



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

Evaluation report for habilitation thesis and the candidates research activity

I. Phases for the habilitation assessment of the candidates

The evaluation of the candidates in order to obtain the certificate of habilitation is made in two steps:

- (1) the evaluation of accomplishing the minimum quantitative evaluation criteria which correspond to the habilitation domains' standards; if the candidate does not accomplishing the corresponding areas is eliminated; if the candidate accomplishes the minimal standards passes to the second stage of evaluation;
- (2) The evaluation of the candidate's scientific production, reflected in the thesis and in 10 publications selected by the candidate and proposed to the evaluated.

II. Qualitative evaluation

Quality assessment of scientific production (qualitative evaluation) is done in two distinct phases:

(a) online qualitative assessment of habilitation thesis and of the 10 publications selected by the candidate: this assessment is qualitative and ends with the commission's decision who accept or reject the thesis to be presented.

(b) qualitative assessment of public presentation for the habilitation thesis - ends with the commission's decision which propose to give or not the habilitation certificate.

In each of the two qualitative evaluation is applied a set of reference common criteria listed below.

These criteria are detailed and / or adapted on panels from CNATDCU commissions, so each CNATDCU commission applies these criteria according to the specific or disciplinary.

II. Criteria of quality assessment and scoring

The reference common criteria of quality assessment for habilitation thesis and scientific production are:

- Scientific quality and visibility of scientific production;



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

- **Habilitation thesis and scientific production originality;**
- **Scientific independence of the candidate;**
- **Quality of the professional development plan.**

These criteria are associated on a scale from 1 to 5, where 5 is the maximum quality evaluation value for each criterion. The scoring from every commission member for every 4 criteria is summed so the final score has to reflect the cumulative quality of the scientific production. The minimum score from every habilitation commission member has to be at least 12 points in order to accept the thesis to be presented. In case of a member is according a score less than 12 points all the commission members are comparing the methods of application of evaluation criteria and the scoring to reach to a. This consensus is referring only to the score accorded by one of the commission members which is less than 12 points.

The final score accorded to the habilitation thesis and scientific production is the average of the scores accorded by every member of habilitation commission.

Chart 1. Criteria and scores accorded by every member of habilitation commission

Criterion	Score
Scientific quality and visibility of scientific production	
Habilitation thesis and scientific production originality	
Scientific independence of the candidate	
Quality of the professional development plan	
Final score	

The score is starting for 1 to 5, so:

- **Scientific quality and visibility of scientific production** (minimum 3):
 - o 5-exceptional: at least 3 times over the minimal standards, international prizes, lecture invited at leading conferences, etc.
 - o 4-very good: at least 2 times over the minimal standards, significant elements of international recognition;
 - o 3-good: over the minimal standards, with some elements of international visibility;
 - o 2- satisfactory: limit minimal standards, with some elements of national recognition;
 - o 1-unsatisfactory: only minimal standards, without significant elements of recognition and visibility, not even national.



- **Habilitation thesis and scientific production originality** (minimum 3):
 - o 5-exceptional: international level news
 - o 4-very good: significant elements of international level news
 - o 3-good: some elements of international level news
 - o 2-satisfactory: weak elements of international level news, but very high on the national level news
 - o 1-unsatisfactory: elusive originality
- **Scientific independence of the candidate** (minimum 2)
 - o 5-exceptional: led international projects as a project manager; laboratory/department manager or other leading position;
 - o 4-very good: responsible for the Romanian part in international project; team leader for a research team in international projects;
 - o 3-good: individual international grants, manager of national research projects;
 - o 2-satisfactory: Director or scientific responsible of national research projects;
 - o 1-unsatisfactory: wasn't a project manager;
- **Quality of the professional development plan** (minimum 2):
 - o 5-exceptional: propose new international directions
 - o 4-very good: significant elements of international level news
 - o 3-bine: some elements of international level news, and a highly national level news;
 - o 2-satisfactory: national level news;
 - o 1-unsatisfactory: elusive originality

The scoring accorded by every habilitation commission member and the final average score are detailed in chart 2.

Chart 2: Synthetic data assessment of habilitation thesis and scientific production in order to accomplish the habilitation process

	Commission members	Score
1		
2		
3		
	Final score: the average of commission members' scores	



EUROPEAN UNION

GOVERNMENT OF ROMANIA
MINISTRY OF LABOUR, FAMILY
AND SOCIAL PROTECTION
MASOPHRDEuropean Social Fund
SOPHRD 2007-2013Structural Funds
2007-2013

DOSOPHRD

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

The final cumulated score, accerded by every member, has to be at least 12 points in order to present public the thesis.

Evaluation report for public presentation of the habilitation thesis

Public presentation of the habilitation thesis is evaluated by every commission member by scores related to the criteria:

- Oral presentation quality of the habilitation thesis;
- Quality of the answers;

Chart 3: The evaluation report of every commission member of the public presentation for habilitation thesis

Criteria	Score
(a) Quality of the presentation	
(b) Quality of the answers	
<i>Final score: the average of the points accorded for every criterion</i>	

The scores from 0 to 3 are accorded in this way:

3- Very good quality: clarity in presentation, synthesis and analysis capacity, good timing, prompt and documented responses etc.

2- Good quality: some hesitation and doubt in the presentation, small time overcoming, hesitations to the answers, unconvincing answers, etc.

1- Satisfactory quality: often hesitation during the presentation, time overcoming, lack of concentration, questions without answers, etc.

0- Unsatisfactory quality: inability to clearly answer the questions, clear elements who doubt the thesis originality, etc.

Chart 4: Synthetic assessment report of the commission members of the public presentation for the habilitation thesis

	Assessment commission members	Score

	Prof. Dinar Camotim	
	<i>Final score: average of the scores given by members of the habilitation commission</i>	

If a candidate fails to obtain an arithmetic average minimum, equal or bigger than 1, for the scores accorded by commission members for his thesis habilitation presentation, the candidate is declared rejected and is proposed to withhold the certificate of habilitation.

III. Final grade

The commission offers to the candidate a final grade. Correspondence between ratings and amount of arithmetic average of the points offered for the quality evaluation of the habilitation thesis and for the scientific production are the following:

22-23 points: **Exceptional**

19-21 points: **Very good**

16-18 points: **Good**

13-15 points: **Satisfactory**

Less than 13 points = unsatisfactory and is not granting the certificate of habilitation.

IV. Validation and approval

The proposals of the habilitation commissions are validated by General Council of CNATDCU and presented to the Ministry of Education, Research, Youth and Sports to be approved and to issue the habilitation certificate.