

II. Instructions for reviewers

In formulating their assessments, reviewers should take into account the Criteria and the annex to the Criteria of the member institution to which the candidate has applied. The expert assessments must be written in Slovenian or English (for foreign reviewers).

The reports should contain the following elements:

Introduction

Date of appointment as expert reviewer, title of reviewer and field in which they were appointed, an indication of the candidate and the title requested and habilitation field.

Opinion on the bibliography submitted and the points system

The reviewer should check the adequacy of the submitted bibliography and points, especially the conformity of the works listed by the candidate to the field in which they are seeking appointment to a title, the adequacy of the classification of works, the points assigned to individual works and the adequacy of all evidence of meeting the requirements for appointment to the requested title.

If the reviewer concurs with the bibliography and points, they should give an unequivocal statement of this in their report. In this case there is no need to state the points in the report. If a check of the bibliography and points indicates that there are errors (e.g. inappropriate points tally, inappropriate calculations), they should clearly draw attention to the observed error. This may be done by correcting the points, signing them and attaching them to the report. Here they should explain the corrections in the report.

Fulfilment of the minimum conditions for an application to be considered

Reviewers should check and express their view in the report on fulfilment of the minimum conditions for an application for appointment to a requested title to be considered as follows:

- whether the candidate fulfils the common, general and special conditions for appointment to a title;
- whether the candidate fulfils the minimum requirements of quality set out in Articles 55, 60 and 66 for the relevant title, for instance guest work abroad, mentorship, heading projects etc.; if work abroad is required for appointment to a title, the report should contain an assessment of whether the candidate's work abroad complied with the requirements of the Criteria and within the wider field (e.g. natural sciences, technology, medicine, biotechnology, social sciences, humanities, art) in which the candidate works;
- whether the candidate fulfils the quantitative conditions (points, number of important works cumulatively and in the last appointment period, sufficient number of first and/or lead authorships and so forth);
- whether the candidate fulfils other required minimum criteria under the annex to the Criteria of the member institution to which the application for appointment was submitted.

Qualitative assessment of academic or artistic work

In this section the report should contain a reasoned analytical evaluation of the importance of the candidate's academic or artistic output with an analysis and assessment of the quality of the

candidate's submitted works. In the analysis the reviewer should take a reasoned and structured view regarding:

- the demonstrated capacity for independent academic, artistic or research and development work;
- proven ability to solve problems of an academic, research and development or technical nature;
- the international response or importance for the national identity and culture of the candidate's work and
- the candidate's active international engagement.

The assessment must contain an analysis of important academic or artistic works, with special emphasis on a presentation of the international importance and reception of these works (for instance number of citations, importance of journals in which works are published, reputation of publishers that published monographs or parts of monographs, contribution to scholarship, public presentations and prizes and awards for artistic works) or their importance for national identity and culture in the habilitation fields, where appearances in the international arena are not possible or not suitable as a criterion of quality.

Especially prominent and detailed evaluation should be assigned to works which in the reviewer's judgement represent the most important academic or artistic achievements of the candidate, specifically:

- at least 2 for appointment to the title of assistant professor,
- 4 for appointment to the title of associate professor and
- 6 for appointment to the title of professor.

Reviewers should substantiate the importance and international response of these works, or their national importance if they involve fields for which international response is not the sole criterion of quality.

Qualitative assessment of educational work (only applicable to pedagogical titles)

If the candidate has already worked in the educational field and demonstrated pedagogical training is required for the title, where the reviewers know the candidate sufficiently well to be able to do this (for instance if they work at the same organisational unit of the faculty as the candidate), they should assess the quality of the candidate's educational work; the assessment should be merely descriptive, since the reviewers do not have access to student assessments. They should highlight any praise or criticism based on possible demonstrated mentorship, study material, textbooks etc.

In the case of a first appointment at UL to a teaching title, where the educational ability of the candidate is demonstrated by a public trial lecture, the reviewers must draw up their reports only after the trial lecture, wherein the assessment of the candidate's pedagogical training shall take into account as appropriate the findings from the special report in accordance with the Rules on Trial Lectures.

Qualitative assessment of professional work

A brief description and assessment of the quality and importance of the candidate's professional work (leading and participating in professional projects, patent applications and patents awarded,

the appearance of papers given in professional circles, papers given at conferences, participation in professional associations and so forth).

Conclusion

The conclusion must contain a clear and unambiguous statement on whether the candidate fulfils the conditions for appointment to the requested title.