Annex

to HSE Directive № 6.18.1-01/1912-12, dated December 19, 2016

Approved

by HSE University’s Academic Council

Minutes No. 10, dated December 2, 2016, as amended by directive No. 6.18.1-01/1205-18, dated May 12, 2017

**REGULATIONS on**

**Procedures for Conducting Performance Evaluations of Academic Staff Members at National Research University Higher School of Economics**

1. **General Provisions**
   1. These Regulations on Procedures for Conducting Performance Evaluations of Academic Staff Members at National Research University Higher School of Economics (hereinafter, the “Regulations”) were developed in accordance with the Labour Code of the Russian Federation and the Regulations for Conducting Performance Evaluations of Academic Staff Members, as approved by Ministry of Education and Science Directive No. 293, dated March 30, 2015, and the Charter of National Research University Higher School of Economics (hereinafter, “HSE University”, or the “University”). These Regulations outline the procedures for conducting performance reviews of HSE University’s academic staff members, as well as those working at its regional campuses and other subdivisions of HSE University (hereinafter, “academic staff member” or “academic staff”).
   2. Performance evaluations are conducted on the basis of assessment of an academic staff member’s professional activities with the aim of confirming his/her compliance with their job requirements.
   3. Academic staff at HSE University may include the following positions: Dean of the Faculty, Professor, Associate Professor, Senior Lecturer, Lecturer, Teaching Assistant, Institute Director, and Department Head.

1. **Preparations for Performance Evaluations**

2.1. Meetings of the Review Board are held upon the receipt of evaluation materials, with due consideration of frequency of the performance evaluations as specified in paragraph 3.1 of these Regulations

To carry out an evaluation of academic staff, the required number of review boards shall be formed, including subdivision-based boards. The review boards shall be formed taking into account the need to avoid any possible conflicts of interests, which may influence the decisions of a given board. The composition of the review boards must be approved by directive of the HSE University’ Rector.

* 1. Performance evaluations shall be initiated:
     1. for HSE University’s academic staff – by the Vice Rector, who according to the Directive on the Delegation of Powers at HSE University is vested with the right to perform as an employer with respect to the academic staff of coordinated subdivisions (hereinafter, the “Coordinating Vice Rector”);
     2. for staff at HSE University’s regional campuses - by the director of the relevant campus.
  2. The Coordinating Vice Rector/director of the relevant HSE University’s regional campus must, not later than 75 calendar days prior to the performance evaluation, send a memo to the Rector specifying the reasons for performance evaluation, as well as the period for the evaluation, full name and position of the academic staff member to be evaluated.
  3. The HSE University’s Rector shall make a decision about the date, place and time of the performance evaluation, which shall be then formalized in an HSE University’s directive.
  4. Information about the Rector’s decision to conduct an evaluation must be sent no later than 60 calendar days prior to its start to the HR Office of HSE University (hereinafter, the “HR Office”), or the relevant subdivision at an HSE University’s regional campus, as well as the chairperson of the Review Board.
  5. A decision to conduct a performance evaluation, as specified in paragraph 2.4 hereof, must be communicated in writing by the HR Office to the relevant academic staff to be evaluated no later than 45 calendar days before the start of the evaluation.

1. **Procedure for Performance Evaluations**
   1. Performance evaluations of academic staff are conducted every 5 (five) years for academic staff who are employed under a permanent employment agreement.
   2. Performance evaluations shall be conducted with the aim of confirming that the academic staff member is in compliance with the requirements for his/her position.
   3. The following persons are not subject to performance evaluations:
      1. academic staff who have been at their current position for less than 2 (two) years;
      2. pregnant women;
      3. women on maternity leave; academic staff on childcare leave (until a child is 3 years of age).

Performance evaluations to confirm compliance with the requirements for the position occupied by an academic staff member specified in subparagraph 3.3.3 of these Regulations shall not be carried out within (2) two years after their return from a specified leave.

* 1. During the performance evaluation, the results of the academic activities should be objectively assessed over time and in accordance with the criteria for evaluating academic staff (Annex 4).
  2. Performance evaluations of academic staff are conducted as per the recommendation of the subdivision (hereinafter, the “recommendation”) where the academic staff member under review is employed. The recommendation should contain an objective and comprehensive evaluation of his/her activities.

The recommendation shall be submitted to the Review Board and must contain a reasoned assessment of the business and professional qualities of the academic staff member being assessed, as well as the results of his/her professional activities.

The head of the subdivision where the academic staff member under review works is obligated to familiarize him/her with the recommendation (affirmed by an academic staff member’s signature) no later than 30 calendar days prior to the start of performance evaluation.

If the academic staff member in question refuses to familiarize themselves with the recommendation, a statement shall be drawn up, which is then signed by the head of the relevant subdivision and at least two persons who were in attendance when the statement was being drawn up.

In order to conduct a performance evaluation, no later than 10 working days prior to the start of the evaluation, the head(s) of the subdivision where the academic staff member under review works must send the Review Board the following:

* + 1. an evaluation form (prepared using the form provided in Annex 1 hereof) with the first section completed and signed by the academic staff member under review and endorsed by the head(s) of the subdivision in which the academic staff member in question works;
    2. if available, a report on the fulfilment of the conditions of the unified agreement for the previous academic year with a grade from the head of the respective subdivision;
    3. if available, files containing 1 (one) to 3 (three) academic publications/manuscripts from the last 3 (three) years which the academic staff member considers to be his/her best;
    4. a recommendation.
  1. When the academic staff member submits the publications/manuscripts specified in subparagraph 3.6.3, the chairperson of the Review Board shall organize an examination of the submitted publications/manuscripts. Therefore, the experts shall prepare written commentary on each academic staff member’s submitted work, prepared as per the form provided in Annex 2 of these Regulations.

The results of the examination and any information received in relation thereto, as well as the contents of the written commentary (hereinafter, “Information about the Examination Results”) shall be considered HSE University’s confidential information as it features personal information about the academic staff and experts, and may include other restricted information. Persons who have obtained access to Information about the Examination Results are obliged to respect and ensure the confidentiality of any Information about the Examination Results and may disclose the personal data maintained within only with the written consent of the relevant staff member and experts, as well as in the instances stipulated by the legislation of the Russian Federation and HSE University’s internal bylaws and regulations.

The procedures for providing or distributing confidential or restricted information and the procedures for providing access to such information are determined by the Coordinating Vice Rector, unless otherwise stipulated by HSE University’s bylaws. The chairman of the Review Board must ensure that measures are taken to respect and protect the confidentiality of the Information about Examination Results.

* 1. No later than 14 calendar days prior to the day of the performance evaluation, the academic staff member under review has the right to submit to the Review Board additional information about his/her professional activity, including:
     1. a list of academic works by the following categories:
* monographs and chapters in monographs;
* articles in academic collections and academic periodicals, patents (certificates) for intellectual property;
* publications in materials of academic events;
* publications in registered academic electronic editions;
* pre-prints;
* popular science books and articles;
  + 1. the names of published study books prepared by the assessed academic staff member, or those to which the academic staff member contributed;
    2. A list of teaching aids, curricula, work programmes for study subjects, courses, modules, and electronic educational resources with the academic staff member’s contribution;
    3. information about the volume of his/her teaching load;
    4. a list of grants, contracts and/or agreements for research and development works with the involvement of the academic staff member, specifying his/her role;
    5. information about the participation of the academic staff member in academic events (congresses, conferences, symposia, and other academic events), with an indication of the status of the paper and the level of the event;
    6. information about the academic staff member’s involvement in editorial boards for research and teaching periodicals;
    7. information about organizing mentoring work and pastoral care for students;
    8. information about awards and recognitions in the research and educational spheres;
    9. information about continuing education and professional retraining;
    10. a statement with the reasons for objecting to the recommendation;
    11. other information.

At each subsequent performance evaluation, the evaluation sheet of the academic staff member with the details on his/her previous performance evaluation(s) is presented to the Review Board.

* 1. The academic staff member reserves the right to attend the meeting of the Review Board for the process of his/her evaluation. If the academic staff member is not in attendance, the Review Board has to the right to carry out the performance evaluation in his/her absence.
  2. The meeting of the Review Board shall be deemed valid if no less than two thirds of its members are present.
  3. The decision of the Review Board shall be made in the academic staff member’s absence via the show-of-hands majority voting among the members in attendance and shall be recorded in the minutes. In the event of a tie, the academic staff member will be declared in compliance with the requirements for his/her position.
  4. When evaluating an academic staff member who sits on the Review Board, its decision shall be rendered in his/her absence as per the standard procedure.

1. **Results of the Review Board Meetings**
   1. The outcome of the Review Board’s meeting shall be its reasoned decision about the academic staff member’s compliance or non-compliance with the requirements for his/he position that has been made on the basis of an objective evaluation of his/her professional activities.
   2. The decision of the Review Board must be drawn up in its minutes and signed by the chairperson and other members. If necessary, the Review Board should note in their decision the positive and/or negative aspects of the academic staff’s professional activities and make a reasoned recommendation about said activities, including the need for his/her further training.
   3. Minutes of the Review Board shall be drawn up using the form provided by Annex 3 to these Regulations.
   4. The review Board shall make 1 (one) of the following decisions in relation to the academic staff member under review: compliance with the requirements for his/her position or non-compliance therewith. The results of respective performance evaluations are recorded in minutes, which shall be sent to the HR Office within 3 (three) calendar days following the performance evaluation and kept there together with the materials and information specified in paragraphs 3.6-3.8 of these Regulations. An extract from the minutes of the Review Board meeting containing the last and first name of the academic staff member under review, his/her position, the date of the Review Board’s meeting, results of the vote, and the decision made by the Review Board, shall be drawn up and sent to the HR Office staff member within 10 (ten) working days from the date of the relevant meeting.
   5. A copy of the evaluation materials with respect to academic staff are submitted by the Review Board to the Coordinating Vice Rector/the campus’ director (if an academic staff member of a HSE University’s regional campus is being assessed) for making a decision in accordance with the Labour Code of the Russian Federation, no later than 5 (five) working days from the day of the Review Board meeting. Within the specified timeframe, the Coordinating Vice Rector shall also receive a copy of the evaluation materials with respect to the academic staff members of the relevant HSE University’s regional campus.
   6. Decisions on the academic staff member’s compliance or non-compliance with the requirements for his/her position shall be made on the basis of the evaluation materials submitted by the Coordinating Vice Rector or, in the case of an evaluation of an academic staff member at an HSE University’s regional campus – by the director of said campus.
   7. In the event of an academic staff member’s non-compliance with the requirements for his/her position due to insufficient qualifications, as confirmed by the results of the performance evaluation, the employment agreement with him/her may be terminated in accordance with paragraph 3 clause 1 article 81 of the Labour Code of the Russian Federation. Dismissal on a specified basis is possible if the academic staff member cannot be transferred with his/her written consent to another position at HSE University (either a vacant position or a job that meets his/her qualifications, or a vacant lower position or a lower-paid position), whereby the academic staff member can fulfil given his/her current health condition.
   8. After a decision has been made in accordance with paragraph 4.5 of these Regulations, the evaluation materials shall be sent to the HR Office to be documented, as well as arranged for their further storage.

4.9. The academic staff member is entitled to appeal the results of his/her performance evaluation in accordance with the legislation of the Russian Federation. Annex 1

to Regulations on Procedures for Conducting Performance Evaluations of Academic Staff at National Research University Higher School of Economics

National Research University Higher School of Economics

**Evaluation List**

I. Information about the academic staff member under Review:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Last Name, First Name, Patronymic/Middle Name (if applicable) | |  | |
|  | Campus | |  | |
|  | Faculty/Institute | |  | |
|  | Department/School | |  | |
|  | Department/Subdivision | |  | |
|  | Position | |  | |
|  | Salary | |  | |
|  | Years of work in current position at the time of evaluation | |  | |
|  | General academic and teaching work experience, years | |  | |
|  | Academic degree, year when received | |  | |
|  | Academic title, year when received | |  | |
|  | Membership in professional organizations | |  | |
|  | Honorary titles | |  | |
|  | List of academic publications over the last 3 years (full bibliographic description) | |  | |
|  | Number of academic publications over the last 3 years | |  | |
|  | In the event of no academic publications for the last three years, state the reason for absence | |  | |
|  | List of courses taught in current academic year | |  | |
|  | Teaching/classroom/methodological load in current academic year | |  | |
|  | In the case of reduction in teaching load, reasons for reduction | |  | |
|  | Teaching ratings for previous academic year: minimum average value/maximum average value (specify by course) | |  | |
|  | “Best Lecturer” status (indicate years when received) | |  | |
|  | Academic bonuses received (specify years and bonus level) | |  | |
|  | Participation in conferences, symposia, and other academic events over the last 3 years, specifying the year(s) and status of the event and title of the paper | |  | |
|  | Information about advanced training over the last 3 years with supporting documents | |  | |
|  | Information about the academic supervision of dissertations for Master’s, Candidate of Sciences’ and Doctor of Sciences’ degrees over the last 3 years, specifying the results | |  | |
|  | Additional information, which the academic staff member believes is necessary for the evaluation | |  | |
| Date: | | Academic staff member’s name: | | Academic staff member’s signature: |
| Date: | | The subdivision head’s name: | | Signature of subdivision head: |

II. Evaluation Results:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | was found as being in |  |  |
| Name of the academic staff member under review |  | Compliance/non-compliance with the requirements for the position (specify decision of the Review Board) | |
|  |  |  |  |
| Chairperson of the Review Board: |  |  |  |
|  | Full name | Signature | Date |
| Members of the Review Board: |  |  |  |
|  | Full Name | Signature | Date |
|  | Full Name | Signature | Date |
|  | Full Name | Signature | Date |
|  | Full Name | Signature | Date |
|  |  |  |  |
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**Date of Expert Evaluation:**

**“...” \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_20..**

**Expert evaluation of the quality of academic works by the academic staff member under review**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Expert (Full Name)** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Information Security and Privacy Requirements!*  *The evaluation shall be conducted anonymously. This expert evaluation and any information contained therein shall not be disclosed to persons not affiliated with the Review Board. Information about the expert and the text of this evaluation must not be passed to those assessed or third parties, unless otherwise stipulated by the legislation of the Russian Federation or HSE University’s internal regulations or bylaws.*  *By taking part in the expert evaluation of the competition documents and publications/manuscripts, the expert is obliged to respect the confidentiality of the information contained in such documents, the results of the expert evaluation and the information received with respect to its process and the content of this conclusion (hereinafter, the “confidential information”), as well as all restricted information, including the personal information of the author. This also includes not disclosing information and materials obtained during the examination process to third parties.* | |
| **Circumstances that may impede an objective examination (i.e., conflict of interest)** | Please specify if you have a conflict of interest with respect to this expert evaluation. A conflict of interest is considered present if you or your close relatives (father, mother, wife, husband, or children) have previously co-authored with the authors of the given academic work or with their close relatives (father, mother, wife, husband, or children), were or are subject to litigation with them, were founders of joint commercial or non-commercial organizations, or if serious professional conflicts have existed  **❒** yes  **❒** no  If a conflict of interest is present (circumstances that impede an objective examination), but you believe that it will not affect the results of the expert evaluation, please clarify: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | |

**We ask you kindly to provide expert evaluation of the academic work as per the following parameters** (please tick ONE box in each column)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Author (Full name)** |  |

Начало формы

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The work is completed | | Academic Work 1 | Academic Work 2 | Academic Work 3 |
| 5. | At a high international level |  |  |  |
| 4. | At a sufficiently high professional level |  |  |  |
| 3. | At an average professional level |  |  |  |
| 2. | At a low professional level |  |  |  |
| 1. | At an unacceptably low level |  |  |  |
| 0. | The work is not academic in nature |  |  |  |
|  | Specify the number of academic works that have been subject to expert evaluation (1, 2, or 3) |  | | |
|  | Average score (calculated as the sum of points for each academic work divided by the number of works that have undergone the expert evaluation) |  | | |

**Expert opinion on the quality of the academic works by the academic staff member under review (must be filled in for all submitted works)**

Approximate size of the conclusion—800-1,000 symbols. The review MUST contain the reasoning behind your expert evaluation of the academic work.

Конец формы

|  |
| --- |
| Please write a short overview of the submitted academic works, as well as note the following characteristics:   * well-reasoned assessment of positive qualities of the academic work; * well-reasoned assessment of deficiencies in the academic work; * overall assessment of the quality of academic work (summary—no more than 2-3 sentences). |
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National Research University Higher School of Economics

**Minutes of Review Board № \_\_\_\_\_**

Year \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Specify Campus

Chaired by:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Attended by: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Agenda:

Performance Evaluation of Academic Staff at HSE University.

1. Reviewed evaluation materials concerning:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Full name of the academic staff member under review | position | subdivision |

Evaluation of the professional activities of the academic staff member under review:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Voting results:

“for” – \_\_\_ votes; “against” – \_\_\_ votes; “abstained” – \_\_\_ votes.

After considering the results of the performance evaluation, the Review Board has found the academic staff member under review to be in:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | with the requirements for his/her position. |
| compliance/non-compliance |  |

1. Reviewed evaluation materials concerning:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Full name of the academic staff member under review | position | subdivision |

Evaluation of the professional activities of the academic staff member under review:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Results of vote:

“for” – \_\_\_ votes; “against” – \_\_\_ votes; “abstained” – \_\_\_ votes.

After considering the results of the performance evaluation, the Review Board has found the academic staff member under review to be in:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | with the requirements for the position. |
| compliance/non-compliance |  |

1. Reviewed evaluation materials concerning:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Full name of the academic staff member under review | position | subdivision |

Evaluation of the professional activities of the academic staff member under review:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Results of the vote:

“for” – \_\_\_ votes; “against” – \_\_\_votes; “abstained” – \_\_\_votes.

After considering the results of the performance evaluation, the Review Board has found the academic staff member under review to be in:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | with the requirements for the position. |
| compliance/non-compliance |  |

Commentary of the Review Board regarding its decision:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The Review Board Chairperson |  |  |  |
|  | Full Name | Signature | Date |
| Review Board Members: |  |  |  |
|  | Full Name | Signature | Date |
|  | Full Name | Signature | Date |
|  | Full Name | Signature | Date |
|  | Full Name | Signature | Date |
|  |  |  |  |
| I hereby declare that I have been familiarized with the results of the performance evaluation: |  |  |  |
|  | The Academic Staff Member’s Full Name | Signature | Date |

Annex to Directive № \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_,

dated\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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Criteria for Evaluating the Performance of Academic Professionals

1. Basic criteria.

1.1. The presence of academic and educational publications over the last 3 (three) years, including:

1.1.1. for the position of professor — no fewer than 5 (five) academic publications, including 1 (one) in a top-tier publication;

1.1.2. for the position of associate professor — no fewer than 3 (three) academic publications, including 1 (one) in a top-tier publication;

1.1.3. for the positions of Senior Lecturer, Lecturer, Assistant — no fewer than 2 (two) academic publications.

These publications do not refer to intra-university teaching and learning materials, conference abstracts and materials in conference collections (except for the April HSE University Conference), as well as publications from the list of journals charging the authors for publishing, as approved by the Board of the HSE University Academic Fund Programme.

1.1.4. Materials submitted for print are considered publications provided that there is an official confirmation from the media outlet/publisher about the publication specifying the number and month of the journal’s release.

1.1.5. Publications in top-tier publications may include:

a) chapters in monographs, monographs in foreign languages, publications in foreign journals;

b) publications in leading Russian journals.

2. Additional Criteria.

2.1. Fulfilment of obligations under the Unified Contract, including fulfilment of at least than 75% of the normative general and classroom academic load in the current academic year.

2.2. The absence of rating indicators lower than 3 (three) points over the past six months where the academic staff member has had an academic load (the rating shall be taken into account when there are at least 10 (ten) respondents; ratings scored on the basis of the responses of less than 10 (ten) people are considered relevant if they account for no less than 50% of the students enrolled on a course).

2.3. The presence of a completed personal page of the academic staff member on HSE University’s corporate website (portal) with a full text of the respective syllabi of the courses taught in the current academic year, and a full list of the academic and educational publications over the last 3 (three) years.

2.4. The absence of unexpunged disciplinary actions taken against the academic staff member over the previous calendar year.

2.5. Commendation(s) from HSE University over the preceding calendar year.

2.6. Defense of a candidate’s thesis within 2 (two) years after completing doctoral studies and within 5 (five) years after being employed by HSE University as a full-time lecturer.

2.7. Personal contribution to improving the quality of training in the courses taught, as well as providing solutions to academic/research problems in the respective field of knowledge.

2.8. Participation in the development of teaching and mentoring methods, as well as the mastering of new educational technologies.

2.9. Enhancement of one’s professional qualifications.