











Panel 3 Quality on-line evaluation report of the habilitation thesis

Criteria	Satisfactory criteria level	Score	Score accorded by the habilitation commission
Candidate's scientific production visibility	Minimum standards are met by at least 2 times (P)	3	
	Minimum standards are met by at least 1,5 times	2	
	Minimum standards are met by	1	
Scientific production originality	Clear elements of novelty at international level	3	
	Some novelty elements at international level	2	
	Nationally high level of novelty	1	
	Elusive originality	0	
Scientific independence of the candidate	Leaded international research projects obtained through competition as a director / responsible research team	3	
	He received research grants, individual, internationals or leaded research national projects through competition as a director/responsible research team;	2	
	He was member in international projects and/or national	1	
	He didn't participate on research grants teams obtained through competition	0	
Quality and credibility of the career development plan	Propose new research directions internationally; The implementation is well reasoned and feasible	3	
	The plan contains some innovations internationally elements and clear elements of nationally novelty; The implementation is well reasoned and feasible.	2	
	The plan contains some innovations nationally elements	1	
	Difficult to identify the novelty	0	
Total	asiata Minimum assatahla 6 asiata		

Maximum possible – 12 points; Minimum acceptable - 6 points.

Evaluation report for public presentation of the habilitation thesis

Criteria	Satisfactory level of the criteria	Score	Score accorded by the habilitation commission
Presentation quality	Very good quality, capacity for synthesis and analysis	2	
	Good quality, hesitation and ambiguity in the presentation, small excess of time	1	
	Vagueness in presentation, over time	0	
The quality of the answers to the commission's questions	Clear answers and documented	2	
	Hesitations and ambiguities in the answers	1	
	Incapacity to respond clearly to questions	0	
The quality of the answers to the audience's questions	Prompt responses and documented	2	
	Hesitations and ambiguities in the answers	1	
	Incapacity to respond clearly to questions	0	
Total			

Maximum possible – 6 points; Minimum acceptable - 3 points.

















Maximum possible – 18 points; Minimum acceptable - 9 points

Final grades: excellent (18 points), very well (15-17 points), well (12-14 points), satisfactory (9-11 points), unsatisfactory (less than 9 points).



