**Protocol of the competition board meeting**

**for the position of .............. (research-didactic employee)**

**full-time work in …………/organizational unit/**

**on ……..**

**1. Reference number of the competition announcement (specified in the Rector's consent to conduct the competition procedure):**

**2. Starting date of the competition board work:**

**3. Date of the competition board meeting:**

**4. Competition board includes:**

1) Chairman:

2)

3)

**5. List of submitted applications:**

1)

2)

3)

**6. Detailed criteria for the evaluation of candidates:** *(specify the criteria and the manner of their evaluation, e.g. in points, in discussions, etc.)*

The basic criteria were: the candidate's research interests and the results of graduation. An additional criterion was scientific activity expressed in active participation in scientific conferences, scientific achievements, awards received for scientific activities, knowledge of foreign languages enabling conducting classes and research in a given language, experience in international cooperation and completed international internships, and organizational activity. Candidates were assessed on a scale from 0 to 5 points, where 0 means no achievement or activity, and 5 means outstanding achievement or activity at a very high level.

**7. Formal analysis of the applications**

*(in the case of rejection of the application for formal reasons, the protocol should specify in detail what the formal failure was)*

After verification of the documents submitted by the candidates, it was established that the documentation is complete and meets the competition requirements in the case of:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Surname and name of the candidate |  |
| 1. |  | meets the formal requirements |
| 2. |  | meets the formal requirements |

…. candidates did not qualify:

**8. Assessment of individual candidates according to established criteria**

*(each candidate should be assessed separately in accordance with the criteria proposed by the board and the method of their assessment).*

THE ELIGIBILITY OF CANDIDATES HAS BEEN ASSESSED BY THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA (ON A SCALE OF 0-5, WHERE 0 MEANS NO ACHIEVEMENT, AND 5 MEANS OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENTS):

*According to the qualifications set out in the competition notice, e.g.*

1. Authorship or co-authorship of a monograph published by the publishing house from level 2 of the "List of publishing houses" (200 points)
2. Authorship of a monograph published by the publishing house from level 1 of the "List of publishing houses" (80 points).
3. Co-authorship of a monograph published by the publishing house from level 1 of the "List of publishing houses" (80 points).
4. Authorship or co-authorship of a chapter in a monograph published by a publishing house from level 2 of the "List of publishing houses".
5. Authorship of a chapter in a monograph published by the publishing house from level 1 of the "List of publishing houses".
6. Co-authorship of a chapter in a monograph published by a publishing house from level 1 of the "List of publishing houses".
7. Editing of a monograph published by the publishing house from level 2 of the "List of publishing houses".
8. Editing of a monograph published by the publishing house from level 1 of the "List of publishing houses".
9. Authorship or co-authorship of a reviewed scientific article published in a journal or in peer-reviewed conference materials from the List of journals, part 1 A and part C and List of journals 2 with a score of 100, 140 or 200.
10. Authorship of a reviewed scientific article published in a journal or in peer-reviewed conference materials from the List of journals, part 1 B and List of 2 journals with a score of 20, 40 or 70.
11. Co-authorship of a reviewed scientific article in a journal or in reviewed conference materials from the List of journals, part 1 B and List of 2 journals with a score of 20, 40 or 70.
12. Authorship or co-authorship of a peer-reviewed scientific article published in a journal outside the Journal Lists 1 and 2.
13. Authorship or co-authorship of a monograph published by a publishing house outside the "List of publishing houses".
14. Authorship or co-authorship of an European patent or a patent granted abroad in at least one of the OECD countries.
15. Authorship or co-authorship of a patent granted by the Patent Office of the Republic of Poland.
16. Authorship or co-authorship of a plant variety covered by the breeder's exclusive right.
17. Authorship or co-authorship of a utility model covered by a protection right granted by the Patent Office of the Republic of Poland or abroad.
18. Authorship or co-authorship of the completed artistic, construction or technological project.
19. Participation in research projects, grants, etc.
20. Organizational activity (including membership in scientific circles, associations, scientific organizations).
21. Participation in scientific conferences.
22. Completed scientific internships and studies abroad.
23. Knowledge of foreign languages.
24. Clearly defined research topics, documented by publications.
25. Didactic skills in the position being the subject of the competition.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name and surname of the candidate** (in alphabetical order) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Sum** |
|  | **2** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **0** | **2** | **2** | **10** |
|  | **3** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **1** | **4** | **4** | **4** | **3** | **3** | **22** |

**9. Application of the chairman of the board to select a candidate/candidates to vote.**

**10. Secret vote:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name and surname of the candidate** (in alphabetical order) | **YES** | **NO** | **ABSTENTION** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Number of people entitled to vote:

Number of people present at the meeting:

Number of validly cast votes:

**11. The decision of the competition board to select a candidate(s) for the position to which the competition concerns:**

As a result of voting, the competition board selected the following candidates for the position:

*JUSTIFICATION*

Employment of ……………………… in ………………… is related to the need to develop research in the field of didactics (………………. among others). When assessing the scientific and professional achievements of the proposed candidates, the Board took into account that the achievements presented by the ………….. most fully correspond to the research conducted and planned in ……………….. The board also appreciated the previous experience in international cooperation and the award for the doctoral dissertation received by the candidate.

**12. Signatures of the members of the competition board:**