



ROMANIAN ACADEMY

"PETRU PONİ" INSTITUTE OF MACROMOLECULAR CHEMISTRY

Aleea Grigore Ghica Vodă, nr. 41A, 700487, Iași

Tel.: +40 332 880 050, +40 332 880 220; Fax: +40 232 211 299

Directory

Dr.ing. Valeria HARABAGIU

REGULATION

**on the evaluation of the scientific performance of researchers
within the Institute of Macromolecular Chemistry "Petru Poni" Iași**

I. General provisions

1. The Regulation on the evaluation of the scientific performance of researchers within the Institute of Macromolecular Chemistry "Petru Poni" Iași (ICMPP), hereinafter referred to as the "Regulation", is developed pursuant to *Law no. 183/2024 on the status of research, development and innovation personnel* and in accordance with the Organization and Functioning Regulation and the Internal Regulation of ICMPP.

2. This Regulation regulates the manner of organizing and carrying out the process of periodic evaluation of the scientific performance and the results obtained by the research staff provided for in art. 9 para. 1 of Law 183/2024, namely:

- (i) Principal Investigator (R4): Scientific Researcher Grade I - CS I;
- (ii) established researcher (R3): scientific researcher grade II - CS II;
- (iii) recognized researcher (R2), holding the title of doctor: scientific researcher grade III - CS III;
- (iv) junior researcher (R1), holding the title of doctor: scientific researcher - CS;
- (v) assistant in scientific research activity, graduate: scientific research assistant - ACS.

3. (1) **The evaluation of scientific performance** shall be carried out at an **interval of 5 years** and represents a formalized procedure by which the level of fulfillment of individual criteria and indicators of scientific activity is determined.

(2) The criteria and performance indicators in Annex no. 1 as well as the value thresholds for establishing the evaluation grades by categories of functions (ACS, CS, CSIII, CSII, CS I) (Annex 2) were endorsed by the Scientific Council of ICMPP for the period 2025-2029.

(3) The evaluation action **includes the continuous monitoring of the results obtained by the researchers** in correlation with the monitoring of the research activity of the Research Subprograms of the Institute, in order to rhythmically identify the professional development needs and the barriers encountered by the researchers in order to obtain an optimal scientific professional performance. The monitoring of the individual performance of the researchers is carried out twice a year, together with the monitoring of the activity of the Research Subprograms.

4. The purpose of the evaluation of researchers in scientific research is to improve organizational performance by developing the individual skills and professional performance of researchers.

5. The evaluation of professional performance applies to each researcher, in accordance with the legislation mentioned in point 1 and with this Regulation.

For the purposes of this Regulation, the following notions are defined:

- a) *Evaluation commissions* – constituted for each professional category mentioned in item 2 of the Regulation and composed of a president and at least 2 members having positions with professional grades higher than the evaluated category and a secretary;

- b) *Appeals Resolution Commission* - composed of the president and at least 2 members with positions of first or second degree within the institute and a secretary;
- c) *The evaluation grades*, "unsatisfactory", "satisfactory", "good", "very good" are established for each category of research functions and depend on the value thresholds of the performance indicators that delimit the grades specific to the position (Annex 2);
- d) *The individual performance indicators* specific to each category of research functions are calculated on the basis of Annex 1;
- e) *evaluated period* - the period for which the researcher is evaluated;
- f) *evaluation period* - the period between January 1 and March 31 of the year following the evaluated period.

6. The directors of the research subprograms (laboratory coordinators) are responsible for updating the individual criteria and performance indicators of all the researchers in the Subprograms team, in correlation with the objectives/performance indicators of the Subprogram and with the institutional performance objectives/indicators, assumed through the Institutional Development Strategy assumed by ICMPP through the approval of the Scientific Council.

7. The results of the monitoring and evaluation of scientific performance shall be taken into account when making decisions regarding the classification, maintenance of researchers in the same position or their promotion as well as the continuation of the activity in the same position for researchers who meet the conditions for enrollment in retirement for old age.

8. The evaluation of the scientific performance of researchers is done in compliance with the legal regime of conflict of interest regarding researchers of public institutions and in accordance with the provisions of the Labor Code.

9. The results of the evaluations of the scientific performance of researchers are approved by the head of the research organisation and validated at the level of the Scientific Council.

II. Factors involved in the process of evaluating the professional performance of researchers, their duties and obligations

10. *The Scientific Council* of ICMPP approves - at the beginning of the evaluation period and whenever there are changes - the necessary and mandatory individual performance criteria/indicators, in order to establish the evaluation grades (insufficient, sufficient, good, very good), for each professional category of researchers (*Annexes no. 1 and 2*), according to the priorities and objectives of the Institute.

11. *The ICMPP director* or the person designated by him has the following main duties and obligations:

- a) ensures the uniform and correct implementation of the evaluation procedure within the institute;
- b) approves the criteria and performance indicators of the researchers within the institute, in accordance with the legislative norms in force;
- c) issues *the administrative act establishing the evaluation period*, the *evaluation commissions* identified for each professional category, as well as the *Commission for the resolution of appeals*.

12. *The evaluation commissions* are established once every five years, by professional categories (ACS, CS, CS III, CS II and CS I), before the beginning of the evaluation period, and have the following main attributions/obligations:

- a) analyzes and discusses with the evaluated researcher the degree of fulfillment of the criteria in terms of individual performance indicators;
- b) completes the *Evaluation Report* for the evaluated researcher;
- c) propose the qualification for the evaluation of professional performance;
- d) submit the *Evaluation Report* to the Human Resources Payroll Service (SRUS)

- e) are responsible for the objectivity and impartiality of the results of the evaluation of the scientific performance of the evaluated researchers;
- f) keep the data in the *Assessment Report* confidential.

13. *The Appeals Resolution Commission* is established every five years and has the following main duties and obligations:

- a) examines appeals made by researchers dissatisfied with the results of the evaluation;
- b) decide on the outcome of appeals by a simple majority vote of the members present;
- c) prepares a *Report of the appeal* that he brings to the attention of the contesting researcher and submits a copy to the SRUS.

14. *The Subprogram Director* is the scientific and administrative coordinator of the research Subprogram team and has the following main duties and obligations:

- a) periodically monitors (at least twice a year) the fulfillment of the individual performance criteria/indicators for all researchers in the Subprogram team;
- b) identifies the needs for improvement and proposes together with the monitored researchers the necessary measures;
- c) prepares annually an *Activity Report* of the sub-programme which contains, in addition to the annual monitoring data of the objectives/criteria/indicators of the Sub-programme, and the data of individual monitoring of researchers.

15. *The evaluated researcher* has the following main duties and obligations:

- a) prepares the *Activity Report* (according to the performance criteria/indicators established according to the position he/she occupies) – *Annex 3*;
- b) present evidence confirming the achievement of the objectives and comment on the assessment rating awarded;
- c) shows collaboration in the evaluation process;
- d) participates in the identification of their professional development needs.

16. *The Human Resources Payroll Service* (SRUS) is responsible for organizing the evaluation process of the ICMPP staff and has the following main attributions and obligations:

- a) before the beginning of each evaluation period, prepares the decisions on the appointment of the Evaluation and Appeals Commissions approved by the Scientific Council for all professional categories that will be subject to evaluation and informs their members about the process based on the administrative act issued by the ICMPP director;
- b) provides researchers with this *Regulation* containing the methodological recommendations for establishing the criteria and performance indicators, the Scoring Grid for Performance Criteria/Indicators (Annex 1). The grid for establishing the grades (Annex 2), the models for the *Activity Reports* (Annex 3) and the *Evaluation Reports* (Annex 4); at the same time, the SRUS provides informational and methodological assistance to all the factors involved in the evaluation process;
- c) designates the persons who participate as secretaries of the Commissions for evaluation and settlement of appeals;
- d) based on the information contained in the *Evaluation Reports* and the suggestions from the Evaluation Commissions, draws up the *Annual Professional Training Plan*;
- e) archives all documents related to the process of evaluating the individual performance of researchers in their personnel files.

III. The process of evaluating the scientific performance of researchers

Section 1. Establishing/revising individual criteria/performance indicators

17. (1) *The individual criteria and performance indicators* represent the key priorities in the researcher's activity, which involve the desired/expected results to be achieved during the evaluated period.

18. (1) The evaluation criteria shall be analyzed and interpreted on the basis of the non-

cumulative quantitative and qualitative indicators defined according to Law no. 183/2024, art. 27, but not limited to these:

- *The results obtained within the research activity and their impact;*
- *Managing and/or leading/coordinating research activities;*
- *Entrepreneurial activity/collaboration with the business environment and the applicability in the economy/society of the results obtained;*
- *Teaching activity, mentoring, research supervision;*
- *Continuous professional training;*
- *Contributions to the development of science and the enrichment or promotion of world culture;*
- *Services provided to society.*

19. The main criteria and indicators are established at the beginning of the evaluation period for all researchers within the ICMPP.

20. The criteria and performance indicators shall be brought to the attention of the researchers at the beginning of the evaluation period or at each change, if applicable.

21. The individual performance criteria/indicators can be revised whenever there are changes in the activity or in the organizational structure of the ICMPP that determine changes in the tasks and service attributions of the evaluated researcher. Thus, the following situations are considered:

- a) the priorities, the organizational structure of the institute, the objectives and/or tasks of the laboratory or institution are modified;
- b) the position of the researcher is modified;
- c) a newly hired researcher or returned after having had the employment contract suspended (e.g., internship of more than six months, parental leave)
- d) Other causes: objective circumstances that made the established performance indicators unattainable for reasons not attributable to the evaluated researcher.

22. If the situations mentioned in item 21 have occurred during the evaluated period, the revision of the individual performance criteria/indicators shall be made and communicated to all researchers within 30 days after their occurrence and shall determine effects in the evaluation of individual performance only for the percentage of the period between the date of modification and the end of the evaluation period.

Section 2. Procedure for evaluating the professional performance of researchers

23. The procedure for evaluating the professional performance of researchers is carried out by filling in the *Evaluation Report* by the Evaluation Commission based on the *Activity Report* drawn up by the evaluated researcher for the evaluated period, according to the pre-established qualitative and quantitative criteria and performance indicators.

24. *The researcher's evaluation report* contains information on how and level of fulfillment of individual performance criteria/indicators, professional development needs, as well as the evaluation grade awarded.

25. In the *Evaluation Report*, the Evaluation Committee shall record the results of the researcher, the objective difficulties encountered by the researcher during the period evaluated and any other observations that it considers relevant. If the Evaluation Commission establishes the evaluation rating as "unsatisfactory", it must mention relevant arguments in the "comments" section of the *Evaluation Report*.

26. The evaluated researcher may present his/her own comments in the *Evaluation Report* on any aspect relevant to the evaluation process and procedure within 2 working days from the receipt of the respective document.

27. In case of being awarded the "unsatisfactory" rating, the researchers are re-evaluated after

a period of 24 months, based on the decision of the head of the research organization.

28. For researchers who receive the qualification "unsatisfactory" after two consecutive evaluations, the research organization may order the reduction of the basic salary by a maximum of 20% until the next evaluation of scientific performance, a reduction of 50% of all salary increases and allowances granted until the next evaluation of scientific performance or the termination of the individual employment contract.

29. The Commission and the evaluated researcher may attach to the *Evaluation Report* documents/materials relevant to the evaluation of professional performance.

30. If the evaluated researcher does not agree with the evaluation rating given or with the comments mentioned by the Commission, he/she must argue his/her opinions and record his/her comments in the *Evaluation Report*.

31. If the researcher does not sign the *Evaluation Report*, he/she records his/her refusal in the "Signature" section.

32. Researchers who do not agree with the result of the evaluation may appeal to the Appeals Resolution Committee, in writing, within 2 working days of becoming aware of it.

33. The Appeals Settlement Commission, within 10 working days from the date of submission of the appeal, will examine the appeal, requesting points of view from both the Evaluation Commission and the evaluated researcher.

34. The result of the appeal shall be communicated in writing to the researcher within 3 working days from the examination of the appeal.

Section 3: Evaluation grades

35. Following the evaluation of professional performance, the evaluated researcher is awarded one of the following evaluation qualifications: "unsatisfactory", "satisfactory", "good", and "very good".

36. Each evaluation criterion is assessed with a score, calculated according to the indicators presented in *Annex no. 1*. The evaluation grade is established according to the professional category of the researcher, according to the score limits presented in *Annex no. 2*.

IV. Final provisions

37. In the case of new employees, the periodic evaluation of scientific performance will not be carried out if the researcher has worked less than 6 months in the position in question during the period evaluated.

38. Scientific researchers who meet the conditions for registration for retirement according to the legislation on the public pension system can choose between granting the old-age pension and continuing their activity in the same research position, if they obtained the qualification "very good" at the last periodic evaluation of scientific performance.

39. For researchers retained in research positions after reaching retirement age, the periodic evaluation of scientific performance shall be carried out annually.

This Regulation has been endorsed by the Consultative College for Research, Development and Innovation, being registered with no. 1300/05.06.2025.

Head of Human Resources Payroll Service

Dr. ec. Dragoş Ovidiu TOFAN

SCOREBOARD AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR RESEARCHERS

A. Results obtained within the research activity and their impact				
		Activity score	Individual scoring	Observations
A1	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 relevant databases	Q1: AIS*100 Q2: AIS*80 Q3: AIS*50 Q4: AIS*30	main author (first author or corresponding author): $[(2P+nP)/(N+2)]/n$ other authors: $P/(N+2)$ P: paper score n: number of main authors N: total number of authors in the paper	The Commission assesses whether the work falls within the declared field The number of review articles will not exceed 10% of the total number of articles The Commission assesses whether the review falls within the declared field
A2	scientific papers published in open access			The number of main authors in the Institute will not exceed 3 A2 - max 1/3 of the total number of works choose the AIS with the best classification in the year of publication or the first available AIS
A3	scientific papers presented at prestigious conferences in the field of activity, publication in conference volumes	International scientific events: 3 National scientific events: 1.5	Score A3 – A7: main author (first author or corresponding author): $2P/(N+1)$ other authors: $P/(N+1)$	The paper must have a minimum of 3 pages are taken into account only for ACS-CSIII positions
A4	books/book chapters and studies edited/published by prestigious national/international publishing houses	<i>Books as a publisher:</i> established foreign publishers: 20 Other foreign publishers: 10 Established publishing houses in the country: 10 Other publishers in the country: 6 <i>Books as author:</i> established foreign publishers: 60 other foreign publishers: 30 Established publishing houses in the country: 30 Other publishers in the country: 15 Chapters in books: Established foreign publishers: 13 Other foreign publishers: 10 publishers in the country: 5		the number of chapters will not exceed 10% of the number of published ISI articles no more than two chapters whose (co)author(s) are also editor(s) at the same time consecrated foreign publishers: Wiley, Elsevier, Taylor and Francis, Springer, RSC, Sage, CRC, Kluwer, Pergamon) consecrated publishing houses in the country: Romanian Academy Publishing House, Technical Publishing House)
A5	Granted Patents	International: 50 National: 25		only for patents that do not apply
A6	participating in the development of databases	0.1 × paper score in which the structures/information are presented		new structures in databases, etc

	or digital corpora of specialized information			
A7	participation in the development of digital dictionaries, digital encyclopedias, digital editions of documents or specialized texts	International: 3 National: 1.5		it is scored only once (either in electronic or in letter format)
A8	citations in books/book chapters or in papers published in journals indexed in international databases		- 0.15 × number of WoS citations	
B. Managing and/or leading/coordinating research activities				
B1	research projects/programs won through competition or coordinated	<p>grants/projects won through competition from national bodies, respectively extrabudgetary contracts: value (EUR): score (P) < 50 000 EUR: 2 50,001 – 85,000: 4 85,001 – 150,000: 6 150,001 – 250,000: 8 250,001 – 500,000: 12 500,001 – 1,000,000: 15 > 1 000 001: 20</p> <p>Grants/projects won through competition from international organizations: Value (EUR): Score (P) < 50 000: 3 50,001 – 85,000: 6 85,001 – 150,000: 9 150,001 – 250,000: 12 250,001 – 500,000: 18 500,001 – 1,000,000: 23 1 000 001: 30</p>	<p>director/responsible/project manager: 2P</p> <p>project team member: P</p> <p>project proposal director: P</p>	For the director of an unfunded project proposal that has received at least 70% of the maximum score of the competition, the score assigned to a member of the team of a funded project is awarded
B2	Organizational Management		<p>Director of the ICMPP Subprogram: 20</p> <p>project director within the ICMPP Subprograms: 10</p>	
B3	Editor/guest editor of journals indexed in international databases		member of the editorial boards of recognized journals: 10	does not refer to the special issue editor, member of the scientific committee, member of the "Topical Advisory Panel", and others
B4	RDI programmes/projects evaluated		<p>International projects evaluated: 5</p> <p>RDI national projects assessed: 2</p>	
C. Entrepreneurial activity/collaboration with the business environment and the applicability in the economy/society of the results obtained				
C1	services, technologies, developed products		score B1 × 1.5	
C2	Technology transfer of R&D results	<p>International Level: 100</p> <p>National level: 50</p>	main author (first author or corresponding author): 2P/(N+1)	Patents that apply

			other authors: P/(N+1)	
C3	partnerships with innovative companies, within the limits of the law	Contracts with industry	score B1 × 1.5	
C4	Spin-offs/start-ups set up or managed		score B1 × 1.5	
D. Teaching, mentoring, research supervision				
D1	partnerships with researchers/faculty from other national or international research organizations		2 points	
D2	being a visiting researcher/associate professor in a research organisation		5 points	
D3	the quality of doctoral supervisor and the number of supervised doctoral students		PhD supervisor: 10 / PhD student Member of the Supervisory Committee: 6 / PhD student - Member of the commission for guiding a student to practice: 2 / student	
D4	membership in a committee for the defense of a doctoral thesis		5 points	
D5	university courses developed and published in written or electronic format		university courses developed and published in written or electronic format used as course bibliography: 15 courses developed, defended and completed with examination (exam, colloquium): 10	
E. Continuing professional training				
E1	Doctoral, postdoctoral studies	Study Abroad	Ph.D.: 10 Postdocs: 10	Postdoc: 8 years since the defense of the doctoral thesis
E2	participation in mobility programmes	Internships abroad	1 month: 2 2-6 months (cumulative): 57-12 months (cumulative): 8 > 12 months (cumulative): 10 Participation in summer schools, specialization courses: 2	The number of months of internship is cumulated and scored according to the classification in the categories presented
F. Contributions to the development of science and the enrichment or promotion of world culture				
F1	organization of scientific events		National scientific events: 4 International scientific events: 6	
F2	organization of science popularization events		National events: 2 International events: 3	
F3	Invited presentations at prestigious scientific events		Plenary conferences: 6 Invited conferences: 5 Papers/Posters International Scientific Events: 4 / 2 National scientific events: 2 / 1	the number of oral communications will not exceed the number of ISI articles published, for the CIS and CIS positions

				posters are considered only for ACS-CSIII positions
F4	presentation of reference scientific papers for the field of activity published by prestigious international publishers	papers published in extenso in volumes of scientific events, ISI indexed: 4	main author (first author or corresponding author): 2P/(N+1) other authors: P/(N+1)	- the paper must have a minimum of 3 pages - are taken into account only for ACS-CSIII positions
F5	winning prestigious awards from a public authority or institution	Romanian Academy Awards	8 points	
		awards from international professional organizations	7 points	
		awards from national professional organisations	5 points	
		awards obtained at various scientific events	2 points	
		awards obtained at invention salons	- 2 points	
G. Services provided to the company				
G1	being a member/leader/coordinator of a national/international professional organisation in the field of RDI	member/leader/coordinator of a national/international professional organization in the field of RDI	AR member: 50 member/director/coordinator of other organisations: 30	
		Scientific committees of national/international professional organizations	President: 30 Member of the Executive Board 25	e.g.: SChR, EuChemS
		member of the board of a doctoral school (CSUD) or the board of a doctoral school (CSD)	8 points	
G2	membership/leader/coordinator of a consultative body/working group in the field of RDI at sectoral, regional, national or international level		Leader: 40 Member: 30	
G3	occupying a management, coordination or control position within a public authority in the field of RDI		50	
G4	public policies, strategies, international, national and sectoral research plans, standards, regulations, guides developed for public authorities or institutions	contributions to the development of public policies, strategies, international, national and sectoral research plans, standards, regulations, guidelines developed for public authorities or institutions	15	e.g.: working commissions, scientific commission, methodology development commission
		Member of internal committees	10 /Commission	e.g.: competition commissions, examination commissions, scientific commission, methodology/guides/regulations development commission, other active commissions of the Scientific Council

**GRID FOR AWARDING THE
QUALIFICATIONS OF THE SCIENTIFIC PERFORMANCE OF RESEARCHERS**

Professional degree	Rating [points]			
	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Well	Very good
ACS	<10	10-20	21-30	>30
CS	<25	25-45	46-70	>70
CSIII	<50	50-70	71-100	>100
CSII	<75	75-110	111-160	>160
CIS	<100	101-170	171-250	>250

ACTIVITY REPORT – period:

Name, surname:

Research Function:

Subprogram:

RESULTS		SCORE
A. Results obtained within the research activity and their impact		
A1	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 relevant databases	
A2	scientific papers published in open access	
A3	scientific papers presented at prestigious conferences in the field of activity, publication in conference volumes	
A4	books/book chapters and studies edited/published by prestigious national/international publishing houses	
A5	Granted Patents	
A6	participating in the development of databases or digital corpora of specialized information	
A7	participation in the development of digital dictionaries, digital encyclopedias, digital editions of documents or specialized texts	
A8	citations in books/book chapters or in papers published in journals indexed in international databases	
B. Managing and/or leading/coordinating research activities		
B1	research projects/programs won through competition or coordinated	
B2	Organizational Management	
B3	Editor/guest editor of journals indexed in international databases	
B4	RDI programmes/projects evaluated	
C. Entrepreneurial activity/collaboration with the business environment and the applicability in the economy/society of the results obtained		
C1	services, technologies, developed products	
C2	Technology transfer of R&D results	
C3	partnerships with innovative companies, within the limits of the law	
C4	Spin-offs/start-ups set up or managed	
D. Teaching, mentoring, research supervision		
D1	partnerships with researchers/faculty from other national or international research organizations	
D2	being a visiting researcher/associate professor in a research organisation	
D3	the quality of doctoral supervisor and the number of supervised doctoral students	
D4	membership in a committee for the defense of a doctoral thesis	
D5	university courses developed and published in written or electronic format	
E. Continuing professional training		
E1	Doctoral, postdoctoral studies	
E2	participation in mobility programmes	
F. Contributions to the development of science and the enrichment or promotion of world culture		
F1	organization of scientific events	
F2	organization of science popularization events	
F3	Invited presentations at prestigious scientific events	

F4	the presentation of scientific papers of reference for the field of activity published by prestigious international publishers,	
F5	winning prestigious awards from a public authority or institution	
G. Services provided to the company		
G1	being a member/leader/coordinator of a national/international professional organisation in the field of RDI	
G2	membership/leader/coordinator of a consultative body/working group in the field of RDI at sectoral, regional, national or international level	
G3	occupying a management, coordination or control position within a public authority in the field of RDI	
G4	public policies, strategies, international, national and sectoral research plans, standards, regulations, guides developed for public authorities or institutions	

I, the undersigned, declare to _____ that all statements are in accordance with reality and I can support them with evidentiary materials.

Date:.....

Signature:.....

Checked
Subprogram Coordinator
Name, Surname:
Signature:.....

Annex no. 4

EVALUATION REPORT – period:

Name, surname (evaluated researcher):

Research Function:

Subprogram:

RESULTS		SCORE AWARDED
A. Results obtained within the research activity and their impact		
A1	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 relevant databases	
A2	scientific papers published in open access	
A3	scientific papers presented at prestigious conferences in the field of activity, publication in conference volumes	
A4	books/book chapters and studies edited/published by prestigious national/international publishing houses	
A5	Granted Patents	
A6	participating in the development of databases or digital corpora of specialized information	
A7	participation in the development of digital dictionaries, digital encyclopedias, digital editions of documents or specialized texts	
A8	citations in books/book chapters or in papers published in journals indexed in international databases	
B. Managing and/or leading/coordinating research activities		
B1	research projects/programs won through competition or coordinated	
B2	Organizational Management	
B3	Editor/guest editor of journals indexed in international databases	
B4	RDI programmes/projects evaluated	
C. Entrepreneurial activity/collaboration with the business environment and the applicability in the economy/society of the results obtained		
C1	services, technologies, developed products	
C2	Technology transfer of R&D results	
C3	partnerships with innovative companies, within the limits of the law	
C4	Spin-offs/start-ups set up or managed	
D. Teaching, mentoring, research supervision		
D1	partnerships with researchers/faculty from other national or international research organizations	
D2	being a visiting researcher/associate professor in a research organisation	
D3	the quality of doctoral supervisor and the number of supervised doctoral students	
D4	membership in a committee for the defense of a doctoral thesis	
D5	university courses developed and published in written or electronic format	
E. Continuing professional training		
E1	Doctoral, postdoctoral studies	
E2	participation in mobility programmes	
F. Contributions to the development of science and the enrichment or promotion of world culture		
F1	organization of scientific events	
F2	organization of science popularization events	
F3	Invited presentations at prestigious scientific events	
F4	the presentation of scientific papers of reference for the field of activity published by prestigious international publishers,	
F5	winning prestigious awards from a public authority or institution	

G. Services provided to the company		
G1	being a member/leader/coordinator of a national/international professional organisation in the field of RDI	
G2	membership/leader/coordinator of a consultative body/working group in the field of RDI at sectoral, regional, national or international level	
G3	occupying a management, coordination or control position within a public authority in the field of RDI	
G4	public policies, strategies, international, national and sectoral research plans, standards, regulations, guides developed for public authorities or institutions	

Proposals for the professional training of the evaluated researcher:

Evaluation commission – date:.....		
<i>Name, surname</i>	<i>Function</i>	<i>Signature</i>

Comments of the evaluated employee (if applicable):

Researcher evaluated – date:		
<i>Name, surname</i>	<i>Function</i>	<i>Signature</i>