

**NATIONAL INSTITUTE
FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
IN INFORMATICS - ICI BUCHAREST**

REGULATION

on the evaluation of the scientific performance of ICI Bucharest researchers

Romanian version approved in the Scientific Council meeting on 08.07.2025

Romanian version endorsed by CCCDI with Decision no. 1364/30.09.2025

Romanian version endorsed at the Steering Committee meeting on 04.11.2025

Romanian version approved in the Administration Council meeting on 07.11.2025

1. General Provisions

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this Regulation is to establish the criteria and methodology used to evaluate the scientific performance of researchers. The evaluation is based on fundamental principles, including objectivity, through the use of clear and measurable criteria applied uniformly to all researchers, and transparency, through the clear communication of the evaluation methods and criteria. Recognising excellence is essential, promoting researchers with significant and innovative contributions, while international comparability ensures alignment with global standards to maintain the relevance and competitiveness of the evaluation. Fairness is guaranteed through equitable treatment without discrimination, and the dynamism of evaluation implies continuous adaptation to new developments and trends in research. The responsibility of the researchers is fundamental, as they have the obligation to respect ethical rules and to assume the correctness of the reported data.

ICI Bucharest adheres to Council Recommendation C/2023/1640¹ and:

- recognises the importance of geographical, inter-sectoral, inter-institutional, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary mobility as a means of enhancing scientific knowledge and professional development at any stage of a researcher's career;
- ensures high standards of ethics and integrity in the professional activity of researchers, practises the proper conduct of research and value good practice, including open practices of sharing research results and research methodologies whenever possible;
- utilises evaluation criteria and processes that respect the variety of research disciplines and national contexts;
- supports the diversity of researcher profiles and career paths and values individual contributions as well as the role of teams, collaborative activities and interdisciplinarity;
- does not penalise non-linear, multi-career and hybrid career paths.

The evaluation criteria are designed to avoid any form of discrimination or stereotyping that might affect the assessment of researchers' performance on the basis of criteria irrelevant to the scientific work. The evaluation is not limited to the scientific achievements of researchers, but also includes institutional commitments to creating a fair and inclusive research environment.

This Regulation is aligned with the rules of good conduct in the research, development and innovation (RDI) work, ensuring not only the judgement of scientific performance, but also the promotion of an academic culture based on integrity, accountability and transparency.

The rules are published on the Institute's website.

1.2. Regulatory framework

- Law no. 183/2024 on the status of research, development and innovation personnel;
- Government Ordinance no. 57/2002 on scientific research and technological development, with subsequent amendments and additions;

¹ Council Recommendation C/2023/1640 of 18 December 2023 on a European framework for attracting and retaining research, innovation and entrepreneurial talent in Europe.

- Government Decision no. 477/2019 on the approval of the Methodological Norms for the assessment for accreditation of national R&D institutes;
- Government Decision no. 1621/2003 for the organisation and functioning of the National Institute for Research-Development in Informatics - ICI Bucharest, with subsequent amendments and additions;
- Council Recommendation C/2023/1640 of 18 December 2023 on a European framework for attracting and retaining research, innovation and entrepreneurial talent in Europe;
- ICI Bucharest Strategy 2023-2026;
- Quality policy and objectives - ICI Bucharest;
- ICI Bucharest Innovation Strategy;
- Strategy and Plan for Gender Equality 2022-2025 - ICI Bucharest;
- Anti-discrimination Guide - ICI Bucharest.

1.3. Scope of application

(1) This Regulation applies to the researchers of the National Institute for Research and Development in Informatics - ICI Bucharest.

(2) For the purposes of this Regulation and in accordance with Law no. 183/2024, researchers are differentiated according to the following professional functions and grades:

- Senior researchers, holding the title of PhD:
 - Senior researcher (R4): scientific researcher grade I - CS I;
 - Senior researcher (R3): research scientist grade II - CS II;
- Recognised researcher (R2) with doctoral title: research scientist grade III - CS III;
- Early-stage researcher (R1), holding a doctoral degree or being a doctoral student: research scientist - CS;
- Scientific research assistant, graduate: scientific research assistant - ACS.

(3) The individual employment contracts of researchers, through the job description as an annex to the individual employment contract, contain clauses specific to each research grade concerning the fulfilment of the specific objectives of the RDI activity approved by the Institute and clauses on the sanctioning of the employee in case of failure to meet the individual objectives.

(4) The periodic scientific performance evaluation of researchers is to be carried out every 4 years, with the exception of researchers retained in R&D positions after reaching the retirement age, who are evaluated annually provided that they are rated "very good" in the last periodic scientific performance evaluation.

1.4. Definitions and used terms

Research Scientists – “professionals engaged in the conception or creation of new scientific knowledge based on original concepts or hypotheses, who conduct research and improve or develop concepts, theories, models, techniques, tools, software or operational methods. Research scientists identify options for new research and development activities, which they plan and manage using high-level skills and knowledge acquired through education and training or practical experience gained through research”²; they may also “be partly involved in, among others, project management, teaching, mentoring, supporting evidence-based policy-making,

² Law no. 183/2024, art. 8, para. (2), a).

open science practices, knowledge and technology transfer activities and science communication."³

Evaluator - a scientific researcher of at least equal professional rank to the evaluated researchers and with relevant expertise in the areas of RDI concerned by the evaluation, who analyses and evaluates the scientific performance of the researchers in accordance with the provisions of this Regulation in order to provide an evaluation report with substantiated conclusions based on evidence supporting the outcome of the evaluation.

Evaluation system - A framework that is based on objective, *peer-reviewed* qualitative analysis by relevant experts, supported by the responsible use of quantitative indicators, and that recognises: diversity of outputs, inter alia, publications, datasets, software, methodologies, protocols, patents, models, theories, algorithms, workflows, exhibition dissemination materials, strategies, policy inputs; diversity of activities, inter alia mentoring, research supervision, leadership roles, entrepreneurship, FAIR data management, teaching, knowledge valorisation, industry-academia cooperation, support for evidence-based policy development, interaction with society, management and leadership, teamwork, service to society, scientific communication and methodological rigour, as well as a diversity of practices including open science, early knowledge and data exchange and open collaboration, mobility experiences including geographical, inter-sectoral, inter-institutional, interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary.⁴

Activity report sheet - a standardised document that reports, based on evidence, on performance, competences and activities in the research area(s) undertaken during the period under review. It is used to facilitate critical reflection on achievements, strengths and areas for improvement and contributes to the assessment made through the evaluation system. The final section of the activity report sheet is completed by the Human Resources Structure on the basis of the annual performance evaluation sheets for the evaluated period. With the exception of the last section, the activity report sheet shall be completed by the researcher under evaluation.

2. Criteria for the evaluation of scientific performance

The periodic evaluation of the scientific performance of the researchers is based on non-cumulative evaluation criteria, adapted to the specificities of their work, the mission of the Institute and the individual objectives, giving priority to qualitative evaluation, supported by the responsible use of quantitative indicators, as follows:

2.1. Research output and impact, taking into account, but not limited to, non-cumulative indicators such as:

- a) scientific papers published in journals indexed in Web of Science - Science Citation Index Expanded, Web of Science - Emerging Sources Citation Index, Social Sciences Citation Index, SCOPUS, IEEE, ERIH+, CNCS - A and CNCS - B or in other databases relevant to the various fields of activity;
- b) scientific papers published in open access;
- c) scientific papers presented at prestigious conferences in the Institute's field of activity;

³ Council Recommendation C/2023/1640 of 18 December 2023 on a European framework for attracting and retaining research, innovation and entrepreneurial talent in Europe.

⁴ Idem.

- d) books/book chapters edited/published at prestigious national/international publishers⁵ and studies;
- e) granted patents;
- f) citations in books/book chapters or in papers published in journals indexed in international databases;
- g) participation in the development of databases or digital corpora of specialised information;
- h) participation in the development of digital dictionaries, digital encyclopedias, digital editions of documents or specialised texts.

2.2. Managing and/or directing/coordinating research activities, taking into account, but not limited to, non-cumulative indicators such as:

- a) competitively won or coordinated research projects/programmes;
- b) organisational management;
- c) editor / guest editor of journals indexed in international databases;
- d) evaluated RDI programmes/projects.

2.3. Entrepreneurial activity/business collaboration and applicability to the economy/society of the results obtained, taking into account, but not limited to, non-cumulative indicators such as:

- a) developed services, technologies, products;
- b) technology transfer of R&D results;
- c) partnerships with innovative companies, within the limits of the law;
- d) established or managed spin-offs/start-ups.

2.4. Teaching activity, mentoring, research supervision, taking into account, but not limited to, non-cumulative indicators such as:

- a) partnerships with researchers/teachers from other national or international research organisations;
- b) status as visiting/associate researcher/faculty member in a research organisation;
- c) PhD supervisor and number of doctoral students supervised;
- d) membership of a doctoral thesis defence committee;
- e) academic courses developed and published in print or electronic format.

2.5. Continuing professional development, taking into account, but not limited to, non-cumulative indicators such as:

- a) doctoral, postdoctoral studies;
- b) participation in mobility programmes.

2.6. Contributions to the development of science and the enrichment or promotion of world culture, taking into account, but not limited to, non-cumulative indicators such as:

- a) organisation of scientific events;
- b) organisation of events popularising science;
- c) invited presentations at prestigious scientific events;
- d) presentation of scientific reference works in the field of the activity published in prestigious international journals;

⁵ Updated lists of recognised publishers, in accordance with UEFISCDI.

e) winning prestigious awards from a public institution or authority.

2.7. Services to society, taking into account, but not limited to, non-cumulative indicators such as:

- a) membership/leadership/coordinator of a national/international professional organisation in the field of RDI;
- b) membership/leadership/coordination of an advisory body/working group in the field of RDI at sectoral, regional, national or international level;
- c) holding a leading, coordinating or supervisory position in a public authority in the field of RDI;
- d) public policies, strategies, international, national and sectoral research plans, standards, regulations, guidelines developed for public institutions or authorities.

The Institute may also include other evaluation criteria and associated quantitative indicators in addition to those set out above, depending on the specificities of its field of activity and in correlation with the individual objectives of the researchers.

3. Evaluation methodology

The evaluation methodology outlines the process and responsibilities of the parties involved in the evaluation of researchers' performance, the activities and outcomes at each stage of the process, underpinned by the criteria outlined in Chapter 2 and, as a basic guideline, aligned with national and international requirements in the field.

3.1. Evaluation planning

The year in which the evaluation takes place is determined according to its periodicity in relation to the professional level of research. The actual evaluation shall take place in the first quarter of the following year.

In the case of researchers who, during the reference period, have passed a competition for appointment or a promotion examination, as provided for by law, the evaluation will be carried out for the work performed from the date of appointment or promotion ("T zero") up to the time of the evaluation, in relation to the requirements corresponding to the new research grade.

The secretariat for the evaluation activity is provided by the Human Resources Structure.

The following activities are carried out during this stage:

- 1) Establishment of the list of researchers to be evaluated: to be drawn up by the Human Resources Structure and approved by the Scientific Director.
- 2) The Human Resources Structure will fill in the annual performance evaluation section in the activity report sheets and make them available to the evaluation commission.
- 3) The establishment of the evaluation commissions (taking into account the research degrees of the staff evaluated and the areas of research undertaken by them), composed of a chairperson and 2 evaluation members: proposed by the Scientific Director and approved by the General Director.
- 4) The establishment of the appeal commission, composed of a chairperson and 2 evaluation members: proposed by the Scientific Director and approved by the General Director.
- 5) Establishment of the evaluation timetable, including:

- a) Starting date of the evaluation action;
- b) The period for completion and submission of the activity report sheet, including completion by the Human Resources Structure of the final section (25 calendar days);
- c) Evaluation period and submission of the commission's evaluation report (20 calendar days);
- d) Direct communication (to each researcher) by the Secretariat of the evaluation result (3 calendar days);
- e) Period for submission of appeals (10 calendar days);
- f) The period for analysing and resolving appeals (5 calendar days);
- g) Communication of evaluation results following appeals (3 calendar days);
- h) Analysing and validating the evaluation results at Scientific Council level and approval by the General Director (7 calendar days).

The timetable is proposed by the Secretariat, endorsed by the Scientific Director and approved by the General Director. Once approved, it shall be communicated by the Secretariat, before the start date of the evaluation action, to the evaluated researchers and the evaluation commissions.

3.2 Completion and submission of activity report sheets

The activity report sheet (Annex 1) is structured according to the evaluation criteria in Chapter 2 of this Regulation.

Each researcher under evaluation shall complete and submit this form to the Secretariat within the deadline communicated in the evaluation timetable. In completing the form, consideration shall be given to the requirements concerning:

- accuracy, correctness and completeness of the information;
- the indication of personal contribution in the case of collective/partnership results;
- the provision of additional information (descriptive documents, links to existing information on the Internet) to allow a fair assessment of the results concerned.

3.3. Evaluation of scientific performance

The Secretariat shall make available to each appointed commission of evaluators the activity report sheet of the researchers assigned to them.

In the course of analysing each performance report, the commission's responsibilities include:

- carefully analysing the information provided, in terms of accuracy, correctness and completeness;
- requesting clarifications or additional information from the evaluated researcher, as deemed necessary, and attaching the answers received to the activity report sheet;
- each member of the commission checks the reported scores and fills in the result in the summary evaluation report of the researcher (Annex 2), and the chairperson fills in the total evaluation score, from which the grade is derived;
- the summary evaluation report is sent to the Secretariat within the deadline communicated in the evaluation timetable.

3.4. Rating

(1) The following are the possible grades that may be awarded following the evaluation of scientific performance:

Qualification	Minimum score				
	ACS	CS	CS III	CS II	CS I
Very good	160	180	200	220	240
Good	120	140	160	180	200
Satisfactory	80	100	120	140	160

(2) The minimum standard for Section I of the activity report sheet (related to subchapter 2.1.) is as follows:

Research degree	Score
ACS	80
CS	120
CS III	140
CS II	160
CS I	180

(3) After the appeals period, the report of the evaluation commission shall be analysed and validated by the Scientific Council and approved by the General Director.

(4) In the case of an "*unsatisfactory*" rating, the researchers shall be re-evaluated after a period of 24 months, on the basis of a decision by the General Director.

(5) For researchers who receive two consecutive "*unsatisfactory*" evaluations, the Institute may order: a reduction of the basic salary by a maximum of 20% until the next scientific performance evaluation, a 50% reduction of all salary increments and allowances until the next scientific performance evaluation or termination of the individual employment contract.

3.5 Submission, analysis and resolution of appeals

(1) Researchers shall have the right to contest the outcome of the evaluation within 10 calendar days from the date of communication of the result by the Secretariat, if they consider that it does not accurately reflect their scientific work.

(2) Appeals shall be analysed by the appeals commission within 5 calendar days as follows:

- analyses the activity report sheet, the evaluation report and the text of the contestation;
- on this basis, it formulates a point of view on the awarded rating (report of the appeal commission), which it communicates to the Secretariat.

3.6. Evaluation of researchers who fulfil the conditions for retirement eligibility

(1) Scientific researchers who fulfil the retirement eligibility conditions according to the legislation on the public pension system may choose between the granting of an old-age pension and the continuation of their activity in the same R&D position, if they were rated "very good" in the last periodic evaluation of scientific performance.

(2) For researchers who remain in a R&D position after reaching retirement age, the periodic scientific performance review shall be carried out annually, in accordance with the procedure described above.

4. Final and transitional provisions

4.1 Entry into force of the Regulation

This Regulation shall be approved by the Scientific Council for submission for endorsement to the Advisory Board for Research-Development and Innovation (CCCDI), as required by law. The Regulation endorsed by the CCCDI is endorsed by the Steering Committee and shall enter into force after approval by the Administration Council of the Institute.

4.2 Sanctions

Offences or errors in the reporting of the researcher's scientific activity are subject to the Code of Ethics of ICI Bucharest. These sanctions are applied gradually, depending on the seriousness of the misconduct, and are aimed at maintaining the integrity and fairness of the scientific performance evaluation process.

4.3. Updating and review

The Regulation shall be updated and revised in line with changes in national and international regulations and institutional objectives.

Annexes:

1. Activity report sheet
2. Summary evaluation report

Activity report sheet

Annex 1

Name and surname:

Professional degree:

Reporting period: from to

Evaluation criteria for scientific performance

I. Research output and impact:

	Score / criterion	Score obtained
scientific papers published in journals indexed in Web of Science	(25+30*impact factor)/n.a.	
scientific papers published in SCOPUS, IEEE, ERIH+, CNCS - A and CNCS - B or in other databases relevant to various fields of activity	25/n.a.	
scientific papers published in the volumes of ISI-indexed scientific proceedings	25/n.a.	
open access scientific papers	10/n.a.	
scientific papers presented at prestigious Web of Science, SCOPUS, IEEE indexed conferences in the field of the institute's activity	(15+30*0.25)/n.a.	
scientific papers presented at prestigious BDI-indexed conferences in the field of activity of the institute	15/n.a.	
books edited/published by prestigious international publishing houses	100/n.a.	
book chapters edited/published by prestigious international publishing houses	25/n.a.	
books edited/published by international publishing houses	60/n.a.	
book chapters edited/published by international publishing houses	15/n.a.	
books edited/published by prestigious national publishing houses	50/n.a.	
book chapters edited/published by prestigious national publishing houses	12/n.a.	
books edited/published by national publishing houses	16/n.a.	
book chapters edited/published by national publishing houses	6/n.a.	
studies / teaching materials published by ISBN publishing houses	20/n.a.	
granted patents	200/n.a.	
utility model (or similar)	50/n.a.	
ORDA certificates	20/n.a.	
citations in papers published in ISI indexed journals in Q1 or Q2	16/n.a.	
citations in papers published in ISI indexed journals in Q3	12/n.a.	
citations in papers published in ISI-indexed journals or ISI proceedings	8/n.a.	
citations in books/book chapters	4/n.a.	
citations in papers published in journals indexed in international databases	4/n.a.	
participation in the development of databases or digital corpora of specialised information	30/n.a.	
participation in the development of digital dictionaries, digital encyclopedias, digital editions of documents or specialised texts	30/n.a.	

II. Managing and/or directing/coordinating research activities:

	Score / criterion	Score obtained
director - international research projects/programmes competitively won or coordinated	25*no. years of operation	
responsible partner - international research projects/programmes won by competition or coordinated	20*no. years of operation	

WP coordinator - international research projects/programmes won by competition or coordinated	12*no. years of operation	
member - international research projects/programmes won through competition or coordinated	4*no. years of operation	
director - national research projects/programmes competitively won or coordinated	15*no. years of operation	
responsible partner - national research projects/programmes competitively won or coordinated	10*no. years of operation	
member - national research projects/programmes won through competition or coordinated	2*no. years of operation	
director - internal research project	5*no. years of operation	
member - internal research project	1*no. years of operation	
international project proposal submission as project leader	14*no. proposals	
international project proposal submission as responsible partner	10*no. proposals	
international project proposal submission as project member	3*no. proposals	
national project proposal submission as project leader	7*no. proposals	
national project proposal submission as lead partner	5*no. proposals	
national project proposal submission as project member	2*no. proposals	
organisational management (member of Scientific Council, Ethics Commission)	5*no. years	
participation as chair in evaluation / competition / RDI promotion exam commissions	2*evaluation	
participation as member in evaluation commission / competition / RDI promotion exam	1*evaluation	
coordination of the RDI institutional evaluation commission, institute annual report	15*evaluation	
participation in RDI institutional evaluation commissions	10*evaluation	
participation in the drafting of RDI regulations	10/n.a.	
editor-in-chief of Web of Science indexed journals in Q1 / Q2	30*no. journals*no. years	
editor-in-chief of Web of Science indexed journals in Q3	25*no. journals*no. years	
editor-in-chief of journals indexed Web of Science, SCOPUS, IEEE	20*no. journals*no. years	
editor-in-chief of journals indexed in international databases	15*no. journals*no. years	
guest editor of Web of Science indexed journals in Q1 / Q2	6*no. journals	
guest editor of Web of Science indexed journals in Q3	4*no. journals	
guest editor of Web of Science, SCOPUS, IEEE indexed journals/proceedings	3*no. journals	
guest editor of journals indexed in international databases	2*no. journals	
editor of journals indexed in Web of Science in Q1 / Q2	20*no. journals*no. years	
editor of Web of Science indexed journals in Q3	15*no. journals*no. years	
editor of journals/proceedings indexed Web of Science, SCOPUS, IEEE	12*no. journals*no. years	
editor of journals indexed in international databases	10*no. journals*no. years	
member of the scientific/editorial committee of Web of Science indexed journals in Q1 / Q2	15*no. journals*no. years	
member of the scientific/editorial committee of Web of Science indexed journals in Q3	10*no. journals*no. years	
member of the scientific/editorial committee of journals indexed Web of Science, SCOPUS, IEEE	8*no. journals*no. years	
member of the scientific/editorial committee of BDI indexed journals	5*no. journals*no. years	
member of the technical programme committee of Web of Science, SCOPUS, IEEE scientific events	10*no. events*no. years	
member of the technical programme committee of BDI scientific events	5*no. events*no. years	
reviewer of Web of Science, SCOPUS, IEEE scientific journals or events	2*no. articles reviewed	
reviewer of BDI scientific journals or events	1*no. articles reviewed	
evaluated international RDI programmes/projects	3*no. projects	
evaluated national RDI programmes/projects	2*no. projects	

management of RDI organisation	25*no. years	
coordination of RDI organisation (head of department)	20*no. years	
coordination of RDI structure (head of unit/assimilate)	10*no. years	

III. Entrepreneurial activity:

	Score / criterion	Score obtained
developed services, technologies, products	50/n.a.	
research software with public access and documented use	20/n.a.	
technology transfer of R&D output	50/n.a.*no. items	
partnerships with innovative companies, within the limits of the law	3*no. agreements	
established spin-offs/start-ups	50*no. entities	
managed spin-offs/start-ups	20*no. entities*no. years	

IV. Teaching, mentoring, research supervision:

	Score / criterion	Score obtained
partnerships with researchers/teachers from other national or international research organisations	1*no. partnerships	
visiting/associate researcher/lecturer in a research organisation	5*no. associations	
PhD supervisor status obtained during the evaluated period	50	
number of doctoral students supervised	1*no. students*no. years	
membership of a doctoral thesis defence commission	3*no. commission	
university courses developed and published in print or electronic format	10/n.a.	
mentoring	10*no. mentored researchers*no. years	
professional training activities	1*50 hours	
mentoring activities for internship	1*no. students	
curriculum development training course	5*no. curricula	

V. Continuing professional development:

	Score / criterion	Score obtained
doctoral studies during the evaluated period	5*no. years	
postdoctoral studies during the evaluated period	10*no. years	
participation in mobility programmes during the evaluated period	5*no. programmes	

VI. Contributions to the development of science and the enrichment or promotion of world culture:

	Score / criterion	Score obtained
organisation of scientific events	2*no. events	
organisation of science popularisation events	1*no. events	
invited presentations at prestigious scientific events	3*no. presentations	
presentation of scientific reference works in the field of activity published by prestigious international publishing houses	15/n.a.	
prestigious awards won from a public institution or authority	5*no. awards	

VII. Services to society:		
	Score / criterion	Score obtained
member/leader/coordinator of an international professional organisation in the field of RDI	2*no. years	
member/leader/coordinator of a national professional organisation in the field of RDI	1*no. years	
member/leader/coordinator of an advisory body/working group in the field of RDI at sectoral, regional, national or international level	2*no. years	
holding a leading, coordinating or supervisory position within a public authority in the field of RDI	3*no. years	
public policies, strategies, international, national and sectoral research plans, standards, regulations, guidelines developed for public institutions or authorities	2*no. years	
awareness raising and public mobilisation activities (event presentations, keynote speech, moderation, etc.)	2*no. activities	

VIII. Professional evaluation (to be completed by the Human Resources Structure: sum of the arithmetic averages of the criteria over the evaluated period/no. of years)		
	Score / criterion	Score obtained
professional competence		
professional activity		
activity characterisation		

*n.a. = number of authors

Minimum standard Section I.

ACS	80
CS	120
CS III	140
CS II	160
CS I	180

Minimum score

Qualification	ACS	CS	CS III	CS II	CS I
Very good	160	180	200	220	240
Good	120	140	160	180	200
Satisfactory	80	100	120	140	160

Summary evaluation report

of the Evaluation Commission, appointed by Decision of the Director General of ICI Bucharest no. ____ / ____ / ____
/ _____

Name and surname of the RDI staff evaluated:

Professional degree:

Evaluated period: from ____ / ____ / ____ to ____ / ____ / ____

Commission evaluation

On the basis of the analysis of the activity report sheet, made available to the commission, the following scores have been obtained:

Evaluation criteria	Score (C)	Score (M1)	Score (M2)
I. Research results and impact (Minimum standard...)			
II. Management and/or leadership/coordination of research activities			
III. Entrepreneurial activity			
IV. Teaching, mentoring, research supervision			
V. Continuing professional development			
VI. Contributions to the development of science and the enrichment or promotion of world culture			
VII. Services to society			
VIII. Professional evaluation ¹			
Total:			

Total evaluation score :²

The rating resulting from the evaluation:

Evaluation commission, consisting of:

Chair (C): _____

Signature: _____

Member (M1): _____

Signature: _____

Member (M2) : _____

Signature: _____

Commission secretary: _____

Signature: _____

Date: ____ / ____ / _____

¹ As provided by the Human Resources Structure.

² Arithmetic average of the 3 total scores (C, M1, M2).