



Evaluation sheet Habilitation Thesis- remote evaluation

No.	Criterion	Percentage (P)	Mark (M)	Score (S) (S= M*P/100)
1	Scientific quality of the candidate	35%		
2	The originality of Habilitation Thesis	35%		
3	Candidate's scientific autonomy	10%		
4	Quality of professional development plan	20%		
TOTAL evaluation score, $St_e = \sum Si$				

The marks range between 0 and 3, as follows:

- **The candidate's scientific competences**

3- Excellent- Considerable exceeding of minimum standards; international visibility; he/she who has been associated or invited, minimum one month, within at least 3 universities; having been participated to prestigious international conferences; internationally acknowledged publications (attestable at www.worldcat.org).

2- Very good: Reasonable exceeding of minimum standards; considerable elements of international acknowledgment and certain national visibility.

1-Good: Minimum standards, with few elements of international visibility and certain national visibility.

0 –Inacceptable: With no relevant elements of national acknowledgment or visibility.

- **Originality of Habilitation Thesis**

3- Excellent: Innovation elements at international level

2- Very good: Innovation at national level, aligned with current international tendencies

1-Good: Innovation at national level.

0- Inacceptable: Hardly identifying innovation elements.

- **Candidate's scientific autonomy**

3-Excellent: Having coordinated international projects as project manager; member of an internationally accredited research centre.

2-Very good: Being/having been in charge for international projects in Romania; international individual grants.

1-Good: Managing national projects or being member of research teams in 3 national projects at least.

0-Unacceptable: Irrelevant participation at research activities.



EUROPEAN UNION



GOVERNMENT OF ROMANIA
MINISTRY OF LABOUR, FAMILY
AND SOCIAL PROTECTION
MASOPHRD



European Social Fund
SOPHRD 2007-2013



Structural Funds
2007-2013



DOSOPHRD



EXECUTIVE AGENCY FOR
HIGHER-EDUCATION, RESEARCH
DEVELOPMENT AND
INNOVATION FUNDING

- **Quality of professional development plan**

3-Excellent: It brings innovative approaches, remarkable at international level.

2-Very good: It is aligned with current research directions at international level, highly appreciated at national level.

1-Good: Innovation at national level.

0-Inacceptable: Hardly identifying innovation elements.

Requirements for public presentation approval

-mean scores of total evaluation (Ste_m) given by the commission's members ≥ 1

-average of the marks (M) given by the commission's members for each of the criteria 1, 2 and 4 ≥ 1 .

After weighting and computing the average for the 3 evaluators, the mean score of the total evaluation (Ste_m) will be converted as follows:

$1 \leq Ste_m \leq 1,49 = \text{good}$

$1,50 \leq Ste_m \leq 2,49 = \text{very good}$

$2,50 \leq Ste_m \leq 3 = \text{excellent}$

The minimum of Ste_m for approving the thesis is 1.



Evaluation sheet of Habilitation Thesis – public presentation

No.	Criterion	Weight (P)	Mark (N)	Score (S) (S= N*P/100)
1	Quality of presentation	70%		
2	Quality of answers asked by the committee/ audience	30%		
TOTAL score –public presentation St_sp = $\sum S_i$				

The marks will range between 0 and 3, as follows:

- 3- Excellent quality: clarity of the presentation, synthesising and analytic abilities, timing, prompt answers and arguments.
- 2- Very good: few hesitations and confusions, small delays in answering the questions, unconvincing answers.
- 1-good: several hesitations, bad timing, distraction, unanswered questions or irrelevant answers.
- 0-unsatisfactory: lack of clarity and accuracy, incapacity of clearly answering the questions, obvious elements which call in question the thesis' authenticity, etc.

After weighting and computing the average for the 3 evaluators, the *mean score for public presentation* (Sm_sp) will be converted as follows:

$1 \leq S_{m_sp} \leq 1,49 = \text{good}$

$1,50 \leq S_{m_sp} \leq 2,49 = \text{very good}$

$2,50 \leq S_{m_sp} \leq 3 = \text{excellent}$

For approving, the minimum of Sm_sp is 1.

Final mark of Habilitation (NFA) = Average: Ste_m and Sm_sp.

Final requirements for approving the Habilitation:

-Final mark of Habilitation (NFA) ≥ 1

-Final mark of Habilitation (NFA) will be converted in *Final Habilitation Grade* (CFA) as follows:

If $1 \leq NFA \leq 1,49$ then CFA= good



EUROPEAN UNION



GOVERNMENT OF ROMANIA
MINISTRY OF LABOUR, FAMILY
AND SOCIAL PROTECTION
MASOPHRD



European Social Fund
SOPHRD 2007-2013



Structural Funds
2007-2013



MINISTRY OF
EDUCATION
RESEARCH
YOUTH
AND SPORT
DOSOPHRD



EXECUTIVE AGENCY FOR
HIGHER-EDUCATION, RESEARCH
DEVELOPMENT AND
INNOVATION FUNDING

If $1,50 \leq NFA \leq 2,49$ then CFA = very good

If $2,50 \leq NFA \leq 3$ then CFA = excellent

Assessor Name

Data

Signature

EUROPEAN SOCIAL FUND

Investing in
PEOPLE



Quality Assurance in HE
through Habilitation and Auditing