



LEGAL BULLETIN

OF NICOLAUS COPERNICUS UNIVERSITY IN TORUŃ

2017; item

RESOLUTION No. 180

of the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń Senate

of 19 December 2017

on Periodical Evaluation of Academic Teachers in Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń

On the basis of art. 132 of the Resolution of 27 July 2005, Act on Higher Education (Journal of Laws of 2017, item 2183), § 121-125 of Nicolaus Copernicus University in of 22 October 2013 (NCU Legal Bulletin of 2017, item 252 with further changes), having regard to the provisions on a recommendation of the Commission of the European Communities of 11 March 2005, on the European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct during recruitment of scientists (OG No L, 2005 No 75, page 67)

it is resolved as follows:

Chapter I General Provisions

§ 1

The aim of the procedure is regulation of periodic evaluation process of academic teachers at Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, hereinafter referred to as the University, and further use of the results of this evaluation for:

- 1) informing the Rector and Faculties authorities about the quality of their employees work (informative purpose);
- 2) informing employees on their strengths and weaknesses and indicating the direction of their development (informative purpose);
- 3) providing the employees with feedback, which should motivate them to personal development and improving the quality of their work (motivating purpose);
- 4) shaping personal policy with regard to recruitment, evaluation, internal relocations, employee remuneration policy and their professional development (administrative purpose),
- 5) matching proper forms of support for the development of a given employee, of which catalogue was indicated in diagnosis and NCU scientists career development planning procedure.

§ 2

1. The subject of the procedure is academic teachers periodic evaluation, in the scope of proper conduct of responsibilities connected with realized scientific or artistic, didactic and organizational activity. Periodic evaluation consists of:
 - 1) the self-evaluation of an academic teacher on conducted scientific or artistic, didactic and organizational responsibilities,
 - 2) the results of evaluation conducted at least once per academic year by students and doctoral students on conducting didactic responsibilities by an academic teacher, to which the academic teacher refers to within self-evaluation process;
 - 3) the result of evaluation of didactic classes made by the supervisor on the basis of conducted visitations, to which the academic teacher refers to within self-evaluation process;
 - 4) the result of evaluation of scientific activity on the basis of defined bibliometric requirements;
 - 5) the evaluation and opinion of direct supervisor (the head of the faculty/department) on conducting scientific or artistic, didactic and organizational duties by an academic teacher;
 - 6) the evaluation and opinion of the Departmental Evaluation Commission on conducting scientific or artistic, didactic and organizational duties by an academic teacher.
2. It is also advised to connect periodic evaluation procedure of academic teachers with diagnosis and the University's scientists career development planning procedure, which will enable to define the Employee Competence Profile and to create an Individual Plan for Employee Development, as well as providing appropriate support from supervisors.

§ 3

1. The academic teacher evaluation is made not less frequently than once every 4 years or upon request of the Head of the Department at which the person is employed.
2. Absence from work due to maternity, paternity, parental or extended post-maternity leave, health leave, leave on the same conditions as maternity leave and period of military and civilian service is not taken into account to the periods mentioned in article 1.

Chapter 2

Proper authorities with regard to periodical evaluation of academic teachers

§ 4

1. Periodical evaluation of academic teachers' work results is conducted by:
 - 1) The Departmental Evaluation Commission (appointed by the Faculty Council), with the Dean as its chairman;
 - 2) The University's Evaluation Commission (appointed by the Senate), with the Vice-Rector, appointed by the Rector, as the chairman, and an academic teacher from Collegium Medicum as a deputy chairman of the commission;
 - 3) The Evaluating Board of Appeal (appointed by the Senate), with the Rector as its chairman, and Vice-Rector of Collegium Medicum as a the deputy chairman of its commission.

2. Appointed academic teacher may be a member of only one Evaluating Commission. A term of office of Evaluating Commissions lasts for 4 years and starts with the beginning of the term of University's authorities.

§ 5

1. The Evaluating Commission should consist of at least 5 academic teachers employed at the Faculty.
2. The Departmental Evaluating Commission evaluates academic teachers employed at a given Faculty.
3. Periodical evaluation of work results of the Departmental Evaluating Commissions, the University's Evaluating Commission and the Evaluating Board of Appeal chairmen is conducted by the commission led by the Senior of the Faculty Council.

§ 6

1. The University's Evaluating Commission consists of:
 - 1) Permanent members:
 - a) One representative per each Faculty chosen by the Faculty Councils among academic teachers with at least doctor habilitowany degree;
 - 2) Non-permanent members:
 - a) One representative seconded by Collegium Medicum's Vice-Rector from Collegium Medicum extra-faculties.
 - b) One representative from the University Library, Foreign Language Centre and University's Sports Centre, chosen by these units councils.
2. The University's Evaluating Commission evaluates academic teachers employed in Faculties that are not the part of the Faculties and are not University Library employees hired at positions presented in article 113 of the Act on Higher Education Law.

§ 7

1. The Evaluation Board of Appeal consists of academic teachers chosen by a Faculty Council with a title of professor – one for each Faculty.
2. The Evaluation Board of Appeal decides on appeals against evaluation made by the University's Evaluating Commission and the Departmental Evaluating Commissions.

Chapter 3

The basis and criteria for evaluation of academic teachers

§ 8

1. The base for evaluation of academic teachers are his/her scientific achievements and/or artistic, didactic and organizational achievements. During the evaluation, there should be taken particular accounts of:
 - 1) Scientific activity, including:
 - a) Scientific publications along with bibliometric parameters,
 - b) Citation index,
 - c) Implemented and proposed research projects financed from external sources,
 - d) Documented research results other than publications,
 - e) Other aspects of scientific activity (taking part in conferences, scientific speeches, taking part in consortiums and research networks, scientific cooperation with Polish and foreign scientific centres),

- f) Work that is a basis for the academic advancement,
 - g) Artistic actions and their results;
- 2) Didactic activity, including:
- a) classes,
 - b) authorial materials and didactic methods,
 - c) didactic achievements,
 - d) evaluation of classes made by students and doctoral students,
 - e) evaluation of classes made by supervisors,
 - f) promoting students and taking part in awarding diplomas,
 - g) teaching and promotion of staff;
- 3) organizational activity, including
- a) functions performed at the Faculty and at the University,
 - b) taking part in organization of conferences,
 - c) taking part in colleges and committees,
 - d) taking part in organizational and popularizing works,
 - e) membership in scientific, didactic, organizational bodies and functions there performed,
 - f) membership in scientific organizations and societies and functions there performed,
 - g) cooperation with socio-economic environment and public and self-government administration;
- 4) completed courses and trainings as well as other forms of self-education and personal development useful in research and development, didactic and organizational activity;
- 5) study leaves and scholarships and their results;
- 6) honours, awards and honourable mentions received for research and development, didactic and organizational activity;
- 7) proposals and requests of the employee;
- 8) propositions of individual plan of the University scientist development along with due support presented by the academic teacher accordingly with diagnosis and the University's scientists career development planning procedure;
- 9) academic teacher declaration of respecting the copyright, related rights as well as industrial property right.
2. It is also advised to take into account the individual University's Scientist Competence Profile, created according to diagnosis and the University's scientists career development planning procedure, in the evaluation.

§ 9

Authorities appointing Evaluating Commissions may introduce additional detailed criteria of evaluation. In terms of evaluating, the Departmental Evaluating Commissions, the University's Evaluating Commission and the Evaluating Board of Appeal may consult with experts outside the University. The evaluation of the scientific or artistic, didactic and organizational contribution conducted during the procedure of awarding an academic title and appointing for the position of Associate Professor or Full Professor replaces periodical evaluation.

§ 10

1. The evaluation of the Head of the Department/Faculty, as well as evaluation of the Departmental Evaluating Commission is marked on scale 1-5, where 1 equals negative, 2 – conditionally positive, 3 – positive, 4 – very good, 5 – excellent.
2. Threshold for cumulative evaluation:
 - 1) <1, 2) – negative,
 - 2) <2, 2,6> – conditionally positive,
 - 3) (2,6, 3,5) – positive,
 - 4) <3,5, 4,5) – very good,
 - 5) <4,5, 5> – excellent.
3. Weight for particular partial areas of evaluation:
 - 1) In case of researchers and didactic workers:
 - a) 0,6 – scientific or artistic activity,
 - b) 0,2 – didactic activity,
 - c) 0,2 – organizational activity;
 - 2) In case of researchers:
 - a) 0,8 – scientific or artistic activity,
 - b) 0,2 – organizational activity;
 - 3) In case of didactic workers:
 - a) 0,5 – didactic activity,
 - b) 0,5 – organizational activity.
4. The Head of the Faculty/Department and the Departmental Evaluating Commissions/ the University's Evaluating Commission (in case of academic teachers of departments) may withdraw from the negative evaluation (1) in one of partial areas (scientific or artistic activity, didactic and organizational) and give conditional positive evaluation (2) in case where the evaluated person is excessively burdened with responsibilities in other partial areas of evaluation. In case of receiving a negative or conditionally positive evaluation by the employee, the evaluation is conducted the following year.
5. Each Faculty/Department proposes own open and clear evaluation criteria, in particular partial areas of evaluation (research or artistic, didactic and organizational), resulting from requirements towards researchers, research and didactic worker and didactic workers. Propositions of evaluation criteria should be submitted to the Rector no later than December, the first year of the new term of University's representatives. For preservation of periodical evaluation process cohesion at the University, propositions of criteria for Faculties/Departments are verified and approved by the Rector. Criteria should be approved no later than until March, the first year of the new term of University's representatives. During the period from submitting propositions by the Faculties to Rector's approval, amendments, previously agreed on as part of negotiations, may be introduced. In case of Rector's non-acceptance of propositions of periodical evaluation criteria, submitted in given time by the Faculties, the Rector imposes criteria of evaluation for the Faculty for one academic year. Next year, the Faculty should present proposition according to the calendar from the previous year.

Chapter 4

The procedure

§ 11

Academic teachers periodical evaluation procedure should be launched no later than with the beginning of the summer term and last no longer than until the end of classes of the summer term.

§ 12

1. The chairman of the proper Evaluating Commission should notify the academic teacher about planned evaluation and should determine the time for self-evaluation preparation which cannot be shorter than two weeks.
2. The meeting of the Evaluating Commission, at which the evaluation of the employee is conducted, should take place no later than a month since notifying the employee about the evaluation.
3. Within two weeks since conducting the evaluation by the Commission, the Head of the Faculty/Department, in the presence of the chairman of the Commission, has a conversation with the evaluated employee concluding the results of the evaluation as well as presents the employee the Individual Competence Development Plan created basing on diagnosis and the University's scientists career development plan procedures.

§ 13

If the results of the evaluation indicate that the employee is in need of support, the Head of the Faculty/Department, in the presence of the chairman of the Commission, should present the employee with such proposition or determine a method of its preparation with the employee, setting a deadline no longer than two weeks. After that time, there should be another conversation of the Head of the Faculty/Department, in the presence of the chairman of the Commission, with the employee finally summarizing the results of the evaluation and presenting the employee with propositions of support for his/her development. The catalogue of propositions of support has been indicated in diagnosis and University's scientists career development plan procedures.

§ 14

1. After the conversation concluding the evaluation, the employee confirms that he/she got acquainted with the evaluation result with a signature.
2. Within two weeks since confirming the acquaintance with the evaluation, the employee may appeal against it directly to the Evaluating Board of Appeal. The appeal should be reviewed by the Evaluating Board of Appeal no later than within six weeks since the date of receiving the appeal.

§ 15

Conclusions resulting from the evaluation influence:

- 1) the amount of remuneration,
- 2) advancements and awards,
- 3) appointing for managing positions.

§ 16

1. In case of receiving a negative evaluation mentioned in article 132 of the Act of Higher Education Law by an academic teacher, the Departmental Evaluating Commissions/ the University's Evaluating Commission (in case of academic teachers of departments) order another extraordinary evaluation after 1 year .
2. In justified cases (e.g. a disease or other random event, excessive activity in one of the areas of evaluation which may justify a negative result of the evaluation in other area of activity of the academic teacher evaluated) the chairman of specific Evaluating Commission may postpone the time of another evaluation for more than 1 year; however, no more than 4 years In case of receiving two more negative evaluations mentioned in article 132 of the Act on Higher Education Law by an academic teacher, the Rector terminates his/her employment.

§ 17

1. Periodical evaluation of academic teachers is conducted according to the following schedule:

| No. | PARTY RESPONSIBLE | OBJECTIVE | DEADLINE |
|-----|--|--|---|
| 1 | Dean's Offices/ Secretariats/ the Heads of Dean's Offices/ the Heads of the Departments | Preparing the list of academic teachers under the periodical evaluation procedure | Six weeks before planned periodical evaluation of academic teachers |
| 2 | Chairmen of the Evaluating Commission (the Deans/the Heads of the Departments) | Providing the Heads of Departments and indicated academic teachers with the information of compulsory periodical evaluation | A month before planned periodical academic teachers evaluation |
| 3 | Dean's Offices/ Secretariats/ the Heads of Dean's Offices/ the Heads of Departments | Mailing questionnaires of academic teachers evaluation in a file or link to designated academic teachers | A month before planned periodical academic teachers evaluation |
| 4 | Academic teachers under the periodical evaluation procedure | Filling the questionnaire of academic teacher evaluation in a file or electronic version, printing it and submitting at the date indicated by the Dean, the Head of the Department or Secretariat of the Faculty | Three weeks before planned periodical academic teachers evaluation |
| 5 | Dean's Offices/ Secretariats/the Heads of Dean's Offices/the Heads of the Departments | Forwarding the printouts of filled forms of academic teachers evaluation under the procedure of periodical evaluation to their supervisors | Two weeks before planned periodical academic teachers evaluation |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 6 | The Heads of the Institutes/the Heads of the Departments | Evaluating academic teachers under the procedure of periodical evaluation in questionnaires of academic teachers evaluation, informing them on granted evaluation during a conversation concluding the results of evaluation as well as submitting filled questionnaires of academic teachers evaluation in the Dean's Office/Secretariat of the Department at the date indicated by the Dean/Head of the Department | A week before planned periodical academic teachers evaluation |
| 7 | Dean's Offices/ Secretariats/the Heads of Dean's Offices/ the Heads of the Departments | Forwarding filled questionnaires of academic teacher evaluation to the Departmental Evaluating Commission/ the University's Evaluating Commission (in case of academic teachers of the departments) | A week before planned periodical academic teachers evaluation |
| 8 | The Departmental Evaluating Commission/ the University's Evaluating Commission (in case of academic teachers of the departments) | Evaluating academic teachers under the periodical evaluation procedure | The date of evaluation indicated by the Dean/Head of the Department |
| 9 | the Heads of the Institutes/ the Heads of the Departments In the presence of the chairman of the Evaluating Commission (the Dean/ the Head of the Department) | Familiarizing academic teachers under the periodical evaluation procedure with its results during a conversation concluding the results of the evaluation | Within two weeks since conducting the periodical evaluation of academic teachers |
| 10 | The Heads of Institutes/ the Heads of the Departments In the presence of the chairman of the Evaluating | In case of need for providing the academic teacher under the periodical evaluation procedure with support, conducting another interview finally concluding the results | Within two weeks since previous conversation with an academic teacher |

| | | | |
|----|--|---|---|
| | Commission (the Dean/ the Head of the Department) | of the evaluation and presenting the employee with propositions of support | |
| 11 | Academic teachers under the periodical evaluation procedure | Potential appealing against the evaluation and opinion of the Departmental Evaluating Commission/ the University's Evaluating Commission and submitting the appeal in writing to the Evaluating Board of Appeal | Within 14 days since familiarizing with periodical evaluation and its signing |
| 12 | The Evaluating Board of Appeal | Considering the appeal of academic teachers under the periodical evaluation procedure and familiarizing them with the decision of supporting or changing the evaluation | Within 6 weeks since receiving the documentation |

2. Vice-Rector for Student Affairs and Staff Management monitors the process of periodical evaluation of academic teachers at the University as well as solves current matters.

Chapter 5 Final provisions

§ 18

1. Periodical evaluation of academic teachers is conducted on the basis of academic teacher evaluation questionnaire attached as Appendix No. 1 to this Resolution.
2. Electronic version of the questionnaire mentioned in item 1 includes an instruction indicating which parts of the questionnaire should be filled depending on the degree, position or place of employment of the academic teacher under the periodical evaluation procedure attached as Appendix No. 2 to this Resolution.

§ 19

The review of validity of the procedure is conducted once a year (in the first quarter) by the Academic Council for Quality of Education functioning in the University Academic Excellence System as an advisory body for the Rector.

§ 20

This resolution comes into force on 1 September 2020.

The President of the Senate

Professor Andrzej Tretyn
Rector

APPENDIX NO 1: ACADEMIC TEACHER EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE NCU

from to

PERSONAL DATA

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| Full name: | | Year of birth: | |
| Academic title/Degree/Professional title (<i>write only highest received; write field and discipline</i>): | | | |
| Date and the University awarding the academic degree/title: | | | |
| Organizational unit: Faculty/Institute/Facility/Laboratory: | | | |
| Profession: | | | |
| Starting date of employment at NCU: | | | |
| Position: | | Date of employment on a current position: | |
| Form of employment on the abovementioned position: | Employment contract / appointment (delete as appropriate) | | |
| Additional employment on the basis of employment contract (<i>institution, position, dimension and period of employment</i>): | | | |
| specializations – (to be filled by Collegium Medicum employees) : | I° | Year of acquisition: | |
| | II° | Year of acquisition: | |
| | other | Year of acquisition: | |

A. SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITY DURING THE PERIOD OF ASSESMENT

A.1. Scientific publications – the number of points received for the period evaluated.....

Please attach parametric score prepared by the NCU Main Library (Regulation No. 102 of the NCU Rector of 9 September 2010)

Filled by an employee. For Collegium Medicum only **filled by the Medical Library**

| Publications | Number of works | IF | Ministry of Science and Higher Education points |
|---|-----------------|----|---|
| 1. Books, monographs | | | |
| 2. Manuals, scripts | | | |
| 3. Articles in academic journals | | | |
| 4. Articles (chapters) in collective works | | | |
| 5. Papers and notices in conference materials | | | |
| 6. Other, e.g. editing of collective works | | | |
| total | | | |

.....
(date, signature and a stamp of an employee of Medical Library)

B.

A.2. Citation index

| Citation database | Number of citations | Impact factor (IF) | H index |
|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------|
| Web of Science | | | |
| Scopus | | | |
| GoogleScholar | | | |

C. A.3. Research – grants/projects

Please attach the list of research projects (topic, number, date of submission, realization period)

| Grants/projects | Number of projects in realization | | Number of submitted projects | |
|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------|
| | As a project manager | As a contractor (%) | During proceedings | dismissed |
| 1. Ministry of Science and Higher Education grants | | | | |
| 2. National Science Centre grants | | | | |
| 3. The National Centre for Research and Development grants | | | | |
| 4. Projects funded by NCU | | | | |
| 5. Grants from EU Framework Programs and other funded from foreign funds | | | | |
| 6. Projects funded from young academic staff development funds (pro-quality grant) | | | | |
| 7. Other..... | | | | |

A.4. Scientific Research – documented effects other than publications

Please attach the description of research effects

| Effects | Number |
|--|--------|
| 1. Documented practical effects of scientific work | |
| 2. Sale of scientific research results | |
| 3. Implementation of work results in organizations, which? | |
| 4. Patents obtained | |
| 5. Other effects | |

D. A.5. Other aspects of research activities

| |
|--|
| 1. Participation in national and international scientific conferences (<i>name of the conference, organizer, place, date, nature of participation</i>) |
| 2. Scientific lectures and speeches in other facilities (<i>title, place, date</i>) |
| 3. Participation in consortiums and research networks (<i>name, character participation period</i>) |
| 4. Scientific cooperation with Polish or foreign facilities - lectures, internships and study visits, implementation of research (<i>country, institution, form and period of cooperation, results</i>) |

E.

F. A.6. Work being the basis of academic advancement

| Title of doctoral / habilitation dissertation | Level of advancement (%) | Anticipated submission date |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

A.7. Other aspects of research activities worth mentioning

| |
|-------|
| |
| |
| |

G. A.8. ARTISTIC ACTIVITIES DURING THE EVALUATION PERIOD

| |
|---|
| Individual exhibitions (date, place) |
| |
| Group exhibitions (date, place) |
| |
| Other works and artistic activities (date, place) |
| |
| Other works and artistic activities (date, place) |
| |

H. DIDACTIC ACTIVITIES DURING THE EVALUATION PERIOD

B.1. Classes

| Subject | Type of classes | Level of studies | Year of studies | Form of studies | Number of hours |
|---------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

B.2. Authorial materials and didactic methods used at the time of education process during the evaluated period

.....

.....

B.3. Didactic achievements during the evaluated period (np. awards, honours for students taught etc..)

.....

.....

B.4. Evaluation of classes made by students and doctoral students

| Final result of the survey (an average rating for each subject on own and other faculties/departments) | Own remarks |
|--|-------------|
| | |

B.5. Evaluation of classes made by supervisors

| Final result of visitation | Own remarks |
|----------------------------|-------------|
| | |

B.6. Supervision and contribution in awarding diplomas

| | |
|---|--|
| 1. Number of Bachelors/Engineers | |
| 2. Number of Masters | |
| 3. Number of dissertation reviews (<i>bachelor, engineer, master</i>) | |
| 4. Number of students examined at diploma examinations | |

B.7. Teaching and promoting the staff

| |
|---|
| 1. Promoted PhDs (<i>full name, promoting institution</i>) |
| |
| 2. Doctoral students (<i>full name, affiliation, open PhD proceeding?</i>) |
| |
| 3. Reviews in PhD proceedings (<i>full name; promoting institution</i>) |
| |
| 4. Participation in habilitation proceedings (<i>full name; promoting institution; nature of participation: reviewer, chairperson, a member or comitee secretary</i>) |
| |
| 5. Participation in awarding an academic title proceedings (<i>full name; promoting institution; nature of participation: reviewer, chairperson, member or comitee secretary</i>) |
| |
| 6. Publishing reviews in awarding an academic title proceedings (<i>full name; promoting institution</i>) |
| |
| 7. Promoted specialists of medical disciplines (<i>full name; promoting institution</i>) |
| |
| 8. Proceedings as a supporting promoter (<i>full name; promoting institution</i>) |
| |

B.8. Other forms of engagement in didactic activities worth mentioning (*e.g.. supervising scientific circles, training courses, e-learning, popular scientific works, open lectures popularizing knowledge*)

.....

I. ORGANIZATIONAL ACTIVITIES DURING THE EVALUATION PERIOD

C.1. Forms of organizational activities

| Type of activity | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. Functions performed at the Nicolaus Copernicus University headquarters | Period |
| | |
| 2. Functions performed at the Faculty | Period |
| | |
| 3. Participation in scientific and training conferences organization (<i>title, place, date</i>) | Performed function |
| | |
| 4. Participation in occasional organizational and popularizing works for the University (<i>open days, festival of science, work in committees</i>) | Period |
| | |
| 5. Participation in commissions for awarding degrees and academic titles (<i>as a member of the commission, an examiner etc.</i>) | Performed function |
| | |
| 6. Participation in editorial boards of academic journals and reviewing publications (<i>name of publishing house, editorial office headquarters, function</i>) | Period |
| | |
| 7. Membership, by appointment, in national and international scientific, didactic and organizational bodies (<i>name, country</i>) | Period, performed function |
| | |
| 8. Membership in national and international organizations and scientific societies (<i>name, country</i>) | Period, performed function |
| | |
| 9. Cooperation with socio-economic environment as well as public and self-government administration | Period, nature of cooperation |
| | |

| |
|---|
| C.2. Other aspects of organizational activities, including those outside NCU, worth mentioning |
| |
| |

D. COMPLETED COURSES, TRAININGS AND OTHER FORMS OF SELF-EDUCATION AND PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT DURING THE PERIOD OF EVALUATION USEFUL IN:

| |
|-----------------------------------|
| research and development activity |
| |
| didactic activity |
| |
| organizational activity |
| |
| other |
| |

| |
|--|
| J. E. STUDY LEAVES AND SCHOLARSHIPS DURING THE PERIOD OF EVALUATION (<i>type; duration, achieved results</i>) |
| |

K. L. F. HONOURS, AWARDS, HONOURABLE MENTIONS RECEIVED DURING THE PERIOD OF EVALUATION FOR:

| |
|-----------------------------------|
| research and development activity |
| |
| didactic activity |
| |
| organizational activity |
| |
| other |
| |

M. G. PROPOSALS AND REQUESTS OF THE EMPLOYEE

| |
|---|
| evaluation of research and development, artistic, didactic and organizational working conditions |
| |
| discussing possibilities of improving and changing work executed. |
| |
| Do you think that, in this evaluation, additional competences not mentioned above should be considered? |
| |

N. H. PROPOSAL OF INDIVIDUAL PLAN OF NCU SCIENTIST DEVELOPMENT ALONG WITH DUE SUPPORT IN THE TIME PERIOD UNTIL NEXT PERIODICAL EVALUATION.

Appendix 3 – INDIVIDUAL PLAN OF NCU SCIENTIST DEVELOPMENT – for diagnosis and NCU scientists career development planning procedure

I. I hereby declare, that I respect copyright and related rights, as well as industrial property right.

City, date
.....
 (employee's signature)

O. EVALUATION AND OPINION OF THE HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT / FACULTY

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Evaluation of scientific activity* | | | | | | Scale: 5 – excellent 4 – very good 3 – positive 2 – conditionally positive 1 – negative |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | | | | | |
| Evaluation of didactic activity* | | | | | | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | | | | | |
| Evaluation of organizational activity* | | | | | | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | | | | | |
| Written justification of evaluation | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| General evaluation of ethical, moral and professional stance and teamwork skills | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Conclusion of the Head of the Department / Faculty | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Signature of the Head of the Department/Faculty: | | | | | | |
| City: | | | | | | Date: |

*Every department/faculty, by virtue of the Faculty Council Resolution or equivalent act, specifies own transparent and clear assessment criteria in specific partial evaluation areas (scientific or artistic, didactic and organizational activity) resulting from requirements towards scientists, research and didactic and didactic employees. Evaluation criteria should be forwarded to the Rector for verification and final approval.

P. EVALUATION AND OPINIONS OF DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION COMMISSIONS

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------------|---|---|---|
| Evaluation of scientific activity* | | | | | | Scale: 5 – excellent 4 – very good 3 – positive 2 – conditionally positive 1 –negative |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | | | | | |
| Evaluation of didactic activity* | | | | | | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | | | | | |
| Evaluation of organizational activity* | | | | | | |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | | | | | |
| Written justification of evaluation | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Conclusion of Departmental Evaluation Commission: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Provisions of evaluating commission concerning employee's professional development plan and proposed support (catalogue of employee development support proposition has been shown in diagnosis and NCU scientists career development planning procedure) | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Signatures of Departmental Evaluation Commission members: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| - the Dean –chairman of commission | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| City: | | | Date: | | | |
| I hereby declare that I have read and understood the Departmental Evaluation Committee evaluation: | | | | | | |
| City,....., date..... | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | (employee's signature) |

*Every department/faculty, by virtue of the Faculty Council Resolution or equivalent act, specifies own transparent and clear assessment criteria in specific partial evaluation areas (scientific or artistic, didactic and organizational activity) resulting from requirements towards scientists, research and didactic and didactic employees. Evaluation criteria should be forwarded to the Rector for verification and final approval.

Caution! Academic teacher is entitled to get acquainted with any documents related to his/her evaluation and has the right to provide explanations in the course of evaluation proceedings.

Instruction on appeal procedure: On the basis of § 125(2,3) of the Resolution No. 135 of the Nicolaus Copernicus University Senate of 22 October 2013 on Establishing the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń Statute, academic teachers may appeal from the evaluation made by departmental evaluation commissions and University's Evaluating Commission, directly to the Evaluation Board of Appeal within 14 days of the date of familiarization with the evaluation.