

Approved by decree of the Academic Council

Protocol #2, 24.2025 year

The Rule of evaluation of academic and invited staff

1. General Provisions

- 1.1. This rule regulates the procedures and criteria for assessing the professional development, scientific - research and academic activities of the academic staff of the University of Alterbridge LLC (hereinafter - the university), as well as the professional development and academic activities of invited staff;
- 1.2. The assessment of the academic and the scientific-research activities of the staff facilitates the increase of productivity of scientific-educational activities, raising the qualification and professionalism of the staff, stimulating creative initiative, aiming at the development and improvement of the quality of the University.

2. Goal of the assessment of the academic and invited staff

2.1. The objectives of assessing the scientific and academic performance of academic/invited staff are:

- Assessment of contribution of academic staff to scientific activities in higher educational institutions;
- Identification of strengths and weaknesses of scientific-research potential and determination of directions of development of scientific-research potential;
- Promotion of quality improvement of results of scientific-research activities;
- Determination of scientific-research priorities;
- To assure elaboration of individual professional goals and objectives by the University employees;
- Revealing of staff capabilities and their support for further development;
- Identifying areas to improve staff and support their elimination.

3. Evaluation methods and procedures

3.1. Assessment of the activities of the academic/invited staff at the University is carried out in a formal way, with a defined periodicity, with a pre-selected tools.

3.2. The assessment tool is systematized assessment questionnaires aimed at improving the quality of the activities performed and scientific-research activities. Also, to identify and support the capabilities of staff for further development.

3.3. Assessment of academic / invited staff is carried out with assessment tools:¹

- Academic Staff Annual Report (self-assessment);
- Evaluation of affiliated academic staff by the school dean;
- Evaluation of academic staff by the Dean of the School;
- Evaluation of academic/invited staff by program supervisor;
- Assessment of academic / invited staff by students:²;
- Evaluation of invited staff by the Dean of the School.

3.2. The Human Resource Management Service administers the evaluation process of the academic/affiliated academic/invited staff by the School Dean, Program Supervisor and student and submits the processed results to the Quality Assurance Service for final analysis of the evaluation results and determination of relevant recommendations.

3.3. Administration of the Academic Staff Annual Report (self-assessment) process is carried out by coordinated work of the University Quality Assurance Service and Research Center. The final results will be reported to the Human Resources Management Service.

3.4. Semester and annual results of academic / affiliated academic / invited staff are sent to the Dean of the School by the Quality Assurance Service. To the relevant staff individually, program heads, Human Resources Management Service and Research Center.

3.5.

4. Target benchmarks for evaluating academic / invited staff activities

4.1. The academic staff of the university (including the affiliated academic staff) must carry out the scientific-research activities established by this rule. Academic / invited staff must earn a marginal number of points throughout the academic year:

- Academic Staff Annual Report (self – assessment) - for Professor-total of at least 80 points; for Associate Professor-total of at least 75 points; for Assistant Professor-total of at least 60 points; for Assistant-total of at least 45 points;
- Assessment of affiliated academic staff by Dean - not less than 60 % of the maximum assessment;
- Assessment of academic staff by Dean - not less than 55 % of the maximum assessment;
- Assessment of invited staff by Dean - not less than

50% of the maximum assessment;

Assessment of academic/invited staff by the Head of the program -
not less than 60% of the maximum assessment;

- Assessment of academic / invited staff by students - maximal of at least 70% of the assessment.

5. Periodicity of the evaluation process

5.1. The Academic Staff self-assessment report is filled out once, at the end of each year.

5.2. Assessment of academic / affiliated academic / invited staff is carried out by the Dean of the school and the Head of the Program on a semester basis.

5.3. Assessment of academic / affiliated academic / invited staff is carried out by students on a semester basis.

6. Management of the Activity Evaluation Results

6.1. The goal of the management of the assessment results, its feedback is to improve the teaching and research quality in the University by each professor's involvement, to facilitate the development process in this regard and to successfully implement the achievement of strategic goals and challenges of the University.

6.2. The Human Resources Management Service shall process the results of the academic/invited staff assessment process, introduce the summarized results to the schools and individually to the staff based on the instructions of the Quality Assurance Service.

6.3. The Human Resource Management Service of the University cooperates with the relevant structural unit(s) in order to eliminate the shortcomings identified as a result of the analysis of the assessment results and plan the necessary actions.

6.4 In order to respond to the assessment results, the action plan of the planned activities is drawn up by the Quality Assurance Service of the University, and the action plan of scientific activities of the staff - the research center, while the monitoring of this process is carried out by the Quality Assurance Service of the University.

6.5 Based on the results of the evaluation of the activities of academic/invited staff, the University can use various forms of incentives, including one-time financial reward, salary increase, financing of trainings, conferences, etc.

6.6. In case of non-compliance of the scientific-research component(s) by the affiliated academic staff,

he / she shall be given an appropriate recommendation. In case of non-fulfillment of the above-mentioned activities twice in a row, the University reserves the right to terminate the employment contract with the employee.

7. Final Provisions

7.1. This rule is reviewed and approved by the Rector of the University by an order.

7.2. Amendments to this document are made by the order of the Rector of the University.

Note: Annexes form an integral part of the document.

Academic Staff self-assessment form annex N1

№	Scientific-research project titles	Description of scientific research activity	Date of implementation of scientific research activity	Intended for scientific activity (points) <i>Evaluation by staff</i>	Evaluation of scientific activity (point)
1.	<p>Publication of a scientific article in the following categories of journals:</p> <p>Indexed journals of Thompson Reuters Base (Web of Science) by an Impact Factor and Science Citation Index indicators.</p> <p>Journals indexed on the ELSEVIER publication database and Scopus platform by the SCImago Journal ranking (SJR – SCImago Journal Rank) index</p>	<p><i>Author/authors, article title, Digital Identification code DOI, Journal/collection name and number/volume, place of publication, publishing house, number of pages.</i></p> <p><i>Please specify the appropriate link</i></p>		40 points	

	<p>And/or in those rated bases that have the function of rating evaluation</p>				
<p>2.</p>	<p>Publication of scientific article in peer-reviewed journals indexed in Google Scholar database</p>	<p><i>Author/authors, article title, Digital Identification code DOI, Journal/collection name and number/volume, place of publication, publishing house, number of pages.</i></p> <p><i>Please specify the appropriate link</i></p>		<p>20 points</p>	

3	Publication of an article in the Altebridge scientific journal	<p><i>Author/authors, article title, Digital Identification code DOI, Journal/collection name and number/volume, place of publication, publishing house, number of pages.</i></p> <p><i>Please specify the appropriate link</i></p>		25 points	
4	Making speech at international scientific conference ¹	<p><i>Speaker/speakers, title of the presentation, name of the Conference / Forum, time and place of holding.</i></p> <p><i>Please specify the appropriate link</i></p>		20 points	
5	Presenting a paper at a local scientific conference	<p><i>Speaker/speakers, title of the presentation, name of the Conference / Forum, time and place of holding.</i></p> <p><i>Please specify the appropriate link</i></p>		10 points	

In case the staff conference topic is also published in the scientific collection, journal etc. dedicated to the conference, when summing points, one activity is taken into account by the principle of giving preference to the highest score

6	Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation grant funded scientific-research projects	<i>Project name, Project Identification code, starting and ending years of the project, role of staff involved in the project</i>		50 points	
7	Scientific projects funded by foreign grants	<i>Project name, Project Identification code, starting and ending years of the project, role of staff involved in the project</i>		60 points	
8	Supervising a funded international grant project	<i>Project name, Project Identification code, starting and ending years of the project, role of staff involved in the project</i>		40 points	
9	Participation in the funded grant research project as a key scientific staff member	<i>Project name, Project Identification code, starting and ending years of the project, role of staff involved in the project</i>		30 points	
10.	Invention, patent	<i>Patent topic title, inventor/ inventors and patent owner/ owners, patent identification code</i>		60 points	
11.	Manual / monograph	<i>Author/authors, title of a monograph/book, international standard code</i>		40 points	

		<i>ISBN, place of publication, publishing house, number of pages</i>			
12.	Editorship of the scientific journal referred to in the first paragraph of this table	<i>see above. 1. Please specify the appropriate link</i>		40 points	
13.	Editorial Board Membership of the scientific journal referred to in the first paragraph of this table	<i>see above. 1. Please specify the appropriate link</i>		20 points	
14.	Membership of the scientific commission of the international scientific conference	<i>Name, time and date of the Conference/Forum. Please specify the appropriate link</i>		10 points	
15.	Membership of the scientific commission of the local scientific conference	<i>Name, time and date of the Conference. Please specify the appropriate link</i>		5 points	
16.	Review of the textbook / monograph	<i>Author/authors, title of a monograph/book, international standard code ISBN, place of publication, publishing house</i>		10 points	

17.	Supervising a student's paper for a conference	<i>Name of the student, title of the paper, name of the conference, time and place of holding.</i> <i>Please specify the appropriate link</i>		5 points	
18.	² Reviewing/opponency of PhD work	<i>Title of the thesis, name and surname of the student, time and place of holding.</i>		10 points	
20.	Other scientific activities	<i>Indicate only scientific activity</i>		In a specific case, it is evaluated by the commission, by not more than 20 points	
					<i>Total number</i>
					<i>Signature of academic staff</i>

² On another University doctoral program.

--	--	--	--	--	--

1 In case the staff conference topic is also published in the scientific collection, journal etc. dedicated to the conference, when summing points, one activity is taken into account by the principle of giving preference to the highest score

Annex N2 assessment of affiliated academic/academic and/or invited staff by the Dean of the School

First and Last Name

Academic position School:

Assessment Criteria	Points <input type="text"/>				
Coordinated work of staff with the school	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.

Final assessment:

Annex #3 - Assessment of Academic and Invited Staff by the Head of the program

First and Last Name

Academic position School:

Assessment criteria	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points
Cooperation in the context of updating/creating syllabuses					
Compliance of midterm / final exam issues with syllabus					
Use of electronic and / or innovative teaching methods					
Other types of cooperation in the context of program perfection					

Final assessment:

Annex N4 assessment of academic / invited staff by students

Organization of the training course:

1. Please rate the issues below:

2. Please review what would you change in the training course?

3. By a 5-point system, evaluate at what extent do you agree with the given below:

Assessment Criteria	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points
The lecturer does not miss the lecture					
In case of absence, the lecturer informs the students in advance					
The lecturer makes up for the missed lecture/workgroup.					

The lecturer is not late for the lecture					
Lecturer is competent					
Lecturer is prepared for the lecture					
Lecturer introduces students to syllabus at high level					
Lecturer optimally plans time during lecture / working group					
The lecturer follows the syllabus topics sequentially.					
The lecturer uses a wide variety of methods					
The lecturer explains in an understandable manner, distinctly, clearly					
The lecture is interactive					
The lecturer reflects scores in database in time					
The lecturer gives useful feedback					
Every student can ask a question					
The lecturer's answers to the questions are clear and exhaustive					
The lecturer provides additional consultations to the students					
The lecturer is friendly towards students					

Assessment criteria	1 point	2 points	3 points	4 points	5 points
Devotes proper time to lecture/work in the Working Group					
Time allocated for independent work is enough					
The methods used are adequate and effective					
Learning outcomes are achievable					
Evaluation system is objective					
The time allocated for the the midterm examination is sufficient					
The time allocated for the final examination is sufficient					
The material of the midterm/ final exam is adequate to the course / passed material					

4. Please name the strength of the lecturer

5. Please name the weakness of the lecturer

Final assessment: