must provide a justification for such a step.
 - The Panel will record any possible questions for discussion during the On-Site Visit.
- 1 May – 30 June 2025
 - On-Site Visit to the leading unit in the given research area.
 - Any discussions held will be evaluated in a closed meeting of the Board and the overall grade of the research area will be adjusted, if necessary, by a maximum of one intermediate grade with justification.
- By 30 September 2025
 - The Board will prepare a Summary Evaluation Report on each research area.
- By 31 October 2025
 - The Board will prepare a Summary Final Report on the Evaluation of Creative Activities at the University.
- By 30 November 2025
 - Completion of the evaluation and publication of the results.
- By 31 December 2025
 - Discussion in the Rector's Board, the extended Rector's Board, the Internal Evaluation Board of the University, the Academic Senate of the University, and the Research Board of the University (at the next meeting of the bodies after the evaluation has been completed).
 - Submission of the results of the evaluation for consideration in the breakdown of contributions and subsidies at the University for 2026.

The progress of the evaluation from the point of view of the evaluated research areas:

- 6 March – 30 November 2024
 - Preparation of the Self-Evaluation Report of the Research Area, and discussion of the Self-Evaluation Report by the research boards or analogous bodies of all units involved in the given research area.
- By 30 November 2024
 - The deans/directors of the units will approve the final Self-Evaluation Report. After their approval, the Self-Evaluation Report will be submitted by the RA Board coordinator to the Research Support Office at the Rectorate.
- 1 – 28 February 2025
 - The RA Boards will address additional questions from the Panel in the form of an appendix to the Self-Evaluation Report
- 1 May – 30 June 2025
 - The RA Boards and the representatives of the units will participate in the On-Site Visit convened by the Board.

Appendix No. 2 – Grading Scale for the Evaluation of a Research Area

The level of a research area is determined by awarding it a grade on the scale of A-D, including the possibility of using two intermediate grades between the individual letters, as follows: A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D+, D. The individual grades are described as follows:

Grade A - Excellent research area

The research area has results of an excellent or very good standard in all the evaluated criteria in a comparison across Europe. It has a sufficient number of internationally visible individuals, the production of high-quality outputs is commensurate with its size, and there are no cases of problematic outputs or research activities. The quality of an excellent research area is fully in line with that of the corresponding fields and areas at first-rate European universities.

Grade B - Very good research area

The research area has very good results in all the evaluated criteria and the results are on the level of a very good standard of high-quality European universities. The production of high-quality outputs is commensurate with the size of the research area and there are no, or almost no, cases of problematic outputs or research activities. The quality of a very good research area tends to come close to the level of the corresponding fields and research areas at first-rate European universities.

Grade C - Good research area

The research area has good results in all the evaluated criteria. The best results of a standard research area match the level of the corresponding fields at high-quality European universities but such results are not predominant.

Not competitive research area, D

With minor exceptions, the research area has average or below-average results in the evaluated criteria. In an international comparison, the research area lags behind the level of the corresponding fields and research areas at first-rate European universities.

Appendix No. 3 – Conflict of Interest of Participants in the Evaluation

Definition of a conflict of interest

For the purposes of evaluating creative activities, the following situations in particular are considered a conflict of interest. If a member of the Panel:

1. Has been involved in the preparation of or is the author or co-author of the outputs which he should evaluate;
2. Has been involved in the preparation or investigation of a joint research project with members involved in the evaluated research area or unit involved in the evaluated research area;
3. Has a close family (e.g., spouse or partner) or other close personal relationship with a person who is an author or co-author of the evaluated outputs or with a person who is evaluated personally or is a member of the board of the evaluated research area;
4. Is involved in any way in the management of the evaluated research area or of a unit involved in the evaluated research area;
5. Has an employment relationship with a unit which is involved in the research area which he should evaluate;
6. Has or has had a relationship of scientific rivalry or professional enmity with the author of the outputs which are being evaluated or with the person who is being evaluated or with the member of the board of the evaluated research area; and
7. Is a graduate of a programme of study implemented in a unit which is involved in the evaluated research area.

Procedure in the case of a conflict of interest

1. Upon notification by a member of the Panel, research area, or unit, the Board will decide whether there is a situation which could call into question the evaluator's ability to independently evaluate the research area or its outputs.
2. If it is revealed during an evaluation that an evaluator has deliberately concealed a conflict of interest, the evaluator will be immediately removed from the evaluation by the Board and any recommendations or opinions in which he participated will be subject to a review.

Appendix No. 4 - Template for the Preparation of a Self-Evaluation Report

SELF-EVALUATION REPORT 2019–2023

Content:

- 1/ BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESEARCH AREA (up to 5 pages)
- 2/ PERSONNEL SITUATION (up to 3 pages)
- 3/ RESEARCH OUTPUTS (up to 3 pages)
- 4/ RESEARCH FUNDING, SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION (up to 3 pages)
- 5/ IMPACT OF RESEARCH (up to 2 pages)

1. BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESEARCH AREA (RA) – to give a context in which the given RA operates (up to 5 pages)

Description of the RA

- research fields structure within the RA
- faculties'/units' cooperation within the RA (*underlying data provided centrally by the rectorate*)
- research strategy, decision-makers
- uniqueness and importance of the RA for and within the university (also on national/international scale)
- possible publication structure specifics within the RA, perceived relevant outputs and outlets
- infrastructure for research, Open Science

RA during the evaluated period

- advancements/progress of the RA in the evaluated period
- reflection of the previous evaluation (2014-2018) if applicable
- key topics and key research teams within the RA (possibly within particular fields)
- reflection of the RA in a European/international (e.g. 4EU+)/benchmark/ context

SWOT analysis

- bullet list of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats
- actions, measures and comments on how to deal with the weaknesses and potential threats
- vision for the future - goals, strategies, measures, actions etc. for the future of the RA

2. PERSONNEL SITUATION (up to 3 pages)

Distribution of employees

- distribution of academic staff with respect to different stages of career, age distribution, gender distribution, and nationality (domestic-international) distribution with commentary (*underlying data provided centrally by the rectorate*)

Key researchers

- up to XX key personalities (their impact, position in the international community, leadership) - general comment, plus details in a structured appendix

Junior researchers

- number of Ph.D. students during the evaluated years, comparison to senior staff (*underlying data provided centrally by the rectorate*)
- international young researchers, strategy towards internationalization of young researchers
- up to XX young leaders (up to 8 years after finishing Ph.D.) - leadership, research topics, successes (general comment, plus details in a structured appendix)

Other comments

- approaches towards inbreeding

- alumni - e.g. graduates who continue as postdocs at prestigious foreign universities, innovators, start-ups

3. RESEARCH OUTPUTS (up to 3 pages)

Summary of the research outputs/outcomes

- distribution of research outputs/outcomes for the RA (AIS and SNIP percentile distribution) (*underlying data provided centrally by the rectorate*)
- summarizing comments on the distribution

Top XX research outputs/ outcomes

- summarizing comment on the Top XX research outputs/outcomes
- list of Top XX research outputs of the RA - details in a structured appendix

4. RESEARCH FUNDING, SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION – national and international (up to 3 pages)

RA within the national and international funding schemes

- role of national grant schemes (GAČR, TAČR, AZV,...) in funding of the RA projects – describe the context
- role of international and foreign grant schemes (Horizon 2020/Europe – ERC, MCSA,...) in funding of the RA projects – describe the context
- other important national / international cooperation context

Top research projects

- list of XX top projects in which the RA (Charles University) is engaged as a lead investigator (coordinator) - describe the project, total budget (+ CU share), number of researchers involved, list the main research outcomes (general comment, plus details in a structured appendix, link of the project)
- list of XX top projects in which the RA (Charles University) is engaged as a substantive other investigator (partner) - describe the project, total budget (+ CU share), number of researchers involved, list the main research outcomes (general comment, plus details in a structured appendix, link of the project)

5. IMPACT OF RESEARCH (applied research, social relevance, third role...) (up to 2 pages)

General introduction

- common practice in particular RA, commentary

Applied research, societal impact

- list of XX most relevant applied research projects, collaboration with private and public sectors and other relevant activities - describe each project, comment on the relevant impact (technological, economic, social, environmental)
- list of XX most relevant cases of communication, promotion, and popularization of research and science – e.g. scientific podcast, reports for public, public talks and lectures, citizen science, exhibitions, multimedia outcomes, campaigns on social media etc.

STRUCTURE OF THE NOMINATIONS

- External links (hyperlinks) are allowed.
- Nominations are not evaluated individually.

1. Key researchers

Name	
Research field, Research topic	
Reason for nomination	<i>reason for nomination (up to 150 words)</i>
International activities	<i>international involvement, cooperation and visibility (up to 150 words)</i>

Impact, Leadership	<i>role of the researcher in the community, leadership, pedagogical skills (up to 200 words)</i>
Top outputs/projects/activities	<i>up to 5</i>

2. Young leaders

Name	
Research field, Research topic	
Reason for nomination	<i>reason for nomination (up to 150 words)</i>
International activities	<i>international involvement, cooperation and visibility (up to 150 words)</i>
Impact, Prospects	<i>role of the researcher in the community, leadership, pedagogical skills (up to 200 words)</i>
Top outputs/projects/activities	<i>up to 3</i>

3. Research outputs/outcomes

Output title	
Author(s)	
Output type	
Research field(s)	
Link to the output	
Identifiers (if applicable)	
Description	<i>description of the contribution in the given research area and the impact on the development of the given area will be provided (up to 500 words)</i>
Role of CU author(s)	<i>description of the role of authors or the team from the given RA in case of collective authorship (up to 100 words)</i>
Influential citations	<i>up to 10</i>

4. Projects (CU as PI + others)

Project title	
Research field(s)	
Description	<i>purpose of the project, description of the research team, development of the project, methodology (up to 300 words)</i>
Budget	<i>total (in EUR) versus CU share</i>
Outcomes	<i>list the main outcomes (up to 200 words)</i>
Link to the project	<i>if applicable</i>

5. Applied research and societal impact

Project title	
Research field	
Description of the output	<i>description of the applied research output (up to 150 words)</i>

Description of the collaborators	<i>description of the collaboration with private/public sector (up to 150 words)</i>
Impact	<i>comment on the relevant or expected impact, who benefits from the project (up to 200 words)</i>

6. Communication and promotion of research

Title	
Description, impact	<i>description of the case, potential impact, target audience (up to 500 words)</i>
Link	<i>if applicable</i>

Appendix No. 5 - Methodological Rules for the Development of Creative Activities Indicators

The Self-Evaluation Report (Appendix No. 4 to this Directive) includes data documents which serve as input information on the given research area for the evaluator; they provide information in particular about its size, publication productivity, structure, etc. The source documents will be prepared by the Rectorate of the University for each research area and will be distributed to the RA Boards. These data will serve as source data for the RA Board and they will be commented on in the Self-Evaluation Report.

They include the following 6 graphic sources:

1/ Bibliometric indicators

- Graphs showing the reported numbers of a given type of output and proportions of the total number of reported outputs – distribution of the outputs in the sources in which they were published, according to Decile 1, Quartile 1, Quartile 2, Quartile 3, and Quartile 4, separately according to the metric of *Article Influence Score* (AIS, Web of Science) and *Source Normalized Impact per Paper* (SNIP, Scopus)
- The data source of the set of outputs is the University's system for registration of outputs (OBD) and the outputs included must fulfil the following requirements:
 - their year of publication (submission) falls within the 2019–2023 period;
 - they have been submitted to the *Register of Information on Outputs* (RIV) or it is indicated that they can be submitted to the RIV as the type of output "J" (reviewed scientific article), "B" (scientific book), "C" (chapter in a scientific book), or "D" (article in a collection);
 - they are provided with a UT WOS identifier (Accession Number) or EID Scopus (Electronic Identifier); and
 - records of outputs from the 2019–2022 period are used in the "received" status while in the case records for outputs from 2023 all records starting from the "saved" status are used.
- The data source used for determining the AIS interval is the data provided in the OBD record and the following requirements must be fulfilled:
 - only those outputs are included whose source is recorded in the Science Citation Index Expanded, Social Sciences Citation Index, or Arts & Humanities Citation Index according to the Journal Citation Reports;
 - if an output falls under more than one index or field, the best classification of the source is decisive;
 - when assigning in the AIS interval in the case of outputs with a publication year of 2019, apart from the data provided in the OBD records, the classification of the source of the output in the Arts & Humanities Citation Index according to the Journal Citation Reports 2020 is also taken into account; and
 - outputs with a publication year of 2023 are included in the AIS interval according to the classification of the source in the Journal Citation Reports of 2022.
- The data source for determining the SNIP interval is the SciVal tool and outputs with a publication year of 2023 are included in the SNIP interval according to the classification of the source of the output in 2022.
- Only outputs which are recorded in the Web of Science or Scopus databases as "Article", "Letter", "Review", or "Proceeding/Conference Paper" are included in the calculation.
- The output is assigned to one research area on the basis of the primary assigned field.
- The graph shows the situation for the entire research area.

2/ Staffing of the research area by the individual units involved

- A graph showing the number of FTE (full-time equivalent) academic and research members of staff from the individual units involved in the given research area and the proportion of the total number of FTE in the given research area.

- The source for the calculation of the number of FTEs is the data on the assignment of persons to the fields which are recorded in the “Věda” information system database; the correctness and completion of the data is the responsibility of the units, and the number used is the number of persons having an employment relationship to the unit as of 31 December 2023.
- If the fields to which a person is assigned fall under more than one research area, a proportionate division of the number of FTEs between the research areas is used unless a given person has other than a proportionate division specified.

3/ Staffing of a research area according to pay band/position and nationality

- A graph showing the distribution of FTEs in the pay bands/positions and distinguishing their nationality.
- The source for the calculation of the number of FTEs is the data on the assignment of persons to the fields which are recorded in the “Věda” information system database; the correctness and completion of which is the responsibility of the units, and the number used is the number of persons having an employment relationship to the unit as of 31 December 2023; in the case of students of doctoral programmes of study, the number of persons with active (uninterrupted) studies as of 31 December 2023 is used.
- If the fields to which a person is assigned fall under more than one research area, a proportionate division of the number of FTEs between the research areas is used unless a given person has other than a proportionate division specified.
- The graph shows the distribution of FTEs into the following pay bands:
 - o AP4
 - o AP3
 - o AP1+ AP2 + L2
 - o VP1 + VP2 + VP3
- The graph shows the number of active doctoral students.
- Each category distinguishes the number of FTEs or active doctoral students according to their nationality:
 - o Czech
 - o Slovak
 - o Other
- Information on the distribution into the pay bands and nationality of the persons are taken from the WhoIS database.

4/ Staffing of a research area according to pay band/position and gender

- A graph showing the distribution of FTEs in the pay bands/positions and distinguishing their gender.
- The same data as in point 3 are used to assign the FTEs to the pay bands/positions.
- Each category distinguishes the gender of the persons (male/female); the data are taken from the WhoIS database.

5/ Staffing of a research area according to age categories

- A graph showing the number of FTEs according to age categories, the gender of persons is distinguished in each category.
- The same data as in points 3 and 4 are used for determining the number of FTEs in the research area; for distinguishing the age categories and gender of the persons the data are taken from the WhoIS database.
- The following age categories are used:
 - o < 36 years
 - o 36 – 55 years
 - o 56 – 75 years
 - o > 75 years

6/ Amount of support provided to the research area by the individual units from the funds of the Cooperatio Programme

- A graph showing the amount of funds which the individual units have allocated to the given research area in which they are involved from the institutional support intended for the long-term conceptual development of research organizations and provided to the Cooperatio Programme.
- The sources used are data provided by the individual units as part of the Framework Overview of Funds Allocated to the Cooperatio Programme.
- The data for 2022 and 2023 are used.

Appendix No. 6 – Conversion of Research Area Grades to the Units Involved

The results of the evaluation will be taken into account in the *principles for the distribution of contributions and subsidies at the University* for the allocation of funds to the individual units of the University from 2026 onwards. As a result, it is necessary to project the overall grades of the 43 research areas onto the individual units involved in a given research area so that a resulting *quality coefficient* can be determined for each unit which will then be entered in the *principles and breakdown* of the contributions.

The quality coefficient for each unit will be determined as a weighted arithmetic mean of the overall grades for those research areas in which the given unit is involved. For the purposes of the calculation, the grades will be converted into numerical values, namely A → 1, A- → 1 $\frac{1}{3}$, B+ → 1 $\frac{2}{3}$, B → 2, B- → 2 $\frac{1}{3}$, C+ → 2 $\frac{2}{3}$, C → 3, C- → 3 $\frac{1}{3}$, D+ → 3 $\frac{2}{3}$, D → 4. The weight for the conversion of the grade to the individual units will be determined as a weighted arithmetic mean of the following four criteria:

1/ The number of the FTE (AP and VP) assigned to the given research area. The data used are the same as those used to create the basic data sources (see Appendix No. 5 to this Directive). *The weight of the criterion for the calculation is 20%.*

2/ The amount of funds for the individual research areas from the funds allocated to the University Cooperatio Programme. The data used are the same as those used to create the basic data sources (see Appendix No. 5. to this Directive). *The weight of the criterion for the calculation is 35%.*

3/ The amount of funds from standard research projects which were allocated to the given research area for the 2019–2023 period. For this purpose, standard research projects refer to projects funded in the University programmes of UNCE, PRIMUS, GA CU, START, and Mini Grants for the support of 4EU+ projects, projects registered in the Central Register of Projects of the Information System for Research, Development, and Innovation, with the exception of projects assigned to criterion No. 4, research projects funded from other national and international programmes, and contract research projects.

When assigning a project to a specific area and unit, the classification of the lead researcher within the University/unit and the field/s plays a decisive role. If several fields falling within several research areas are assigned, the funds will be distributed equally unless other than a proportional distribution is specified for the given person. The source document for assigning the funds to the research areas will be prepared by the Rectorate on the basis of available internal and external information and will subsequently be validated by the units. *The weight of the criterion for the calculation is 40%.*

4/ The amount of funds from research projects registered in the Central Register of Projects of the Information System for Research, Development, and Innovation which were allocated to the given research area in the 2019–2023 period and were financed from operational programmes and from the Programme for the Support of Excellent Research in Priority Areas of Public Interest in Health Sector – EXCELES.

When assigning a project to a specific area and unit, the classification of the lead researcher within the University/unit and the field/s plays a decisive role. If several fields falling within several research areas are assigned, the funds will be distributed equally unless other than a proportional distribution is specified for the given person. The source document for assigning the funds to the research areas will be prepared by the Rectorate on the basis of available internal and external information and will subsequently be validated by the units. *The weight of the criterion for the calculation is 5%.*

Appendix No. 7 – Division of the Research Areas into Categories

Several chapters of the Self-Evaluation Report should list specific examples of key researchers (Chapter 2), outputs of creative activities (Chapter 3), research projects (Chapter 4), and outputs with an impact on applied research or public or societal impact (Chapter 5) for each research area. Due to the different size and capacity of the individual research areas, the areas are divided into 5 categories where each is given a different number of specific examples in the individual topics.

The number of persons (FTE) assigned to a given research area and the amount of funds allocated to a given research area from the funds intended for the University Cooperation Programme were used to determine in which of the 5 categories each research area should be assigned. The threshold for distinguishing between the individual categories was primarily based on the number of the FTEs and, if the amount of the funds allocated to a given research area was significantly out of line with the amount of the funds allocated to the other research areas in the given category based on the FTEs, the research area was assigned to a relevant adjacent category. As the number of the FTEs correlates strongly with the amount of funds allocated to a given research area, changes in the classification were required only in a small number of cases. The categories and their respective number of nominated cases are defined as follows:

	Indicative threshold on the basis of the FTEs (Cooperation funds also taken into consideration)	Key / Junior researchers (section 2)	Top research outputs (section 3)	Top research projects – CU as PI/other invest. (section 4)	Applied research projects (section 5)	Communication/Promotion of research (section 5)
CATEGORY 1	< 40 FTE	3	10	2	3	3
CATEGORY 2	40-80 FTE	4	15	3	4	4
CATEGORY 3	80-160 FTE	5	25	4	5	5
CATEGORY 4	160-250 FTE	7	35	5	7	7
CATEGORY 5	>250 FTE	8	45	6	8	8

The result is the following classification of the 43 research areas into 5 categories:

CATEGORY 1	CATEGORY 2	CATEGORY 3	CATEGORY 4	CATEGORY 5
ARCH	AMES	ECON	CHEM	BIOL
AREA	ARTS	GEOG	COMP	DIAG
INCA	CARD	GEOL	PHAR	PHYS
SCAN	DENT	HEAS		
TRAN	ENVI	HIST		
	GEED	IMMU		
	INDI	LAWS		
	MATC	LING		
	MCOM	LITE		
	PEDI	MATH		
	PHIL	METD		
	POLS	NEUR		
	PSYC	ONCO		
	SPOB	SOAS		

	SPOS	SURG		
	SSED			
	THEO			

List of Abbreviations of the Research Areas:

HUMANITIES:

Archaeology	ARCH
Arts and Culture Studies	ARTS
Asian, Middle Eastern and East European Studies	AMES
History	HIST
Linguistics	LING
Literature	LITE
Philosophy	PHIL
Theology and Religious Studies	THEO

SOCIAL SCIENCES:

Area Studies	AREA
Economics	ECON
General Education and Pedagogy	GEED
Law	LAWS
Media and Communication Studies	MCOM
Political Science	POLS
Psychological Sciences	PSYC
Social and Cultural Anthropology	SCAN
Sociology and Applied Social Science	SOAS
Sport Sciences – Social	SPOS
Subject Specific Education Research	SSED

NATURAL SCIENCES:

Biology	BIOL
Computer Science	COMP
Environmental and Sustainability Research	ENVI
Geography	GEOG
Geological Sciences	GEOL
Chemistry	CHEM
Mathematics	MATH
Physics	PHYS
Transdisciplinary Research of the Anthropocene	TRAN

MEDICAL SCIENCES:

Cardiovascular Science	CARD
Dental Medicine	DENT
Health Sciences	HEAS
Immunity and Infection	IMMU
Intensive Care Medicine	INCA
Internal Disciplines	INDI
Maternal and Childhood Care	MATC
Medical Diagnostics and Basic Medical Sciences	DIAG
Metabolic Diseases	METD

Neurosciences	NEUR
Oncology and Haematology	ONCO
Pediatrics	PEDI
Pharmaceutical Sciences	PHAR
Sport Sciences – Biomedical & Rehabilitation Medicine	SPOB
Surgical Disciplines	SURG