

**Instructions for Implementation of the Criteria (technical instructions) – official consolidated text
valid from 21 June 2019**

Pursuant to point 14, Article 52 of the Statutes of the University of Ljubljana (Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 4/2017 with amendments), and pursuant to Article 3 of the official consolidated text of the Criteria for Appointment to the Titles of University Teachers, Researchers and Associates at the University of Ljubljana, at its 18th session held on 28 May 2019 the Senate of the University of Ljubljana adopted the amendments and

Official consolidated text of the Instructions for Implementation of the Criteria (technical instructions)

Terms used in these Instructions in the masculine gender shall apply equally to men and women as gender-neutral terms.

I. Instructions for candidates

Candidates shall submit applications, *printed and in electronic form*, to the appropriate professional department of the UL member institution.

Applications should contain:

1. **A request** with a statement of the habilitation field in which the candidate wishes to be habilitated, and the title to which they wish to be appointed. The request should contain a statement that by signing, the candidate guarantees that the information set out in the application (in the presentation of the candidate or biography, the points system, bibliography and attachments), is accurate. Applications must include in the contact details the candidate's e-mail address.
2. **A presentation of the candidate** in the suggested format for the individual field of habilitation, where the candidate seeks the title of professor, senior research fellow, associate professor, senior research associate, assistant professor, research associate, senior instructor or lector. In cases of other titles, candidates may submit a professional biography clearly indicating the candidate's academic, artistic, educational and professional work.
If a candidate has been appointed to titles in different habilitation fields, at different member institutions or other institutions outside UL, in column 3 "Appointment to titles" in the model form "Presentation of candidate" or in the professional biography they must provide information on all appointments.
3. **A points tally and bibliography** with especially highlighted important sections and information on international response (citations, h-index, other data on international response to works). The bibliography must be drawn up using the bibliography indicators of success for appointment to a title in the Sicris system for all candidates that have a researcher code number and are being appointed in academic habilitation fields. Candidates who are not employed in research organisations may obtain a temporary researcher code via the web link:

<http://www.sicris.si/public/jqm/memo.aspx?lang=slv&opdescr=forms&source=forms.inc&opt=6&subopt=2>. Other candidates must compile a points tally and bibliography by making analogous use of the same document structure as used in the aforementioned tool.

In the event of using the tool *bibliography indicators of success for appointment to a title*, candidates should take into account that the readout is made on the basis of data in the Cobiss system, and through manual entries in the places envisaged for this in the points system make relevant additions to the printout, for instance adding works accepted for printing but not yet published, adding data on guest educational or research positions abroad lasting at least 30 days, information on mentorship for Prešeren Prizes and other. In these cases candidates should also appropriately correct the number of works and points. In the automatically generated record, where necessary and where the programme allows, they should change the categories of individual works, include them in or exclude them from the recent period, change the points, separate out individual works from the bibliography and so forth.

In the case of an application for first appointment to a higher title, the recent period should list works from the date of submission of the application for first appointment to the current title, and in new appointments the works from the date of submission of the application for the latest appointment.

In the bibliography, candidates may only state works that have already been published or accepted for publication up to the date of submitting the application. For works that are not yet published, evidence of being accepted for publication must be attached.

Candidates should check and where necessary correct the number of points/work (ŠTD =) and number of points/candidate (ŠTK =) under each bibliographic unit, where the tool enables this. The ŠTK is calculated by dividing the ŠTD by the number of authors.

In supplementing and adjusting the points and bibliography, candidates should observe the Criteria, the annex to the Criteria of the member institution to which they are applying, and these Instructions. A link to explanations concerning use of the tool is at the top of the readout of the automatic points system and bibliography:

(http://home.izum.si/cobiss/bibliografije/bibl_hab_UL_help.html).

Candidates should select their most important works, which they believe will qualify them for appointment to the requested title, where they should observe the Criteria and the annex to the Criteria of the member institution to which they are applying. The list must contain at least as many important works with first and/or lead authorship as are required for the requested title in the Criteria, but not more than twice as much. In the list of important works, for each work candidates should indicate if they were the first and/or lead author.

4. **Numbered list of all attachments as evidence.** Each attachment should then be appropriately numbered at the top of the first page.
5. **Evidence for the asserted points or bibliography**, not based on Cobiss data, for instance evidence of articles being accepted for publication, if they are not yet published, confirmation of guest work abroad, evidence of heading projects not under the aegis of the Slovenian Research Agency (ARRS), evidence of average survey rating in the upper 10%, which should be in the form of an abstract from the entire readout of the results of student surveys or confirmation from the professional department, evidence of international response or citations not evident from WoS data or Sicris, and other.

6. **Evidence** of higher education, academic, master's, specialist or doctor's degree **diplomas** or evidence of the recognition of artistic works, *if documents have not been issued by UL*.
7. **Evidence of command of a foreign language.** Only for first appointment to a title at UL. Evidence does not need to be submitted in cases referred to in paragraph 2 of Article 51 of the Criteria.
8. **Evidence of fulfilling other minimum requirements** for appointment to an individual title that are stipulated by the Criteria and annex of the member institution to which the application for appointment to a title was submitted.

Candidates who *submit an early application* for appointment to a title or application for appointment that deviates from the sequential order, should also submit the grounds for such appointment, in which the dates of previous appointments should make clear that this is an application for early appointment or for skipping to a higher title. Exceptional achievements should be highlighted in the grounds, with an explanation of how they are exceptional. Candidates must also submit appropriate evidence of such achievements. The early attainment of qualitative and quantitative criteria does not in itself suffice for early appointment or skipping a title, and the decision of the UL Habilitation Committee will be based on the substantive opinions of the reviewers.

Candidates should sign the original printed request and scan the document for the electronic version of the application. The presentation of the candidate or biography and the points tally and bibliography should be converted into pdf format so that searching in the text is enabled. In the electronic version, all documents must be merged into a single file.

In the event that candidates do not use the *bibliography indicators of success for election to a title* tool, they should heed the following additional instructions:

1. Works must be set out by bibliographic units in accordance with the assignment of units in the points system, in chronological order. Each category of works must be visibly demarcated into two periods. The first, in the case of an application for first appointment to a higher title, should list works from the date of submission of the application for first appointment to the current title, and in new appointments the works from the date of submission of the application for the latest appointment. The second should list works that were published in previous appointment periods.
2. Works should be numbered in sequence through the entire application, and not starting at 1 for each category of works.
3. For each work the authors and title of the work should be given.
4. Listings of articles should state the title of the journal, the year number, year of publication, volume and page number. For journals that have an impact factor (IF according to WoS), candidates must state the value for the year in which the article was published or the year in which the WoS IF was known. If the annex to the criteria of the UL member institution requires the classification of articles into groups by quartiles of the journal, for articles under the Cobiss system candidates should add the places in which the journals are classified among all journals in the field, together with a statement of the field to which the classification of the journal relates. For journals that do not have a WoS IF, the ISSN (International Standard Serial Number) must be given along with the database managed by the journals. The impact factor under Scopus (SNIP) should also be stated in an identical procedure, but with an indication that it is that particular impact factor.

5. For monographs, the name of the publisher and the ISBN (International Standard Book Number) must be given, along with the total number of pages, and for parts of monographs the length of the chapter (number of pages).
6. For artistic works the title of the work, programme, place and date of creation must be given.
7. For works published in proceedings of meetings, candidates should state the authors, title of work, title of proceedings, editors, publishing house, year of publication, page of publication (start page and end page) and the total number of pages of the proceedings.
8. Under each bibliographic unit candidates should enter the number of points/work ($\check{S}TD =$) and number of points/candidate ($\check{S}TK =$). The $\check{S}TK$ is calculated by dividing the $\check{S}TD$ by the number of authors.

II. Instructions for reviewers

In formulating their assessments, reviewers should take into account the Criteria and the annex to the Criteria of the member institution to which the candidate has applied. The expert assessments must be written in Slovenian or English (for foreign reviewers).

The reports should contain the following elements:

Introduction

Date of appointment as expert reviewer, title of reviewer and field in which they were appointed, an indication of the candidate and the title requested and habilitation field.

Opinion on the bibliography submitted and the points system

The reviewer should check the adequacy of the submitted bibliography and points, especially the conformity of the works listed by the candidate to the field in which they are seeking appointment to a title, the adequacy of the classification of works, the points assigned to individual works and the adequacy of all evidence of meeting the requirements for appointment to the requested title.

If the reviewer concurs with the bibliography and points, they should give an unequivocal statement of this in their report. In this case there is no need to state the points in the report. If a check of the bibliography and points indicates that there are errors (e.g. inappropriate points tally, inappropriate calculations), they should clearly draw attention to the observed error. This may be done by correcting the points, signing them and attaching them to the report. Here they should explain the corrections in the report.

Fulfilment of the minimum conditions for an application to be considered

Reviewers should check and express their view in the report on fulfilment of the minimum conditions for an application for appointment to a requested title to be considered as follows:

- whether the candidate fulfils the common, general and special conditions for appointment to a title;
- whether the candidate fulfils the minimum requirements of quality set out in Articles 55, 60 and 66 for the relevant title, for instance guest work abroad, mentorship, heading projects etc.; if work abroad is required for appointment to a title, the report should contain an assessment of whether the candidate's work abroad complied with the requirements of the Criteria and within the wider field (e.g. natural sciences, technology, medicine, biotechnology, social sciences, humanities, art) in which the candidate works;
- whether the candidate fulfils the quantitative conditions (points, number of important works cumulatively and in the last appointment period, sufficient number of first and/or lead authorships and so forth);
- whether the candidate fulfils other required minimum criteria under the annex to the Criteria of the member institution to which the application for appointment was submitted.

Qualitative assessment of academic or artistic work

In this section the report should contain a reasoned analytical evaluation of the importance of the candidate's academic or artistic output with an analysis and assessment of the quality of the

candidate's submitted works. In the analysis the reviewer should take a reasoned and structured view regarding:

- the demonstrated capacity for independent academic, artistic or research and development work;
- proven ability to solve problems of an academic, research and development or technical nature;
- the international response or importance for the national identity and culture of the candidate's work and
- the candidate's active international engagement.

The assessment must contain an analysis of important academic or artistic works, with special emphasis on a presentation of the international importance and reception of these works (for instance number of citations, importance of journals in which works are published, reputation of publishers that published monographs or parts of monographs, contribution to scholarship, public presentations and prizes and awards for artistic works) or their importance for national identity and culture in the habilitation fields, where appearances in the international arena are not possible or not suitable as a criterion of quality.

Especially prominent and detailed evaluation should be assigned to works which in the reviewer's judgement represent the most important academic or artistic achievements of the candidate, specifically:

- at least 2 for appointment to the title of assistant professor,
- 4 for appointment to the title of associate professor and
- 6 for appointment to the title of professor.

Reviewers should substantiate the importance and international response of these works, or their national importance if they involve fields for which international response is not the sole criterion of quality.

Qualitative assessment of educational work (only applicable to pedagogical titles)

If the candidate has already worked in the educational field and demonstrated pedagogical training is required for the title, where the reviewers know the candidate sufficiently well to be able to do this (for instance if they work at the same organisational unit of the faculty as the candidate), they should assess the quality of the candidate's educational work; the assessment should be merely descriptive, since the reviewers do not have access to student assessments. They should highlight any praise or criticism based on possible demonstrated mentorship, study material, textbooks etc.

In the case of a first appointment at UL to a teaching title, where the educational ability of the candidate is demonstrated by a public trial lecture, the reviewers must draw up their reports only after the trial lecture, wherein the assessment of the candidate's pedagogical training shall take into account as appropriate the findings from the special report in accordance with the Rules on Trial Lectures.

Qualitative assessment of professional work

A brief description and assessment of the quality and importance of the candidate's professional work (leading and participating in professional projects, patent applications and patents awarded,

the appearance of papers given in professional circles, papers given at conferences, participation in professional associations and so forth).

Conclusion

The conclusion must contain a clear and unambiguous statement on whether the candidate fulfils the conditions for appointment to the requested title.

III. Instructions for UL member institutions

The Senate of the member institution where the procedure for appointment to a title is taking place shall discuss the submitted application and appoint at least three reviewers to assess the professional or artistic capacity of the candidate and, in the event that the candidate has already carried out teaching work at UL, shall invite the Student Council of the member institution where the candidate has been teaching to provide an opinion on the candidate's work as a teacher.

The reviewers must have the same title as or higher title than that being requested by the candidate. At least two reviewers must hold their title in the same field in which the candidate wishes to be appointed. In procedures for a first or new appointment to the titles of senior instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, research associate or senior research associate, at least one member of the reviewers' panel must not be employed at or be habilitated at the member institution where the candidate is seeking habilitation or where they work. In procedures for appointment to the title of professor or senior research fellow, at least one member of the reviewers' panel must not be employed at UL and not have been appointed to a title at UL. Members of the reviewers' panel may also be retired teachers or research associates and foreign university teachers and research associates holding a suitable title. In procedures involving an interdisciplinary field, members of the reviewers' panel must represent all the relevant fields. Reviewers may not have a conflict of interest with the candidate.

Foreign reviewers should as a rule focus on the qualitative assessment of the candidate's academic, educational and professional work, and it is not essential for them to take a view on the points tally and fulfilment of the minimum requirements for appointment to the title. In each case, at least two reviewers must take a view on the appropriateness of the points tally and on fulfilment of the minimum conditions for an application to be considered (see Instructions for reviewers).

If a candidate has performed educational work at multiple member institutions, the UL member institution conducting the habilitation procedure must in such cases request the opinion of the Student Councils of all the member institutions at which the candidate works. The representatives of the Student Councils may opt to draw up a single opinion or several separate opinions.

After receiving all the reviewer assessments and opinions or the opinions of the Student Council or Councils, the member institution shall inform the candidate of any negative assessments and/or opinions, or at the candidate's request, it shall also advise them of positive assessments and opinions. The candidate may comment on the content of negative assessments or negative opinion of the Student Council within three working days of receipt.

After receiving all the assessments, opinions and possible view expressed by the candidate, the member institution shall submit the entire documentation to the UL Habilitation Committee, where this involves a first or new (and each further) appointment to a title of university teacher and research associate and for guest teachers or researchers. Other procedures shall be conducted at the member institutions.

The documentation shall contain the following documents, in this order:

1. A cover letter from the dean of the member institution, providing:
 - a statement that the reviewers did not report any conflict of interest with the candidate;
 - an explanation in the event of variances regarding the required composition of the panel;

- an explanation of the reasons for any delay in the event that more than six months have elapsed between the date of the candidate submitting their application and the submission of the material to the Habilitation Committee;
 - a statement that the Student Council has failed to formulate an opinion on the candidate's teaching performance within the deadline set for the formulation of the opinion by the Senate, in such case;
 - a statement that the candidate was informed of negative assessments and/or opinions and that the candidate did not comment on this within the deadline, in such case;
 - any other necessary explanations regarding the procedure for processing the application.
2. A cover sheet with information introducing the candidate. Information on the cover sheet shall be drawn up and provided by the professional department of the member institution, in accordance with the standardised university form.
 3. The candidate's complete original (unchanged) application.
 4. The independent reports of at least three reviewers. The member institution shall submit all the collected reports from reviewers to the UL Habilitation Committee, irrespective of whether they are positive or negative.
 5. An assessment of a trial lecture for first appointment to a teaching title. The reviewers and representative of the Student Council shall formulate a joint assessment. They shall submit it in the form of a record of trial lecture drawn up on the basis of the model provided in the Rules on Trial Lectures.
 6. Copies of assessments and results of official student surveys, i.e. a collective readout of the results of student surveys from completed questionnaires.
 7. The opinion of the Student Council of the member institution or institutions, if the candidate has worked at several UL member institutions.
 8. Possible clarification from the candidate regarding negative assessments of reviewers and/or opinions from Student Councils.

The member institution shall send to the UL Habilitation Committee one printed copy of the documentation with **original** documents (candidate's signed request, reviewer assessments, opinion of the Student Council, candidate's clarification etc.) and an **identical** electronic version in pdf format, created in such a way as to enable searching in the text of all documents, where there is no need for an original signature and the document is accessible in a form that enables such conversion. All the documentation must be contained in a single file which should be named in the following manner: abbreviation of the member institution, name and surname of candidate, abbreviated title they are seeking. Example: AG Janez Novak DOC or FMF Janez Novak IP or FF Janez Novak GOST UČ.

IV. Additional clarifications

First and lead authorship in publications with several authors

The first author is the author who is named first among the authors in a publication, or as is agreed in exceptional circumstances (i.e. in the listing of authors in alphabetical order) in writing by all the co-authors. In the event of an agreement on first authorship with co-authors, a statement from all the co-authors that they agree with this must be attached. For works published since 2010 inclusive, such statement must be signed by *all* co-authors within six months of the work being published.

The lead author is the author that designed and headed the research. If the lead author is not at the same time the first author, they shall be stated in the publication as corresponding author or listed in last place among the authors (usually preceded by the word ‘and’; example: J. Kovač, J. Novak and J. Kralj), or as is agreed in exceptional circumstances (i.e. in the listing of authors in alphabetical order) in writing by all the co-authors. In the event of an agreement on lead authorship with co-authors, a statement from all the co-authors that they agree with this must be attached. For works published since 2010 inclusive, such statement must be signed by *all* co-authors within six months of the work being published. Lead authorship may also be demonstrated by the candidate being the corresponding author. In this case the candidate must submit in the application a copy of the page of the article indicating that they are the corresponding author.

In fields to which the category of first or lead author does not apply or in which it is not demonstrated in the usual way (for instance, where the authors’ names are given in alphabetical order), the candidate’s relevant contribution to such work in question must be evident. This contribution based on the candidate’s explanation shall be assessed by the reviewers.

For all requirements in the Criteria that relate either to first or lead authorship, these two authorships have equal value, except regarding candidates seeking a first appointment to the title of assistant professor, where for important works there is usually a requirement of at least three first authorships.

Points may not be allocated disproportionately among authors of an article.

Artistic work

This covers an artistic product, artistic project, artistic competition project, artistic conceptual project, the staging of an artistic work, the performance of an artistic work and other forms of creation or presentation of artistic work. It is usually individual work, but may also be work created in a collaboration of two or more persons. In the event of collaboration of several artistic contributors, they shall all appear with equal value, and such work, if it meets the criteria of important work, may be listed for all contributors as work that qualifies them for appointment to the requested title. In such cases the share contributed by the candidate in the creation of the work must be clearly visible and recognisable.

Articles where the candidate has collaborated on research but is not a co-author

Where a candidate has collaborated on research (as is evident from a reference in the article) but is not a co-author of such article, the work shall not be included in the group of works with articles

in the bibliography. If candidates nevertheless wish to list such work in the bibliography, they may do this in column 4.8, where they may also allocate points to such work at their discretion.

Monographs

An academic monograph is a publication which takes a scholarly, systematic, exhaustive and all-encompassing approach in addressing a problem, issue or subject, a person or event in a single volume or set number of volumes, which are published simultaneously or in a predetermined timetable. An academic monograph is a specialised book written for a specialised audience.

A professional monograph (expert book) is a publication which professionally addresses a problem, issue or subject, a person or event in a single volume or set number of volumes, which are published simultaneously or in a predetermined timetable.

A popular science book is a publication that professionally addresses a certain issue and presents it in a popularly accessible way.

A monograph may be published as a book or brochure.

A book is a non-periodical printed publication which excluding the cover comprises a minimum of 49 printed pages. Brochures are works that comprise at least 5 and a maximum of 48 pages excluding the cover. A monograph must be reviewed by at least two academic associates holding doctoral degrees. A monograph must have a catalogue record of publication with the ISBN designation.

Points for monographs and parts of monographs

An academic monograph published abroad shall be allocated up to 25 points, and an academic monograph published in Slovenia shall be allocated up to 20 points.

If a discussion is published in an academic monograph in Slovenia, it shall be evaluated under the following system:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| - contribution of 40 pages or more: | up to 4 points, |
| - contribution of 20 to 40 pages: | up to 3 points, |
| - contribution of 10 to 20 pages: | up to 2 points, |
| - contribution of up to 10 pages: | up to 0.5 points. |

If a discussion is published in an academic monograph by a publisher abroad, it shall be evaluated under the following system:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| - contribution of 40 pages or more: | up to 8 points, |
| - contribution of 20 to 40 pages: | up to 6 points, |
| - contribution of 10 to 20 pages: | up to 4 points, |
| - contribution of up to 10 pages: | up to 1 point. |

A popular science book in Slovenian counts for up to 3 points, and up to 6 points in a foreign language.

Points may not be allocated disproportionately among authors of a monograph or part of a monograph.

International meeting

A meeting (conference, congress) is international if it is organised by an international organisation or if the proceedings are compiled by an international editorial board and they are published in a language used by the international research community in the field covered by such meeting. If a candidate's bibliography and points system re-categorises a publication from a publication at a domestic conference to one at an international conference, the candidate should submit appropriate evidence clearly indicating that the conference meets this condition.

Organisation of exhibitions

If an exhibition is the result of academic, research, artistic or professional work, the exhibition is usually accompanied by a publication (article, monograph, exhibition catalogue) and the work is thereby documented. In such cases the accompanying publication should be listed in the classified bibliography and allocated points appropriately, where the listing in the relevant bibliography category should match the nature of such work (academic, research, artistic, professional), which the expert reviewers must assess.

The substance of the exhibition (e.g. selection or production and presentation of works, their set-up (composition), accompanying text) may be listed in the bibliography and allocated points only in exceptional cases, if the exhibition has no accompanying publication, and if it is the result of academic or professional work, regarding which the reviewers must again take a view.

The technical and administrative organisation of exhibitions cannot be listed in the classified bibliography or be allocated points, but may be taken into account in the overall quality assessment of the candidate's work, so may be listed under non-allocated work.

Textbooks and study materials

A university textbook is a reference book, including in e-form, which is intended for students as prescribed learning material for a specific branch of study or course. A textbook may be published as a book or in e-form, and must be reviewed by at least two university teachers. It must have a catalogue record with ISBN designation. It may be valued at up to 10 points.

Other textbooks with reviews are textbooks for primary and secondary schools and other pre-university education, which are compiled in accordance with the prescribed curriculum and adopted in the relevant procedure. They may be valued at up to 5 points.

Part of a university textbook (to calculate ŠTK) is valued such that 10 points (ŠTD) are divided by the number of parts of the textbook or contributions to the textbook and the number of co-authors of the part (contribution) of the textbook. Part of "another textbook" (to calculate ŠTK) is valued such that 5 points (ŠTD) are divided by the number of parts of the textbook and the number of co-authors of the part of the textbook.

Other learning material includes the first systematic processing of learning materials under a study programme, which the author compiles using their own or another's material (lecture notes, script, collection of exercises and tasks for a specific subject and other learning tools such as audio material). The materials must relate to the entire learning materials and not just specific parts of them (one course, one set of learning material for the subject of lectures and one set of material

for exercises or practicals). Material for professional seminars shall be treated in the same way. It may be published in printed form or available in electronic form. Learning material shall be valued at up to 2 points.

Reprints shall not be valued separately, while new supplemented editions are valued at half the number of points. An edition is considered to be supplemented if at least a third of the text is changed or supplemented.

Points may not be allocated disproportionately among the authors, unless there is an explicit indication of the authors of individual parts of a textbook or study material.

Points allocated for work at a foreign university

For all guest work at foreign universities, a candidate may attain an overall total of 8 teaching points. Only guest work lasting at least 30 days without interruption may be allocated points. If a period of guest work had the nature of research, and the candidate did not teach abroad, no teaching points may be claimed, but such work may serve as fulfilling the condition of guest work at a foreign institution depending on the required length of uninterrupted guest work for a specific title. For guest work eligible for points or that signifies fulfilment of the condition of guest work at a foreign institution, the candidate must submit confirmation from the host university or institution that clearly indicates information on the host, the content of the work undertaken and its duration, along with the start and end dates of the guest work.

Points for co-mentorship

In the case of co-mentorship, the number of points envisaged for mentorship shall be divided equally among all mentors and co-mentors. The maximum possible number of points for the mentoring of work, regardless of the total number of mentors and co-mentors, is set out in the points system. The bibliography should clearly indicate for the work whether the candidate was a mentor with co-mentors or just a co-mentor.

Manuals, dictionaries, lexicons, popular science books

A manual is a type of reference book which contains information and instructions presented in an accessible way in a certain field or subject. Dictionaries and lexicons are a special kind of reference literature. They are evaluated as professional monographs or popular science books.

Part of a popular science book is valued such that 3 points (for domestic professional monographs) or 6 points (for foreign professional monographs) are divided by the number of parts of the book and the number of co-authors of the part of the book.

Requirement of supervision under Article 60 of the Criteria (conditions for appointment to title of associate professor)

Supervision of a postgraduate student whose doctoral thesis proposal has been approved by UL, shall be considered equal to the condition of supervision of a postgraduate student approved for direct transition from master's to doctoral studies.

Equally, the requirement of supervision is satisfied if the candidate was a supervisor under the old (pre-Bologna) academic master's degree and under a specialisation in an artistic field.

Requirement of heading projects

A minimum criterion on the UL level is the requirement to demonstrate one (1) leadership of a project, where as part of the professional assessment of the candidate the referees are bound to assess the relevance of the project, as one of the conditions for election to a title.

Requirement of works in Slovenian

The condition of works in the Slovenian language may be satisfied by co-authorship.

Clarifications regarding points allocation in individual categories of the points system.

The table sets out clarifications regarding points allocation in individual categories of the points system. In allocating points, candidates must also observe the annex to the Criteria of the member institution to which they are submitting an application.

1.	ACADEMIC RESEARCH	
1.0	Outstanding achievements in accordance with article 48 of the Criteria	Up to 25 points
1.1.	Peer-reviewed articles National and international journals with peer-review, international exchange and a summary in a foreign language	
1.1.1	Group I (the top 5% of most quoted journals from individual fields)	Up to 12 points for a bibliographic unit
1.1.2	Group II (SSCI, SCI, AHCI)	Up to 8 points for a bibliographic unit
1.1.3	Group III (journals substituting SSCI, SCI, AHCI)	Up to 6 points for a bibliographic unit
1.1.4	Group IV (other reviewed journals)	Up to 2 points for a bibliographic unit
1.1.5	Group V (other journals)	Up to 1 point for a bibliographic unit
1.2.1	Monograph (foreign)	Up to 25 points for a bibliographic unit
1.2.2	Monograph (domestic)	Up to 20 points for a bibliographic unit
1.3.1	Part of monograph (foreign)	Up to 8 points for a bibliographic unit In allocating points, the number of pages of the part of the monograph is considered (see Points for monographs and parts of monographs)
1.3.2	Part of monograph (domestic)	Up to 4 points for a bibliographic unit In allocating points, the number of pages of the part of the monograph is considered (see Points for monographs and parts of monographs)

1.4.	Invited and published plenary paper:	
1.4.1	- at domestic academic conferences	Up to 2 points for a bibliographic unit
1.4.2	- at international academic conferences	Up to 5 points for a bibliographic unit
1.5.	Published section papers:	
1.5.1	- at domestic academic conferences	Up to 1 point for a bibliographic unit Candidates should attach evidence that the papers were invited
1.5.2	- at international academic conferences	Up to 3 points for a bibliographic unit Candidates should attach evidence that the papers were invited
1.6	Documented published papers from academic symposiums and seminars	
1.6.1	- domestic	Up to 0.5 points for a bibliographic unit
1.6.2.	- international	Up to 1 point for a bibliographic unit
1.7	Reviews published in the form of an article	Up to 2 points for a bibliographic unit
3.	ARTISTIC ACTIVITIES	
2.0	Outstanding artistic achievement in accordance with article 48 of the Criteria	Up to 25 points
2.1	Public performance or presentation of a work of art	Up to 0.5 points for the artistic work
2.2	Public performance, publication or presentation of a work of art with a published review	Up to 2 points for the artistic work
2.3	Public performance, publication or presentation of a work of art at important events of national significance	Up to 4 points for the artistic work
2.4	Public performance, publication or presentation of a work of art on an international level	Up to 5 points for the artistic work
2.5	Public performance, publication or presentation of a work of art defined by the profession as a top-level achievement of national significance	Up to 8 points for the artistic work
2.6	Public performance, publication or presentation of a work of art defined by the profession as a top-level achievement in an international context	Up to 20 points for the artistic work

2.7	Other documented artistic activity at the discretion of reviewers' panels	Up to 5 points for the artistic work
3.	TEACHING ACTIVITY	
3.1	Textbooks	
3.1.1	Peer-reviewed university textbook	Up to 10 points for a bibliographic unit Reprints are not valued separately
3.1.2	New, updated edition	Up to 5 points for a bibliographic unit
3.1.3	Other peer-reviewed non-university textbooks	Up to 5 points for a bibliographic unit
3.1.3.1	- study aids (including video lectures)	Up to 2 points for a bibliographic unit
3.1.3.2	- Study materials (in paper or electronic format)	Up to 2 points for a bibliographic unit
3.2	International projects for developing study programme curricula, teaching methods, etc.	Up to 3 points for a unit Candidates should submit evidence of collaboration
3.3	Certified teaching activity at a foreign university	Up to 8 points cumulatively See Points allocated for work at a foreign university Candidates should attach evidence
3.4	Mentorship	
3.4.1	- for diplomas (UNI) or second cycle (Bologna system)	Up to 1 point for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.4.2	- for first-cycle diplomas (VŠ) or first cycle (Bologna system)	Up to 0.5 points for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.4.3	- student research papers	Up to 1 point for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.4.4	- student art projects	Up to 1 point for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.4.5	- in national classifications in highly competitive contests	Up to 1.5 points for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.4.6	- in international classifications in highly competitive contests	Up to 2 points for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.4.7	- for faculty Prešeren awards	Up to 1.5 points for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship Mentorships in works produced as bachelor's or master's theses and given Prešeren awards cannot be allocated duplicate points, i.e. as a bachelor's or master's thesis and at the same time as a Prešeren award. Candidates should allocate points for such works only in this column.

3.4.8	- for University Prešeren awards	Up to 2 points for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship Mentorships in works produced as bachelor's or master's theses and given Prešeren awards cannot be allocated duplicate points, i.e. as a bachelor's or master's thesis and at the same time as a Prešeren award. Candidates should allocate points for such works only in this column.
3.4.9	- master's theses (pre-Bologna system)	Up to 2 points for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.4.10	- doctoral theses	Up to 3 points for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.5	Student evaluation with an average rating in the top 10% of the assessment scale at a member institution; only one subject is taken into account per year	Up to 3 points cumulatively Candidates may allocate a maximum of half a point each for the results of student surveys for one year, even if the candidate has attained good ratings in several subjects (one subject will suffice), and in all appointment periods together (cumulatively) they may attain a maximum of 3 points. In their applications candidates should submit an extract from the entire readout of the survey results, showing only the results that support the points allocated (not the entire readout), or appropriate certification from the professional services.
3.6	Students' award for teaching (awards are defined by the member institutions' specific guidelines)	Up to 3 points for an award Candidates should attach evidence
3.7	Organization of summer school, seminar, competition	
3.7.1	- with predominantly foreign participation	Up to 2 points for a unit Candidates should attach evidence
3.7.2	- with predominantly domestic participation	up to 1 point for a unit Candidates should attach evidence
3.8	Participation in organized teacher training (at university level or in an international context), with proof of participation	Up to 1 point cumulatively, even if the candidate attended several such trainings Candidates should attach evidence
4.	PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY	
4.1	Popular science book	
4.1.1	- domestic publisher	Up to 3 points for a bibliographic unit See Manuals, dictionaries, lexicons, popular science books

4.1.2	- international publisher	Up to 6 points for a bibliographic unit See Manuals, dictionaries, lexicons, popular science books
4.2	Editor or co-editor of a journal, book or conference proceedings	
4.2.1	- domestic	Up to 3 points for publication
4.2.2	- international	Up to 6 points for publication
4.3	Professional article or computer programme	Up to 1 point for a bibliographic unit
4.4	Published presentations, reports and expert papers	Up to 0.5 points for a bibliographic unit
4.5	Popular papers	Up to 0.1 points for a bibliographic unit
4.6	Patents, (co-)authorship of inventions (taken up or free)	
4.6.1	Patents granted by the national patent office	Up to 3 points for a unit
4.6.2	Patents granted by the European Patent Office	Up to 6 points for a unit Candidates should attach evidence
4.6.3	Granted triadic patent (EU, USA, Japan)	Up to 12 points for a unit Candidates should attach evidence
4.7	Involvement in a top sporting achievement	
4.7.1	Medal at a European championship	Up to 3 points for a medal
4.7.2	Medal at a world championship	Up to 5 points for a medal
4.7.3	Olympic medal	Up to 10 points for a medal
4.8	Other documented professional activity at the discretion of reviewers' panels	Total (cumulatively) up to 12 points Candidates should attach evidence

Number: 012-1/2015

Date: 6 June 2019

Prof. Dr Igor Papič

Chair of the Senate of UL

Rector of UL