



M O N I T O R

OF THE JOHN PAUL II CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF LUBLIN

Item 452/2023

**ORDER NO. ROP-0101-281/23
OF THE RECTOR
OF THE JOHN PAUL II CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF LUBLIN**

of 20 December 2023

on defining the criteria and rules for periodic evaluation of university teachers

Pursuant to Art. 128 sec. 3 of the Act of 20 July 2018 - Law on Higher Education and Science (consolidated text, Dz. U. /Journal of Laws/ of 2023, item 742 as amended), in conjunction with Art. 59 sec. 3 of the Statute of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, after the consultation with the Senate of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, the Institutional Committee of the NSZZ "Solidarność", the University Student Self-Government and the Doctoral Students' Council, it is decided as follows:

Art. 1

General provisions

1. This Order establishes the criteria, procedure and entity for periodic evaluation of university teachers (hereinafter referred to as "evaluation") within the meaning of Art. 128 of the act of 20 July 2018 - Law on Higher Education and Science, hereinafter referred to as the "Act".
2. Whenever in this Order or the Annexes a reference is made to:
 - 1) University - it should be understood as the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin;
 - 2) Evaluation Committee - it should be understood as the University Evaluation Committee established for periodic evaluation of university teachers;
 - 3) Opinion-giving Committee - it should be understood as the committee appointed to provide opinion on a university teacher evaluation questionnaire at a faculty or other unit employing university teachers;
 - 4) organisational unit - it should be understood as faculties, the Department of Foreign Languages, the Department of Physical Education and Sport, the University Library and other organisational units of the University employing university teachers;
 - 5) head of an organisational unit - it should be understood as a dean of a faculty or a vice-dean authorised by the dean, the head of the Study Office, the head of the library and the heads of other organisational units of the University employing university teachers;
 - 6) evaluation unit - it should be understood as:
 - a) Scientific Activity Evaluation Department - responsible for the evaluation of scientific achievements, in particular publications, subject to letter b) and c),

- b) Scientific Projects Department - responsible for the evaluation of achievements in the form of grants and scientific and popularisation projects,
- c) Center for Academic Didactics - responsible for the evaluation of teaching achievements;
- 7) direct supervisor - it should be understood as:
 - a) Rector - with respect to vice-rectors and deans;
 - b) dean - with respect to vice-deans, heads of institutes, heads of departments and heads of research centres, as well as university teachers employed at faculties and not assigned to any department, research centre or other unit in the faculty;
 - c) head of a department or director of a research centre - with respect to subordinate university teachers employed in the departments;
 - d) head of the Study Office, head of the library, heads of other organisational units employing university teachers - with respect to other university teachers, respectively.

Art. 2

Personal scope

1. The following university teachers employed at the University during the evaluation period referred to in Art. 4 sec. 1 are subject to evaluation in accordance with the principles set out in this Order, provided that they are still employed in the next calendar year:
 - 1) research personnel;
 - 2) research and teaching personnel;
 - 3) teaching personnel.
2. The following are not subject to the evaluation:
 - 1) Rector;
 - 2) university teachers employed at the University for a period shorter than 1/4 of the evaluation period referred to in Art. 4 sec. 1;
 - 3) university teachers employed at the University on an hourly basis of less than 1/4 of full-time within the meaning of the Act.
3. In the case of a university teacher whose scientific, teaching and organisational achievements were subject to evaluation in the course of the procedure for awarding the academic title of professor or promotion to the position of professor at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, the periodic evaluation is considered to be the evaluation carried out under that procedure, provided that it was completed during the period subject to the periodic evaluation in question. An employee who was subject to the evaluation under the promotion procedure may submit a request for a periodic evaluation in accordance with the procedure specified in this Order.

Art. 3

Subject scope and evaluation criteria

1. The subject scope of the evaluation of university teachers who are research and teaching staff includes:
 - 1) scientific activity;
 - 2) teaching activity;
 - 3) organisational activity.
2. The provisions of sec. 1 item 1 and 3 and the provisions of sec. 1 item 2 and 3 apply to university teachers who are research personnel and to academic staff who are teaching personnel, respectively.

3. The general description of the periodic evaluation criteria results from Art. 59 of the Statute of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin.
4. Detailed evaluation criteria, divided into scientific criteria (sec. A and B), teaching criteria (sec. C) and organisational criteria (sec. D), are specified in Annex 1 to the Order.
5. The scientific evaluation criteria (sec. A and B) for university teachers who are research and teaching personnel include the effects of scientific and creative activity, in particular, as indicated in the regulations on the evaluation of the quality of scientific activity. The teaching and organisational criteria apply to other professional activities of a university teacher.
6. Detailed evaluation criteria for university teachers employed at the Department of Foreign Languages, the Department of Physical Education and Sport and the School of Polish Language and Culture are specified in Annex 2 to the Order.
7. In the questionnaire referred to in Art. 5 sec. 1, a university teacher may include only the following scientific, didactic and organisational achievements:
 - 1) related to their employment at the University and the scope of entrusted employee duties,
 - 2) attributed to the University, in particular in the process of evaluation or accreditation of the University's statutory activities or as a contribution to the development of the University.
8. Interpretation of the terms used in the evaluation sheet for the description of individual performance outcomes of a university teacher should be done in accordance with the regulations on higher education and science. In sec. A of the evaluation sheet, it is permissible to list only those publications that are scientific in nature, as well as competition procedures under which applications for grants covering scientific research or development work are submitted.
9. For periodic evaluation, a university teacher may submit a maximum of six publication achievements under the categories specified in sec. A of the evaluation sheet, subject to sec. 10.
10. In the case of multi-author publications, an employee may report a larger number of publication achievements to meet the limit of publication achievements specified in sec. 9, in accordance with the principles specified for the process of evaluation of the quality of scientific activity in force on the date the Order enters into force.
11. In the case of multi-author publications, the number of points for a given publication should be divided among the co-authors according to the rules established for the process of evaluation of the quality of scientific activity in force on the date the Order enters into force.
12. In the case of multi-author book publications, the total number of points obtained by a given employee for editing, authorship of chapters, encyclopaedic and dictionary entries within a single publication may not be greater than the number of points awarded for authorship of the particular type of monograph.
13. In the case of the organisation of scientific and didactic (methodological) conferences, the number of points should be divided among the organisers who are employees of the University according to their joint declaration specifying the scope of participation in the organisation of the event, and in the absence of such a declaration - proportionally to the number of organisers who are employees of the University.
14. In the evaluation sheet, artistic achievements can only be included by university teachers representing disciplines that include achievements of an artistic nature. Achievements in the form of artistic design activity can only be listed by university teachers representing the disciplines of architecture and urban planning.
15. For points to be awarded for work in ongoing grants and projects, it is necessary to have a document indicating the scope of work commissioned under the grant/project in the form of a contract or a declaration of the grant/project manager.
16. For points to be awarded for achievements in the form of scientific articles in a scientific journal or peer-reviewed materials from international scientific conferences, the list announced by the minister

responsible for science in force on the date of entry into force of this Order applies; if the score in the list announced in the evaluation period for a given journal or conference is higher, the more favourable list applies. If a new scientific journal or international conference is added to the list, the most recent list should be used.

17. A publication in the form of a lexicon, dictionary or legal commentary may be treated as a scientific monograph, provided that the requirements applicable to a scientific monograph under generally applicable regulations are met.
18. A publication in the form of a glossary may be treated as a scientific article, provided that the requirements appropriate for a scientific article under generally applicable regulations are met.
19. Points awarded for the performance of management functions, work in committees and membership in collegiate bodies, sec. D of the evaluation sheet, are completed automatically based on data from internal IT systems.
20. Points awarded for:
 - 1) participation in workshops, training and other activities to improve the quality of education within the Center for Academic Didactics,
 - 2) obtaining qualifications and certifications (e.g. tutor, mentor, translator, trainer, instructor, coach, professional or business advisor) improving teaching competence and improving the quality of education in the field of study,
 - 3) expert work for the development of academic didactics within the Center for Academic Didactics, require approval of the Center for Academic Didactics, after submitting relevant documentation.

Art. 4

Evaluation period

1. The evaluation is done every 2 years and covers 2 consecutive full calendar years (hereinafter: the evaluation period).
2. At the request of the Rector or the head of an organisational unit, evaluation may be done more frequently, but not earlier than one year after the last evaluation. In such a case, the Rector determines the evaluation period.

Art. 5

Evaluation method

1. The evaluation is done based on the evaluation sheet made available to the university teachers via the internal IT system.
2. Under each criterion, it is required to add a description of the achievement allowing its verification or refer to the relevant documentation, which the university teacher attaches to the evaluation sheet.
3. The University teacher undergoing evaluation should complete, verify and approve the sheet in the internal IT system, print it, sign and submit it to their direct supervisor.
4. The direct supervisor verifies the data in the evaluation sheet, expresses the opinion via the internal IT system and submits the sheet - with a signed printout of the opinion, to the Opinion-giving Committee. The supervisor's opinion should contain specific references to the effects of the university teacher's scientific, organisational and teaching activities, including the results of observations and evaluation of teaching activities.
5. The Opinion-giving Committee is appointed by the head of the organisational unit. The faculty Opinion-giving Committee is composed, in particular, of the following: dean or a representative of the dean,

heads of the institutes that make up the faculty or their representatives, university teacher employed in a teaching position, university teacher employed in a research position, two representatives of the field of study coordinators elected by all coordinators of the fields of study at the faculty. The member of the Opinion-giving Committee involved in the work under evaluation is excluded for the duration of the discussion concerning the work.

6. In the course of the work of the Opinion-giving Committee, the employee's evaluation sheets should be accompanied by an opinion on the results of observation and evaluation of teaching activities prepared by the coordinator of the field of study where the employee teaches the predominant number of hours, and in the case of the division of teaching hours into fields of study run at different faculties, the opinion is prepared by the coordinator of the field of study run at the faculty where the university teacher is employed. The dean or vice-dean responsible for education, at the request of the coordinator of the field of study, may appoint persons to assist the work of the coordinator in the preparation of opinions.
7. The field of study coordinator enters the opinion referred to in sec. 6 into the internal IT system, and submits a signed printout to the Opinion-giving Committee. The coordinator's opinion should include a clear evaluation of the fulfilment of educational duties using the scale: positive, negative, outstanding.
8. Prerequisites for a negative evaluation score in the fulfilment of educational duties:
 - 1) serious, established beyond any doubt, violation of the work rules by the university teacher, including:
 - a) repeated unacceptable conduct of the university teacher such as humiliation and/or discrimination of students,
 - b) significant and systematic misconduct of the university teacher during classes, including: failure to fulfil the obligation to implement the provisions contained in the course syllabus, combining practice groups, constantly being late for classes;
 - 2) failure to improve the quality of classes, including:
 - a) at least two negative scores from the observation of classes conducted during the evaluation period,
 - b) repeated negative scores of evaluation of the way of conducting classes;
 - 3) refusal to teach classes that fall within the professional qualifications of the teacher not exceeding the scope specified in the provisions of the Law on Higher Education and Science, the Statute of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin and the resolutions of the Senate of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin;
 - 4) failure to respond to the comments of the supervisors regarding the performance of teaching and educational duties, including failure to respond to written complaints from students deemed justified by the supervisors.
9. Secretaries for Scientific Process may participate in the works of the Opinion-giving Committee at faculties as advisors. The faculty office may assist in verifying the correctness of the completion of the questionnaire by the university teachers.
10. For the appointment of the Opinion-giving Committees in other organisational units employing university teachers sec. 4 applies, respectively.
11. The opinion of the Opinion-giving Committee should include specific references to the effects of the university teacher's scientific, organisational and teaching activities in accordance with the subject scope of the evaluation referred to in Art. 3 sec. 1-2 and a clear evaluation of the fulfilment of educational duties using the scale: positive, negative, outstanding. The Opinion-giving Committee formulates the opinion taking into account the opinion of the direct supervisor of the university teacher being evaluated and the faculty coordinator.
12. The Opinion-giving Committee may not issue a positive opinion in the case of an employee whose

- performance of educational duties was assessed negatively.
13. The Evaluation Committee may recommend the award of an outstanding score, providing detailed justification.
 14. The grounds for recommending the award of an outstanding score may include, in particular:
 - 1) publication of scientific articles in journals indexed in the highest quartile (Q1) of the Scopus or Web of Science databases, and by publishing houses from level II of the list of MEiN publishers;
 - 2) management of an international scientific or teaching project;
 - 3) application activity, including obtaining patents and other protective rights;
 - 4) raising funds for the University;
 - 5) popularisation activity of significant importance;
 - 6) introduction of modern teaching methods;
 - 7) preparation of students for conferences, competitions and festivals in the field of knowledge, art or sports;
 - 8) teaching abroad within the framework of mobility programmes;
 - 9) The outstanding evaluation score of the fulfilment of educational duties should be understood as, in particular:
 - a) very highly evaluated quality of teaching at the University;
 - b) outstanding organisational and teaching activity (activities outside of teaching duties, but related to teaching, as well as work and activities with students);
 - c) very good results in the evaluation of teaching activity, expressed in scores above 4.5 in sec. I of the evaluation questionnaire (question 4, items 1-7).
 15. The Opinion-giving Committee submits to the Evaluation Committee the evaluation sheets of the university teachers employed in the unit.
 16. Based on the submitted questionnaires, the Evaluation Committee determines the final number of points for individual university teachers and establishes the list:
 - 1) of university teachers who received a negative score;
 - 2) of university teachers who received a positive score (including an outstanding score).
 17. In the course of the work of the Evaluation Committee, the questionnaires are subject to verification by the relevant verification units.
 18. The deadlines for the performance of the activities specified in sec. 1-16 are determined by the vice-rector in charge of periodic evaluation of university teachers.
 19. A university teacher who fails to submit the evaluation sheet on time without a justified reason receives a negative score.
 20. In justified cases, at the request of a university teacher submitted immediately after the cessation of the circumstances preventing that person from submitting the evaluation sheet, the Evaluation Committee may agree to the submission of the evaluation sheet in a different manner or on a different date.
 21. University teachers who are subject to evaluation but who are not obliged to work during the evaluation period are evaluated after the condition suspending the obligation to work ceases to exist, within the deadlines specified by the vice-rector responsible for periodic evaluation of university teachers.

Art. 6

Conditions for receiving a positive score

1. The prerequisites for a positive score are:
 - 1) obtaining the required number of points and meeting the conditions specified in Annex 3 to the Order relevant to the held degree/academic title and the field of research conducted by the employee;

- 2) positive opinion of the Opinion-giving Committee.
2. The university teacher who has not fulfilled any of the prerequisites specified in sec. 1 receives a negative score, subject to sec. 3.
3. In exceptional cases, the Evaluation Committee may exclude a university teacher from evaluation in a given period, at a justified request of the Opinion-giving Committee or the head of the organisational unit, in particular taking into account the personal situation and other reasons that make it impossible to meet the requirements of the periodic evaluation criteria.
4. If the university teacher was not employed full-time or over the entire evaluation period, the Rector individually determines the conditions for obtaining a positive score in proportion to the period and length of service.
5. If, during the evaluation period, the university teacher was employed in employee groups with different conditions for obtaining a positive score, the Rector individually determines the conditions for obtaining a positive score in proportion to the period and length of service within individual groups.
6. In the case of absence of a university teacher from work resulting from:
 - 1) being on:
 - a) leave related to parenthood, as defined in the provisions of sec. 8 of the act of 26 June 1974 - Labour Code,
 - b) leave for health reasons,
 - c) unpaid leave lasting continuously for at least 3 months,
 - 2) performing:
 - a) military service,
 - b) replacement service,
 - 3) taking:
 - a) sickness benefits continuously for at least 3 months,
 - b) rehabilitation benefit in connection with incapacity for work, including due to an illness requiring medical rehabilitation

- the deadline for periodic evaluation is extended by the time of the absence, and the Rector individually determines the conditions for obtaining a positive score in proportion to the evaluation period.

Art. 7

Conditions for receiving an outstanding score

1. In the group of university teachers employed in research and teaching or research positions, an outstanding score may be awarded to individuals who are in the group of 25% of individuals with the highest score for the represented discipline and degree/academic title (mgr/dr and dr hab./prof.) and obtain a recommendation from the Opinion-giving Committee emphasising the specific effects of the university teacher's scientific activity and the significance (importance) of the results of the scientific, teaching or organisational activity of that individual. In the case of persons in research and teaching positions, an outstanding score depends on the number of points obtained by a given university teacher in sec. A and the total number of points in sec. B, C and D, but not more than 1.5 times the number of points in sec. A. In the case of persons in research positions, an outstanding score depends on the number of points obtained by a given university teacher in sec. A and the total number of points obtained in sec. B and D, but not more than 1.5 times the number of points obtained in sec. A.
2. In the group of university teachers employed in teaching positions, an outstanding score may be given to those who are in the group of 20% of individuals with the highest score for the degree or title (mgr/dr and dr hab./prof.) and receive a recommendation from the Opinion-giving Committee emphasising the importance (significance) of the results of the teaching and organisational activity or an outstanding

score for teaching activity of that individual. The number of points obtained by a given university teacher in sec. C and D is taken into account for an outstanding score. In the case of teaching staff, academic achievements may additionally be taken into account.

3. In the group of university teachers who are employees of the Department of Foreign Languages, the Department of Physical Education and Sport and the School of Polish Language and Culture, an outstanding score may be given to those who are in the group of 20% of individuals with the highest score among the university teachers employed at those units and receive a recommendation from their direct supervisor emphasising specific effects of the university teacher's scientific activity and the importance (significance) of the results of the scientific, didactic or organisational activity of those individuals.
4. The limit of persons who can be awarded an outstanding score is determined as follows:
 - 1) for employees in research and research and teaching positions, the limit is 10% of the total number of research and research and teaching positions within the organisational unit rounded up to the nearest whole number;
 - 2) for employees in teaching positions, the limit is 5% of the number of full-time teaching positions within the organisational unit rounded up to the nearest whole number.
5. An outstanding score may be given to a university teacher who does not meet the requirements specified in sec. 1-4 if that person was not employed during the entire evaluation period or was employed on a part-time basis but has a recommendation from the Opinion-giving Committee indicating specific effects of the university teacher's scientific activity and the importance (significance) of the results of the scientific, teaching or organisational activity of that individual.

Art. 8

Explanatory procedure

1. In the course of issuing an opinion, the Opinion-giving Committee may initiate the explanatory procedure regarding the data contained in the evaluation sheet. The Opinion-giving Committee may require the university teacher to provide relevant explanations, submit original or certified copies of documents, originals or photocopies of publications and other materials proving the accuracy of the data provided in the questionnaire. The Opinion-giving Committee may also request further clarification from the direct supervisor or request verification of the data by the relevant verification units.
2. The Evaluation Committee may, ex officio or at the request of a direct supervisor, the Opinion-giving Committee or the head of the relevant organisational unit, initiate an explanatory procedure regarding the data contained in the evaluation sheet.
3. As part of the explanatory procedure, the Evaluation Committee may require the university teacher to provide relevant explanations, submit original or certified copies of documents, originals or photocopies of publications and other materials to prove the accuracy of the data provided in the questionnaire. The Evaluation Committee may also request further clarification from the direct supervisor or head of the relevant organisational unit.
4. If the total number of points awarded by the Evaluation Committee is more than 25% lower than the total number of points shown in the questionnaire submitted by the university teacher or if the teacher does not perform the reporting duties, the teacher may receive a negative score.

5. If there are any doubts as to the university teacher's compliance with copyright and related rights, as well as industrial property law, the Evaluation Committee may suspend the procedure and request that the Disciplinary Ombudsman for Academic Teachers undertake additional explanatory activities.

Art. 9

Information about the results of the evaluation

University teachers are informed of the results of the evaluation in writing. Decisions of the Evaluation Committee are delivered through the relevant organisational units or postal operator to the address indicated by the academic teacher.

Art. 10

Appeal procedure

1. A university teacher who wishes to raise objections regarding the mode or result of the evaluation may appeal to the Rector within 14 days from the delivery of the evaluation results.
2. The appeal should be filed in writing through the Human Resources Department.

Art. 11

Final provisions

1. This Order comes into effect as of the date of its signing.
2. The provisions of this Order apply starting from the periodic evaluation of university teachers for the years 2024-2025.
3. Doubts related to the interpretation of the Order, in particular the method of interpreting the principles or evaluation criteria, are resolved by the Evaluation Committee in the form of a decision. The request for interpretation of the Order should be submitted through the head of the relevant organisational unit.
4. Changes to the criteria and conditions for receiving a positive score may be introduced during the evaluation period only in the event of significant changes in generally applicable regulations.
5. Changing the evaluation criteria requires an amendment to the Order.

Rector of the John Paul II Catholic University of
Lublin:
ks. prof. dr hab. Mirosław Kalinowski

**EVALUATION CRITERIA OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS
EMPLOYED IN RESEARCH, RESEARCH AND TEACHING
AND TEACHING POSITIONS**

NO.	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
SECTION A				
SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITY				
Publications in scientific journals				
A1	Scientific article in a scientific journal listed by the Minister	according to the number of points on the list (20-200 points)		
A2	Review article in a scientific journal listed by the Minister	50% of points according to the number of points on the list (20-200 points)		
A3	Scientific article published in peer-reviewed materials from international scientific conferences listed by the Minister	according to the number of points on the list (20-200 points)		
Scientific monographs and other publications				
A4	Authorship of a scientific monograph in a publication listed by the Minister (level 2): a) in the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences and family sciences b) in other fields	300 points 200 points		
A5	Authorship of a scientific monograph in a publication listed by the Minister (level 1): a) in the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences and family sciences b) in other fields Bonus of 50% of points for publications indexed in the Scopus or Web of Science database or published by publishing houses run by universities with IDUB university status or meeting the requirements for participation in the IDUB competition	120 points 80 points		
A6	Authorship of a scientific monograph published by a publishing house listed by the Minister (level 1), peer-reviewed, with footnotes, references or translated in a way appropriate for a given scientific discipline: a) work of scientific or cultural importance translated into Polish, b) work of scientific or cultural importance published in Polish translated into another modern language; or scientific editing of source texts - 1) in the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences and family sciences 2) in other fields Bonus of 50% of points for publications indexed in the Scopus or Web of Science database or published by publishing houses run by universities with IDUB university status or meeting the requirements for participation in the IDUB competition	60 points 40 points		

No.	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
A7	Authorship of a monograph specified in item A6 created as a result of the implementation of a project financed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) by the National Science Centre, b) by the Foundation for Polish Science, c) under NPRH, NAWA, d) under a framework programme for the promotion of research and innovation of the European Union or under a programme related to the implementation of the above programme - <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) in the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences and family sciences 2) in other fields Bonus of 50% of points for publications indexed in the Scopus or Web of Science database or published by publishing houses run by universities with IDUB university status or meeting the requirements for participation in the IDUB competition	120 points 80 points		
A8	Editing of a scientific monograph published by a publishing house listed by the Minister (level 2): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) in the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences and family sciences b) in other fields 	150 points 100 points		
A9	Editing of a scientific monograph published by a publishing house listed by the Minister (level 1): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) in the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences and family sciences b) in other fields Bonus of 50% of points for publications indexed in the Scopus or Web of Science database or published by publishing houses run by universities with IDUB university status or meeting the requirements for participation in the IDUB competition	40 points 20 points		
A10	Authorship of a chapter in a scientific monograph published by a publishing house listed by the Minister (level 2): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) in the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences and family sciences b) in other fields 	75 points 50 points		
A11	Authorship of a chapter in a scientific monograph published by a publishing house listed by the Minister (level 1):	20 points		
Artistic achievements				
A12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Direction, authoring the script, adaptation, set design, costumes, photos, choreography or lighting direction, editing, production, dramaturgy, production management or a leading role - in the case of a feature film, documentary, animated film, television production, television series up to 13 episodes (season) or television theatre; 2) Direction, authorship of the script, adaptation, play text, set design, costumes, choreography or lighting direction, dramaturgy or a leading role - in the case of a theatre performance, including a television theatre performance; 3) Retrospective of artistic achievements at prestigious film and theatre festivals, on television and at events dedicated to the artist organised by prestigious cultural institutions; 4) Authorship of a multimedia project presented in a prestigious gallery or other space during an artistic event of significant importance; 5) Individual exhibition of multimedia works 	200 points - in the case of an outstanding work, regardless of the place of dissemination and in the case of a retrospective of achievements; 100 points - for a work of high artistic value, disseminated abroad or at home at an international artistic event of high prestige; 50 points - in other cases		

No.	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
A13	1) Post-production of image, sound or special effects or digital restoration of a film; 2) Supporting role (excluding episodes and extras) in a film, television series up to 13 episodes (season) or theatre performance, including television theatre performance; 3) Direction of a dubbing or radio play, a leading role in a dubbing or radio play, audio-book released on any medium or a role in a feature documentary (excluding episodes and extras); 4) Authorship of a film script accepted for production; 5) Authorship of a multimedia project presented in galleries or public space	100 points - in the case of dissemination abroad or at home at an international artistic event of high prestige; 30 points - in other cases		
A14	1) Performance of the function of a coordinator of theatre or film projects, or a curator of a theatre performance or festival of at least national scope; 2) Participation of an employee of the unit in the jury of a competition or festival in the field of theatre and film organised outside the unit by a renowned art centre; 3) Supporting role in a radio play or dubbing or participation in a reading or performance activity; 4) Original design of a theatre puppet; 5) Linguistic, dialect or vocal development of a theatre or film work; 6) Other theatre work distributed in the public space	50 points - in the case of dissemination abroad or at home at an international artistic event of high prestige; 25 points - in other cases		
A15	Authoring or editing publications in the field of theatre or film	200 points - in the case of an outstanding publication of international importance, in particular, a publication for which an award was received during the evaluation period; 100 points – in the case of publications of great importance for the development of theatre or film; 50 points - in other cases		
A16	1) Authorship, performance, recording, publication or public broadcast of a musical work or choreography for a large ensemble; 2) Original design of a musical instrument; 3) Performance of a musical piece (conductor, soloist, chamber music composer or performer, choreographer); 4) Publication of a recording (conductor, soloist, chamber music composer or performer, choreographer); 5) Retrospective of artistic achievements at prestigious music festivals, on television and at events dedicated to the artist organised by prestigious cultural institutions	200 points - in the case of an outstanding work; 100 points - in the case of work distributed abroad or at home at an international art event of high prestige; 50 points - in other cases		

No.	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
A17	1) Authorship, performance, recording, publication or public broadcast of a musical work or choreography for a smaller ensemble; 2) Recital; 3) Performance as a soloist, except for solo orchestral and choral parts; 4) Leading role in a musical performance; 5) Conducting a concert; 6) Preparation of a choir by the choirmaster for a vocal and instrumental concert, opera, operetta or musical performance; 7) Participation in a chamber music concert; 8) Authorship or sound direction of phonographic or audiovisual forms; 9) Authorship of a libretto or script for a musical performance, choreography or development of stage movement; 10) Musical direction or direction of a musical performance	150 points - in the case of an outstanding work; 75 points - in the case of work distributed abroad or at home at an international art event of high prestige; 40 points - in other cases		
A18	1) Supporting role in a musical performance; 2) Other types of published musical works	50 points - in the case of dissemination abroad or at home at an international artistic event of high prestige; 25 points - in other cases		
A19	1) Reconstruction of a vintage musical instrument; 2) Performance of the function of an artistic director of a festival, competition or cyclical concert; 3) Performance of the function of a juror of a music competition or music festival of at least national scope	100 points - in the case of reconstruction of a musical instrument; 60 points - in the case of performing the function of an artistic director of a festival, competition or cyclical concert; 40 points - in the case of being a member of a jury of a music competition		
A20	Authorship or editing publications in the field of music	200 points - in the case of an outstanding publication of international importance, in particular, a publication for which an award was received during the evaluation period; 100 points - for publications of great importance to the development of music; 50 points - in other cases		
A21	Authorship of an outstanding work of art distributed in public space, including a multimedia, performance, audiovisual, sculptural or interdisciplinary work, a series of artworks or design collections	200 points - regardless of the place of presentation		
A22	1) Authorship of a work of art distributed in public space, including a multimedia, performance, audiovisual, sculptural or interdisciplinary work, a series of artworks or design collections 2) Authorship of a conservation project of significant importance along with design and documentation; 3) Individual author's exhibition, including a retrospective of artistic achievements presenting works of art, organised in a renowned artistic centre or a renowned cultural institution; 4) Authorship of a visual project of significant importance in the field of design arts, industrial design, interior architecture (in public and private spaces), photography, landscape architecture, visual communication, painting, sculpture or graphics	100 points - in the case of dissemination at an international art event or competition of high prestige abroad or at home or in a foreign gallery or art institution of high prestige; 50 points - in the case of presentation in a national gallery or art institution of high prestige		

No.	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
A23	1) Authorship of an artwork presented in the galleries; 2) Individual author's exhibition presenting artworks organised in the unit; 3) Authorship of a visual project of a lower level of importance in the field of design arts, industrial design, interior architecture (in public and private spaces), photography, landscape architecture, visual communication, painting, sculpture or graphics; 4) Authorship of a conservation project of a lower level of importance; 5) Other types of artworks presented to the public	50 points - in the case of dissemination at an international art event or art competition of high prestige organised abroad or in a foreign gallery or art institution of high prestige; 20 points - in the case of presentation in a national gallery or art institution of high prestige		
A24	1) Participation of an employee of the unit in the jury of an art competition or festival organised by a renowned art centre or a renowned cultural institution; 2) Performance of the function of a curator of an exhibition, art projects or event in the field of visual arts; 3) Participation in a collective exhibition of photographic works organised by a renowned gallery or museum, artistic centre, cultural institution or university	40 points - in the case of a foreign event of high prestige; 20 points - in the case of a national event of high prestige; 10 points - in other cases		
A25	Authorship or editing of publications in the field of fine arts or conservation of works of art	200 points - in the case of an outstanding publication of international importance, in particular, a publication for which an award was given during the evaluation period; 100 points - in the case of publications of great importance to the development of visual arts or the conservation of works of art; 50 points - in other cases		
Patents and property rights				
A26	Patent for invention: a) granted by the Patent Office of the Republic of Poland b) given abroad (to be shared by the creators)	150 points 300 points		
A27	Property rights for a utility model or trademark, rights from registration of an industrial design or integrated circuit topography granted by the Patent Office of the Republic of Poland or abroad	75 points		
A28	Reporting the invention through the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, transferring the right to the patent to another entity	50 points		
Scientific and research work				
A29	Grants obtained under Horizon 2020 - points shown once during the evaluation period for each of the obtained grants	manager - 200 points task performer - 80 points (For obtaining a grant of more than PLN 1,000,000 - 50% points bonus; of more than PLN 2,000,000 - 100% points bonus)		
A30	Grants obtained in national competitions (NCN, NCBiR, NPRH) - points shown once during the evaluation period for each of the obtained grants The criterion does not apply to the "Miniatura" competition	manager - 100 points task performer - 40 points (For obtaining a grant of more than PLN 300,000 - 50% points bonus; of more than PLN 1,000,000 - bonus 100% points)		

No.	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
A31	Grants obtained in other national competitions - points shown once during the evaluation period for each of the obtained grants Not applicable to internal grants.	manager - 50 points task performer - 20 points (for obtaining a grant of more than PLN 150,000 - bonus of 50% points, of more than PLN 300,000 - bonus of 100% points)		
A32	Grants obtained in foreign or international competitions - points shown once during the evaluation period for each of the obtained grants	manager - 120 points task performer - 50 points (For obtaining a grant of more than PLN 300,000 - 50% bonus points, of more than PLN 1,000,000 - bonus 100% points)		
A33	Preparation and submission of an application for an external grant that was denied	Horizon 2020 - 40 points other international or foreign - 20 points other- 10 points		
A34	Implementation of a research, research and development project financed by an entity outside the higher education sector - minimum value of PLN 10,000	manager - 40 points task performer - 10 points (for a project worth: more than PLN 200,000 - 50% points bonus; more than PLN 400,000 - 100% points bonus; more than PLN 1,000,000 - 200% points bonus)		
A35	Financial resources obtained from direct or indirect commercialisation of the results of scientific research or development works	10 points (for every PLN 10,000 additional 5 points)		
A36	Funds received for the performance of research, research and development services, expertise	10 points (for every PLN 10,000 additional 5 points)		
Obtained academic degrees and titles				
A37	Doctoral degree	50 points		
A38	Habilitation doctor degree	70 points		
A39	Professor	80 points		
Impact of scientific activity on the functioning of society and economy				
A40	Conducting scientific activity that has an impact on the functioning of society and economy - demonstration of the impact along with evidence of the range of the impact: 1) international 2) national 3) regional 4) local (points to be divided among those conducting research and those in charge of dissemination activities related to the description of impact - according to the requirements specified for the evaluation of the quality of scientific activity)	25 points 15 points 10 points 5 points		

No.	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
A41	Conducting scientific activity that has an impact on the functioning of society and economy - demonstration of impact along with evidence of impact, reported in the process of evaluation of the quality of scientific activity: 1) international 2) national 3) regional 4) local (points to be divided among those conducting research and those in charge of dissemination activities related to the description of impact - according to the requirements specified for the evaluation of the quality of scientific activity)	50 points 30 points 20 points 10 points		
SECTION B				
ADDITIONAL SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITY				
Other publishing activity				
B1	Authorship of a popular science publication, a publication promoting science	book - 15 points article - 5 points		
Scholarships, internships, conferences				
B2	Scholarship or internship within the framework of international programmes and projects (at least 1 month)	15 points		
B3	Scholarship or internship within the framework of international programmes and projects (any length)	6 points		
B4	Scientific paper at a national conference or at an international conference in Poland, in Polish or the language of philological affiliation	2 points		
B5	Scientific paper at an international conference abroad or in a foreign language (in the case of philologists in a foreign language other than that represented by the employee's philological affiliation)	4 points		
Scientific reviews				
B6	Publishing reviews: - articles for journals indexed in JCR or Scopus - articles for other scientific journals - scientific monographs (for Polish publishing houses) - scientific monographs (for foreign publishing houses)	2 points 1 point 3 points 5 points		
B7	Review in the procedure for awarding a doctoral degree	6 points		
B8	Review or opinion in the procedure for awarding: - the title of habilitated doctor - the title of professor	8 points 10 points		
B9	Membership of the habilitation committee (excluding reviewers)	3 points		
B10	Performance of the function of a thesis supervisor or assistant supervisor in the doctoral procedure at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin or outside the University and in the procedure for granting the honorary title of doctor honoris causa (completed during the evaluation period with the award of the title)	12 points		
Awards, decorations, functions in representative bodies				
B11	Foreign award or decoration, award from the President of the Republic of Poland, President of the Council of Ministers, Polish Academy of Sciences, the Ministry of National Education and other ministers, the Foundation for Polish Science	8 points		

No.	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
B12	Performance of the function of a member of the Council for Scientific Excellence, the Commission for the Evaluation of Science, the General Council for Science and Higher Education, committees of the Polish Academy of Sciences, the Council of the National Science Centre	10 points		
B13	Performance of the function of an expert: the National Science Centre (panel expert, reviewer), the National Center for Research and Development, the Foundation for Polish Science, the Commission for the Evaluation of Science, the National Agency for Academic Exchange, teams within government administration and international expert teams.	10 points		
Functions in journals (points once per the evaluation period)				
B14	Editor of journals published or co-published by the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin (if indexed in the Scopus or Web of Science database, category B16 applies)	editor-in-chief - 10 points deputy editor/topical editor - 7 points		
B15	Secretary of a journal published or co-published by the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin	8 points		
B16	Editor of a journal indexed in the Scopus or Web of Science database	editor-in-chief - 12 points deputy editor/topical editor - 8 points		
B17	Member of the editorial board of a journal indexed in the Scopus or Web of Science database	4 points		
B18	Member of the scientific advisory board of a journal indexed in the Scopus or Web of Science database	4 points		
Professional activity of librarians and scientific information workers				
B19	Creation of records in databases	0.2 points per record (maximum 15 points)		
B20	Creation of thematic, informative and bibliographic studies	1 point		
B21	Scientific study of book collections and collections	3 points		
B22	Library collection preservation activities	2 points		
PART C				
TEACHING ACTIVITY				
Didactic publishing activity				
C1	Authorship of a textbook (with an ISBN) - also applies to subsequent editions of the textbook	author - 25 points co-author - 10 points editor - 10 points		
C2	Authorship of a teaching script (with an ISBN or published as an open access e-book)	author - 6 points co-author - 3 points		
Teaching activity				
C3	Conducting classes using modern teaching methods (according to the course syllabus). Excluding "Tutoring" classes in the first year of study. The questionnaire should be accompanied by a description of the classes during which modern methods were used and with what results.	0.5 points per hour of classes (maximum 20 points)		
C4	Conducting classes using the project method, design thinking method or service learning with necessary consideration of team and group work as well as role and process management (according to the course syllabus). The questionnaire should be accompanied by a description of what classes were held and what projects/activities were developed/implemented by the students.	2 points per project (maximum 20 points)		

No.	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
C5	Conducting classes the final result of which is the preparation of an individual project by a student (according to the course syllabus). The questionnaire should be accompanied by a description of what projects were developed by the students and during which classes.	2 points per project (maximum 20 points)		
C6	Conducting classes as part of international exchange and foreign cooperation programmes - classes outside the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin (e.g. Erasmus+, cooperation agreement, foreign programmes)	1 point per hour of classes		
C7	Supervisor or assistant supervisor of diploma theses in full-time first-cycle/ second-cycle/master degree studies	master degree - 2 points undergraduate/engineering - 1.5 points		
C8	Reviewing diploma theses in full-time studies	master/undergraduate/engineering - 0.5 points		
C9	Development of an author's elective course, where the instructor independently created the course syllabus, selected the content and teaching methods (points for each course can be added for the first three years of the course)	2 points per course		
C10	Conducting teaching classes in the form of overtime (<i>only full-time studies, excluding the hours specified in the Work Regulations</i>)	0,2 point per hour of classes (maximum 10 points)		
C11	Participation in the implementation of an international teaching project	leader - 40 points task performer - 20 points		
C12	Participation in the implementation of a national teaching project	leader - 20 points task performer - 10 points		
C13	Participation in workshops, training courses etc. with the purpose of improving teaching competence in the dimension of	5 points per every 15 hours of workshop/training course (maximum 20 points)		
C14	Development of a workshop or training course for the Center for Academic Didactics	up to 10 hours - 4 points over 10 hours - 8 points		
C15	Participation in workshops, training courses, etc. to improve the quality of education organised within the Center for Academic Didactics	leader - 8 points participant - 3 points		
C16	Obtaining qualifications and certifications (e.g. tutor, mentor, translator, trainer, instructor, coach, career or business advisor) improving teaching competence and enhancing the quality of education within the field of study	8 points		
C17	Expert work for the development of academic didactics implemented within the framework of the Center for Academic Didactics, as well as commissioned by the Education Department	5 points (maximum 20 points)		
Scholarships, internships, conferences				
C18	Scholarship or internship within the framework of international programmes and projects (at least 1 month)	15 points		
C19	Scholarship or internship within the framework of international programmes and projects (any length)	6 points		
C20	Didactic/methodical paper at a national conference or international conference in Poland and in Polish	2 points		
C21	Teaching/methodological paper at an international conference abroad or in a foreign language (in the case of philologists in a foreign language other than that represented by the employee's philological affiliation)	4 points		
Awards, decorations, functions in representative bodies				

No.	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
C22	Foreign award or decoration, award or decoration from the President of the Republic of Poland, the Prime Minister, the Ministry of National Education or other ministers	8 points		
C23	Performance of the function of a member of the Polish Accreditation Committee, the National Agency for Academic Exchange, commission of the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences	10 points		
C24	Performance of the function of an expert: the National Center for Research and Development, the National Agency for Academic Exchange, teams within the government administration and international expert teams.	10 points		
Educational functions (points once per evaluation period)				
C25	Supervisor of the year (as long as the individual was active and submitted annual reports on the activities conducted during the evaluation period)	10 points		
C26	Supervisor of a student in the individual course of study	3 points		
C27	Supervisor of a student club/student organisation - as long as the organisation was active and this is evident from the annual activity report (participation in university and city events, Lublin Science Festival, Adaptation Week, conferences, exhibitions, etc., as well as obtaining grants for the activities of student organisations)	10 points		
C28	Internship supervisor	6 points		
C29	Faculty internship coordinator	4 points		
C30	Erasmus programme coordinator within a field of study	6 points		
C31	Erasmus programme coordinator within a faculty	4 points		
SECTION D				
ORGANISATIONAL ACTIVITY				
Management functions (points once during the evaluation period regardless of the period of holding the position)				
D1	Vice-rector	35 points		
D2	Dean/vice-dean	25 points		
D3	Head of Institute/Department of Foreign Languages/Doctoral School	25 points		
D4	Deputy head of Institute	12 points		
D5	Field of study coordinator (if not acting as head of the Institute)	20 points		
D6	Rector's Plenipotentiary	15 points		
D7	Coordinator of part-time studies	10 points		
D8	Disciplinary ombudsman	15 points		
D9	Head of department/research centre	8 points		
Function in committees (points once during the evaluation period)				
D10	Work for the university committee	5 points (with the possibility of doubling by the chair)		
D11	Work in a departmental committee for quality of education, scientific discipline grant committee, review committee under the regulations on periodic evaluation	4 points (with the possibility of doubling by the chair)		
D12	Work in the Recruitment Committee of the Doctoral School	leader - 6 points member - 3 points		

No.	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
D13	Work in the committee conducting the mid-term evaluation of a doctoral student from the Doctoral School (for each evaluated doctoral student)	2 points		
D14	Member of a field of study programme council	5 points		
Membership in collegial bodies (points once during the evaluation period)				
D15	Member of the Senate (elected)	5 points		
D16	Member of the Doctoral School Council	5 points		
Works for the benefit of the University and the department				
D17	Preparing the course or Doctoral School for accreditation/evaluation (points to be shared among the team members)	50 points		
D18	Preparation of a description of the impact of scientific activity on the functioning of society and the economy - for the purpose of evaluation of the quality of scientific activity (points to be shared among the team members)	30 points		
D19	Work on the creation of a new major within first-cycle/second-cycle/ long-cycle master degree studies, which has been launched: (points to be shared among the team members)	20 points		
D20	Preparation of and conduct of meetings and events to promote the University, including promotional activities for university recruitment and social media profiles	2 points per event (maximum 20 points)		
D21	Management of a completed project within the Lublin Science Festival	3 points		
D22	Organisation of nationwide scientific or teaching/methodical conferences - (points to organisers based on the participation)	4 points		
D23	Organisation of international scientific or teaching/methodical conferences - (points to organisers based on the participation)	6 points		
D24	Media appearance as a member of the Expert Panel of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin	0,3 points		
D25	Preparation of and conduct of training courses, lectures, workshops, promotions outside the University to promote the activity of the University	2 points (maximum 10 points)		
Organisational activity for the University Library				
Performed functions				
D26	Head of the University Library	20 points		
D27	Deputy head of the University Library	15 points		
D28	Branch or section manager	8 points		
Other activities				
D29	Membership in library organisations and associations	2 points		
D30	Preparation of and conduct of training, internships, lectures, workshops, presentations	2 points		
Other scientific, teaching or organisational activity (this section is subject to evaluation by the direct supervisor)				
Description of other activities		maximum 10 points (self-evaluation)		

I declare that my work during the evaluation period did not violate the provisions of copyright and related rights or industrial property.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR UNIVERSITY TEACHERS
EMPLOYED AT THE DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES, THE DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL
EDUCATION AND SPORT AND THE SCHOOL OF POLISH LANGUAGE AND CULTURE**

NO	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
TEACHING ACTIVITY				
Improvement of qualifications, competence				
1.	Doctoral studies along with obtaining a scientific degree	10 points		
2.	Postgraduate studies	6 points		
3.	Courses and training	3 points		
4.	Scholarships, study visits, workshops	2 points		
5.	Other courses and training	1 point		
Development of teaching materials and teaching activity				
6.	Authorship of a textbook (with an ISBN)	author - 10 points co-author - 5 points editor - 5 points		
7.	Authorship of a teaching script (with an ISBN or published as an open access e-book)	author - 6 points co-author - 3 points		
8.	Creation of original or specialised educational plans/programmes	3 points		
9.	Conducting specialised foreign language classes/sports section training	0.3 points per hour		
10.	Conducting classes as part of international exchange and foreign cooperation programmes - outside the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin (e.g. Erasmus+, cooperation agreement, foreign programmes)	1 point per hour of classes		
11.	Conducting classes using modern teaching methods (according to the course syllabus). Excluding "Tutoring" classes in the first year of study. The questionnaire should be accompanied by a description of the classes during which modern methods were used and with what results	0.5 points per hour of classes		
12.	Conducting classes using the project method, design thinking method or service learning with necessary consideration of team and group work as well as role and process management (according to the course syllabus). The questionnaire should be accompanied by a description what projects/activities were developed/implemented by the students and during which classes	2 points per project (maximum 20 points)		
13.	Obtaining qualifications and certifications (e.g. tutor, mentor, translator, trainer, instructor, coach, career or business advisor) improving teaching competence and the quality of education	8 points		
14.	Expert work for the development of academic didactics within the Center for Academic Didactics	5 points (maximum 20 points)		
Foreign language examiner				
15.	Preparation of a foreign language exam	2 points		
16.	Conducting/coordination of foreign language exam	2 points		

NO	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
Achievements in the field of physical education and sports				
17.	Participation of athletes in the World Academic Championships	10 points		
18.	Participation of athletes in the European Universities Championships	6 points		
19.	Participation of athletes in the Polish Academic Championships	3 points		
20.	Participation of athletes in the Regional University Championships	2 points		
Educational and organisational functions				
21.	Supervisor of a student club/student organisation - as long as the organisation was active and this is evident from the annual activity report (participation in university and city events, Lublin Science Festival, Adaptation Week, conferences, exhibitions, etc., as well as obtaining grants for the activities of student organisations)	10 points		
22.	Student internship supervisor	10 points		
23.	Supervisor of a student in the individual course of study	3 points		
SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITY				
Publications in scientific journals				
24.	Scientific article in a scientific journal listed in the Minister's list of journals	according to the number of points on the list (20-200 points)		
25.	Review article in a scientific journal listed in the Minister's list of journals	50% of points according to the number of points on the list (20-200 points)		
26.	Scientific article published in peer-reviewed materials from international scientific conferences listed in the Minister's list of journals	according to the number of points on the list (20-200 points)		
Scientific monographs and other publications				
27.	Authorship of a scientific monograph in a publication listed by the Minister (level 2): a) in the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences and family sciences b) in other fields	300 points 200 points		
28.	Authorship of a scientific monograph in a publication listed by the Minister (level 1): a) in the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences and family sciences b) in other fields Bonus of 50% of points for publications indexed in the Scopus or Web of Science database or published by publishing houses run by universities with IDUB university status or meeting the requirements for participation in the IDUB competition	120 points 80 points		

No	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
29.	<p>Authorship of a scientific monograph published by a publishing house listed by the Minister (level 1), peer-reviewed, with footnotes, references or translated in a way appropriate for a given scientific discipline:</p> <p>a) work of scientific or cultural importance translated into Polish, b) work of scientific or cultural importance published in Polish translated into another modern language; or scientific editing of source texts -</p> <p>1) in the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences and family sciences 2) in other fields</p> <p>Bonus of 50% of points for publications indexed in the Scopus or Web of Science database or published by publishing houses run by universities with IDUB university status or meeting the requirements for participation in the IDUB competition</p>	<p>60 points 40 points</p>		
30.	<p>Authorship of a monograph specified in item A6 created as a result of the implementation of a project financed:</p> <p>a) by the National Science Centre, b) by the Foundation for Polish Science, c) under NPRH, NAWA, d) under a framework programme for the promotion of research and innovation of the European Union or under a programme related to the implementation of the above programme -</p> <p>1) in the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences and family sciences 2) in other fields</p> <p>Bonus of 50% of points for publications indexed in the Scopus or Web of Science database or published by publishing houses run by universities with IDUB university status or meeting the requirements for participation in the IDUB competition</p>	<p>120 points 80 points</p>		
31.	<p>Editing of a scientific monograph published by a publishing house listed by the Minister (level 2):</p> <p>a) in the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences and family sciences b) in other fields</p>	<p>150 points 100 points</p>		
32.	<p>Editing of a scientific monograph published by a publishing house listed by the Minister (level 1):</p> <p>a) in the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences and family sciences b) in other fields</p> <p>Bonus of 50% of points for publications indexed in the Scopus or Web of Science database or published by publishing houses run by universities with IDUB university status or meeting the requirements for participation in the IDUB competition</p>	<p>40 points 20 points</p>		
33.	<p>Authorship of a chapter in a scientific monograph published by a publishing house listed by the Minister (level 2):</p> <p>a) in the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences and family sciences b) in other fields</p>	<p>75 points 50 points</p>		
34.	<p>Authorship of a chapter in a scientific monograph published by a publishing house listed by the Minister (level 1):</p>	<p>20 points</p>		
35.	<p>Authorship of a popular science publication, a publication that popularises and promotes science</p>	<p>3 points</p>		
36.	<p>Authorship of a dictionary or encyclopaedia entry</p>	<p>2 points</p>		

No	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
37.	Translation of scientific text	1 point per publishing sheet		
Scholarships and scientific internship, conferences				
38.	Scholarship or internship within the framework of international programmes and projects (at least 1 month)	15 points		
39.	Scholarship or internship within the framework of international programmes and projects	6 points		
40.	Scientific or didactic/methodical paper at a national or international conference in Poland and in Polish	2 points		
41.	Scientific or teaching/methodical paper at an international conference abroad or in a foreign language	4 points		
Scientific reviews, awards and decorations				
42.	Editorial reviews of articles for journals indexed in JCR or Scopus and scientific monographs	2 points		
43.	Foreign award or decoration, award from the President of the Republic of Poland, President of the Council of Ministers, Polish Academy of Sciences, the Ministry of National Education and other ministers, the Foundation for Polish Science	8 points		
44.	Performance of the function of a member of the Council for Scientific Excellence, the Commission for the Evaluation of Science, the General Council for Science and Higher Education, the Polish Accreditation Commission, committees of the Polish Academy of Sciences, committees of the Polish Academy of Skills	10 points		
45.	Performance of the function of an expert: the National Science Centre (panel expert, reviewer), the National Center for Research and Development, the Foundation for Polish Science, the Commission for the Evaluation of Science, the National Agency for Academic Exchange, teams within government administration and international expert teams.	10 points		
ORGANISATIONAL ACTIVITY				
Performed functions				
46.	Head of department/unit	10 points		
47.	Deputy head of department	5 points		
48.	Language team coordinator	1 point		
Work in committees				
49.	Work for the university committee	5 points (with the possibility of doubling by the chair)		
Membership in collegial bodies				
50.	Member of the Senate (elected)	5 points		
Works for the University				
51.	Preparation of reports in the process of accreditation and evaluation of the field of study	8 points		
52.	Preparation of and conduct of meetings and events to promote the University, including promotional activities for university recruitment and social media profiles	2 points per event (maximum 20 points)		

NO .	TYPE OF ACTIVITY	NUMBER OF POINTS	NUMBER OF EVENTS	TOTAL POINTS
53.	Management of a completed project within the Lublin Science Festival	3 points		
54.	Organisation of nationwide scientific or teaching/methodical conferences - (points to organisers based on the participation)	4 points		
55.	Organisation of international scientific or teaching/methodical conferences - (points to organisers based on the participation)	6 points		
56.	Media appearance as a member of the Expert Panel of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin	0,3 points		
57.	Preparation of and conduct of training courses, lectures, workshops, presentations, etc. outside the University.	2 points (maximum 10 points)		
Other activities within the field of scientific, teaching and organisational activity (this section is subject to evaluation by the direct supervisor)				
Description of other activities		maximum 10 points (self-evaluation)		

I declare that my work during the evaluation period did not violate the provisions of copyright and related rights or industrial property.

CRITERIA FOR A POSITIVE SCORE

1. Within the group of university teachers who are research and teaching personnel, a positive score is given:
 - 1) In the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences, family sciences:
 - a) to persons with a bachelor's, engineer's, master's, master's of engineering or equivalent professional title, who scored at least 90 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to two scientific publications, taking into account the rules outlined in sec. 2, and 15 points in total in sec. B, C and D of the evaluation sheet;
 - b) to persons with doctoral, postdoctoral and professorial titles who scored at least 130 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to two scientific publications, taking into account the rules outlined in sec. 2, and 25 points in total in sec. B, C and D of the evaluation sheet.
 - 2) In the fields of science and natural sciences, agricultural sciences, medical and health sciences, veterinary sciences:
 - a) to persons with a bachelor's, engineer's, master's, master's of engineering or equivalent professional title, who scored at least 110 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to two scientific publications, taking into account the rules outlined in sec. 2, and 15 points in total in sec. B, C and D of the evaluation sheet;
 - b) to persons with doctoral, postdoctoral and professorial titles who scored at least 150 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to two scientific publications, taking into account the rules outlined in sec. 2, and 25 points in total in sec. B, C and D of the evaluation sheet.
 - 3) In the field of engineering and technical sciences:
 - a) to persons with a bachelor's, engineer's, master's, master's of engineering or equivalent professional title, who scored at least 110 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to two scientific publications, taking into account the rules outlined in sec. 2, and 15 points in total in sec. B, C and D of the evaluation sheet;
 - b) to persons with doctoral, postdoctoral and professorial titles who scored at least 150 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to two scientific publications, taking into account the rules outlined in sec. 2, and 25 points in total in sec. B, C and D of the evaluation sheet.
 - 4) In the field of art:
 - a) to persons with a bachelor's, engineer's, master's, master's of engineering or equivalent professional title, who scored at least 90 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to two scientific publications, taking into account the rules outlined in sec. 2, and 15 points in total in sec. B, C and D of the evaluation sheet;
 - b) to persons with doctoral, postdoctoral and professorial titles who scored at least 130 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to two scientific publications, taking into account the rules outlined in sec. 2, and 25 points in total in sec. B, C and D of the evaluation sheet.
2. When verifying the criteria for obtaining a positive score by university teachers who are research and teaching employees, the following rules apply:
 - 1) The indicated publication limit must include at least one publication in a journal indexed in the Scopus or Web of Science database.
 - 2) The requirement of sec. 2 item 1 does not apply to persons who as part of their achievements during the evaluation period demonstrated authorship of a scientific monograph published by a level 2 publishing

house from the Minister's list of publishing houses or, during the evaluation period obtained and are in charge of a grant or a scientific project specified in one of the items: A.29, A.30, A.32.

3) In the indicated publication limit, it is possible to submit at most one publication from the category: author of a scientific monograph, author of a chapter in a scientific monograph, editor of a scientific monograph published by level 1 publishing house from the Minister's list of publishing houses.

4) In the case of an individual employed in a unit of the higher education and science system for the first time, the number of points required for the first periodic evaluation is reduced by half, and the requirement in sec. 2 item 1 does not apply.

3. In the group of university teachers who are research employees, a positive grade is given:

1) In the field of humanities, social sciences, theological sciences, family sciences:

a) to persons with a bachelor's, engineer's, master's, master's of engineering or equivalent professional title, who scored at least 150 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to three scientific publications, taking into account the rules outlined in sec. 4, and 10 points in total in sec. B and D of the evaluation sheet, and:

- obtained or implemented a grant/scientific or popularisation project financed from external funds or submitted an application for the above-mentioned grant/project that was assessed positively in terms of content or

- obtained funds from direct or indirect commercialisation of results of scientific research or development work or the provision of research, research and development services or expertise for a total amount of at least PLN 5,000 in the evaluation period;

b) - to persons with doctoral, postdoctoral and professorial titles who scored at least 220 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to three scientific publications, taking into account the rules outlined in sec. 4, and 20 points on total in sec. B and D of the evaluation sheet, and:

- obtained or implemented a grant/scientific or popularisation project financed from external funds or submitted an application for the above-mentioned grant/project that was assessed positively in terms of content or

- obtained funds from direct or indirect commercialisation of results of scientific research or development work or from the provision of research, research and development services or expertise for a total amount of at least PLN 5,000 in the evaluation period.

2) In the fields of science and natural sciences, agricultural sciences, medical and health sciences, veterinary sciences:

a) to persons with a bachelor's, engineer's, master's, master's of engineering or equivalent professional title, who scored at least 190 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to three scientific publications, taking into account the rules outlined in sec. 4, and 10 points in total in sec. B and D of the evaluation sheet, and:

- obtained or implemented a grant/scientific or popularisation project financed from external funds or submitted an application for the above-mentioned grant/project that was assessed positively in terms of content or

- obtained funds from direct or indirect commercialisation of results of scientific research or development work or from the provision of research, research and development services or expertise for a total amount of at least PLN 10,000 in the evaluation period;

b) - to persons with doctoral, postdoctoral and professorial titles who scored at least 310 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to three scientific publications, taking into

account the rules outlined in sec. 4, and 20 points on total in sec. B and D of the evaluation sheet, and:

- obtained or implemented a grant/scientific or popularisation project financed from external funds or submitted an application for the above-mentioned grant/project that was assessed positively in terms of content or
- obtained funds from the direct or indirect commercialisation of results of scientific research or development work or the provision of research, research and development services or expertise for a total amount of at least PLN 10,000 in the evaluation period.

3) In the field of engineering and technical sciences:

a) to persons with a bachelor's, engineer's, master's, master's of engineering or equivalent professional title, who scored at least 190 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to three scientific publications, taking into account the rules outlined in sec. 4, and 10 points in total in sec. B and D of the evaluation sheet, and:

- obtained or implemented a grant/scientific or popularisation project financed from external funds or submitted an application for the above-mentioned grant/project that was assessed positively in terms of content or
- obtained funds from direct or indirect commercialisation of results of scientific research or development work or from the provision of research, research and development services or expertise for a total amount of at least PLN 10,000 in the evaluation period;

b) - to persons with doctoral, postdoctoral and professorial titles who scored at least 310 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to three scientific publications, taking into account the rules outlined in sec. 4, and 20 points on total in sec. B and D of the evaluation sheet, and:

- obtained or implemented a grant/scientific or popularisation project financed from external funds or submitted an application for the above-mentioned grant/project that was assessed positively in terms of content or
- obtained funds from the direct or indirect commercialisation of results of scientific research or development work or the provision of research, research and development services or expertise for a total amount of at least PLN 10,000 in the evaluation period.

4) In the field of art:

a) to persons with a bachelor's, engineer's, master's, master's of engineering or equivalent professional title, who scored at least 150 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to three scientific publications, taking into account the rules outlined in sec. 4, and 10 points in total in sec. B and D of the evaluation sheet, and:

- obtained or implemented a grant/scientific or popularisation project financed from external funds or submitted an application for the above-mentioned grant/project that was assessed positively in terms of content or
- obtained funds from direct or indirect commercialisation of results of scientific research or development work or the provision of research, research and development services or expertise for a total amount of at least PLN 5,000 in the evaluation period;

b) - to persons with doctoral, postdoctoral and professorial titles who scored at least 220 points in section A of the evaluation sheet on the basis of up to three scientific publications, taking into account the rules outlined in sec. 4, and 20 points on total in sec. B and D of the evaluation sheet, and:

- obtained or implemented a grant/scientific or popularisation project financed from external funds or submitted an application for the above-mentioned grant/project that was assessed positively in terms of content or
- obtained funds from the direct or indirect commercialisation of results of scientific research or development work or the provision of research, research and development services or expertise for a total amount of at least PLN 5,000 in the evaluation period.

4. When verifying the criteria for obtaining a positive score by university teachers who are research personnel, the following rules apply:

1) The indicated publication limit must include at least one publication published in a journal indexed in the Scopus or Web of Science database.

2) The requirement of sec. 4 item 1 does not apply to persons who as part of their achievements during the evaluation period demonstrated authorship of a scientific monograph published by a level 2 publishing house from the Minister's list.

3) In the indicated publication limit, it is possible to submit at most one publication from the category: author of a scientific monograph, author of a chapter in a scientific monograph, editor of a scientific monograph published by level 1 publishing house from the Minister's list of publishing houses.

4) In the case of an individual employed in a unit of the higher education and science system for the first time, the number of points required for the first periodic evaluation is reduced by half, and the requirement in sec. 4 item 1 does not apply.

5) In the group of university teachers who are teaching personnel, a positive score, subject to sec. 6, is given to:

- 1) persons with a bachelor's, engineer's, master's, master's of engineering or equivalent professional title, who scored at least 65 points in total in sec. C and D of the evaluation sheet;
- 2) persons with doctoral, postdoctoral and professorial titles who scored at least 80 points in total in sec. C and D of the evaluation sheet.

6. In the case of university teachers who are teaching personnel employed in a unit of the higher education and science system for the first time, the number of points required for the first periodic evaluation is reduced by half.

7. In the group of university teachers who are certified librarians and certified employees of scientific documentation and information, a positive score is granted to those who obtained at least 80 points in total in sec. A, B, C and D of the evaluation sheet.

8. In the group of university teachers employed in the Department of Foreign Languages, the Department of Physical Education and Sport and the School of Polish Language and Culture, a positive grade is given to those who scored at least 65 points in the evaluation sheet.