



## UNIVERSITY OF PRISHTINA

George Bush St., Rectorate Building, 10 000 Pristina, Republic of Kosovo  
Tel: +381 38 244 183 • E-mail: rektorati@uni-pr.edu • www.uni-pr.edu

---

Nr. Prot.: [1/282](#)

Date: [03/ 06/ 2025](#)

The Senate of the University of Prishtina, based on the powers defined in Article 20, as well as in implementation of Article 147, paragraph 5, and Articles 148, 150, 152 and 153 of the Statute of the University of Prishtina, in accordance with the provisions of the Law on Higher Education No. 04/L-037, in the meeting held on 30.04.2025, approved the following:

### **REGULATION ON SELECTION PROCEDURES RELATED TO THE APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND RE-ELECTION OF ACADEMIC PERSONNEL AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PRISHTINA**

#### **Article 1**

##### **The Purpose**

1. This regulation aims to regulate and determine the procedures and define the criteria for the appointment, promotion and re-election of academic staff, in all faculties, except the Faculty of Arts, respectively for positions belonging to the field of arts.
2. The issues specified in the Statute of the University of Prishtina (UP), especially those that are not detailed with the statute, related to the evaluation procedures for the appointment, promotion and re-election of academic staff, are regulated in the following provisions of this regulation.

#### **Article 2**

##### **Academic Staff**

1. In accordance with Article 147, paragraph 3 of the statute, the academic staff of the university (except the Faculty of Arts) consists of: full professors, associate professors, assistant professors, university assistants, foreign language lecturers, and university researchers. In the same paragraph, the Statute defines as part of the academic staff the category of visiting professors, visiting researchers and scholars, as well as engaged professors and assistants, whose engagement is defined by special regulations.

2. The academic staff has the responsibilities, which are determined by the contract and other supporting acts for the staff duties, as follows:
  - 2.1. Teaching and assessment;
  - 2.2. Scientific research;
  - 2.3. Services to the development of the institution such as functions in commissions, working groups, mentoring, and project management;
  - 2.4. University and academic unit services;
  - 2.5. Community service through the university.
3. The official abbreviations for academic staff are:
  - 3.1. Full professor - Prof.
  - 3.2. Associate Professor - Prof. assoc.
  - 3.3. Assistant professor - Prof. asst.
  - 3.4. University assistant – Asst.
  - 3.5. Researcher.

### **Article 3**

#### **Principles of first appointment, promotion, and reappointment of academic staff**

The process of appointment, promotion, and reappointment of academic staff at UP is based on the respect and affirmation of the principles defined by the UP statute, including but not limited to the following:

1. **The principle of respecting university autonomy:** *the decision-making process regarding the appointment, promotion and reappointment of academic staff respects the autonomy of the university as defined by the provisions of the Law on Higher Education and the statute, in relation to the opinions and assessments given inside and outside the university, which contradict these provisions.*
2. **The principle of respecting academic integrity, ethical standards, and the reputation of the university:** *all decision-making bodies in the university must ensure the success of the objective process of first appointment in any academic call, promotion, and reappointment of academic staff, protecting the credibility and reputation of the university, based on compliance with the Code of Ethics and the provisions of the Statute for this purpose. In each case of the development of procedures for the appointment, reappointment, and promotion of academic staff, the university takes measures to respect the Code of Ethics, as well as to address the responsibility of the members of the evaluation committees who ignore the obligation in relation to the respect of academic integrity, the Code of Ethics, and other normative framework of the UP.*
3. **The principle of transparency and the competitive process:** *the process of appointment, promotion, and reappointment of academic staff must be transparent, based on the announcement of the public competition (for the appointment for the first time in the*

*corresponding call) and the publication of the report of the evaluation committee, which must be accessible without any restrictions. The appointment for the first time according to the public competition, in any academic call, must be based on a competitive process, recognizing the advantages of the highest scientific and professional achievements and taking into consideration the ethical standards applicable in the university.*

4. **The principle of meritocracy:** *the appointment, promotion, and reappointment of staff for each academic call must be based on meritocracy, respecting the formal, academic, professional, and ethical criteria, defined by this Regulation, Statute, and other applicable normative acts. The process of merit judgment should be based on the rationale of the proposal and decision-making for appointment, promotion, and reappointment.*
5. **The principle of respect for academic freedom:** *the evaluation and decision-making process for academic staff is based on the respect of academic freedom, which includes academic freedom in scientific research, in teaching, and in cooperation, of each member of the academic staff, as defined by the Statute and other legislation in force.*
6. **The principle of non-discrimination and gender equality:** *The University creates equal opportunities for everyone, without any discrimination based on gender, race, sexual orientation, marital status, language, religion, political belief, national, ethnic or social affiliation, wealth status, or birth status. Finding that the criteria have not been met or that the ethical and academic integrity standards provided for by the statute, the Code of Ethics, and the legislation in force have not been met is not considered discrimination. UP affirms gender equality in accordance with the Statute and legislation in force, respecting academic standards and criteria.*
7. **The principle of prevention of conflict of interest:** *all university bodies ensure that, in the process of appointing, promoting, and reappointing academic staff, the highest standards are upheld to prevent conflicts of interest and nepotism, and to safeguard integrity in decision-making. Specific limitations are defined by the applicable laws, the statute, and this Regulation.*
8. **The principle of prohibition of incompatibility with the function:** *the process of promotion and reappointment of academic staff is based on the strict observance of avoiding incompatibilities with mandates, regular employment relationships, and other engagements outside the University of Prishtina. Specific limitations are defined by the applicable laws, the Statute, and this Regulation.*

#### **Article 4**

##### **General conditions for appointment, promotion, and reappointment**

1. The conditions for appointment, reappointment, and promotion to any academic title are the relevant qualifications and professional experience required for the position. A decisive component for the evaluation of such qualifications are the candidate's publications indexed

in Web of Science and Scopus platforms<sup>1</sup>, which may also include locally published works indexed in these platforms.

2. For appointment to the respective title, promotion, and reappointment, candidates must meet the criteria set out in the Statute of the University of Prishtina and in this Regulation, including its relevant appendices.
3. Academic staff are appointed by the Rector, based on the decision of the Senate, following the proposal of the respective academic unit council, and, exceptionally, on the proposal of a committee appointed by the Senate as the highest academic body, in cases defined by this Regulation.
4. If the Senate rejects a proposal, it is returned to the council of the academic unit for reconsideration. If, after reconsideration, the council submits the same proposal, the Senate shall take the final decision.
5. No individual may be appointed without a positive evaluation by the evaluation committee or its members, in accordance with the Statute and this Regulation.
6. The qualifications and all publications of the candidate, including articles and monographs, as well as participation in scientific conferences, must be within the field for which the appointment, reappointment, or promotion of the academic staff member is being considered.
7. Within the interpretation of the field, relevant interdisciplinary qualifications, publications, and contributions may also be taken into account, provided they are justified by the evaluation committee.
8. For the appointment of candidates to the respective academic title, all criteria set out in the Statute of the University of Prishtina must be fulfilled. When more than one candidate applies for the announced position, the evaluation committee shall propose the candidate with the highest achievements and the highest score, based on measurable and comparable criteria, justified according to the Statute and this Regulation.
9. During the evaluation process of the candidate, works for which the candidate has submitted official confirmation from the respective journals that they have been accepted for publication may also be taken into consideration. The final decision, however, shall depend on the publication status of the work at the time of evaluation, provided it falls within the timeframe of the evaluation procedures.
10. The first professorial rank is Assistant Professor. Professorial ranks must comply with the timeframes set out in the Statute and cannot be skipped.
11. The process of reappointment and promotion is managed at the level of the academic unit, without the need for a public call. The final decision is made by the Senate.
12. The criteria and procedures for the transfer of academic staff, the implementation of the “brain gain” program, and cases of extraordinary need are regulated by a separate regulation, based on the Statute.

---

<sup>1</sup> For evaluation issues, for all nomination, reappointment and promotion processes, the scientific contribution is considered - publications indexed in Web of Science (SCIE, SSCI, AHCI, ESCI) and Scopus (Q1 - Q4).

## Article 5

### Criteria for appointment in academic call for new positions, for which the public competition is announced

1. The evaluation procedure for first-time appointment to an academic title (Assistant Professor, University Assistant, University Researcher, and Foreign Language Lecturer) is based on the assessment of the necessary criteria and the evaluation of additional contributions, as outlined below for the respective position:
  - 1.1. Assistant Professor<sup>2</sup>**
    - 1.1.1 Necessary criteria
      - (1) Doctoral studies
      - (2) Scientific publications
      - (3) Competence in teaching
    - 1.1.2 Additional contributions for evaluation and justification of the proposal by the evaluation committee. (See Appendix IV)
  - 1.2. University Assistant**
    - 1.2.1 Necessary criteria
      - (1) Masters' studies
      - (2) Grade point average in bachelor's (or integrated) and master's studies
      - (3) Age
      - (4) Doctoral studies (according to Article 154, points 1.3 and 1.5 of the statute)
    - 1.2.2 Additional contributions for evaluation and justification of the proposal by the evaluation committee. (See Appendix V.a)
  - 1.3. University Researcher**
    - 1.3.1 Necessary criteria
      - (1) Doctoral studies
      - (2) Age
      - (3) Scientific publications
    - 1.3.2 Additional contributions for evaluation and justification of the proposal by the evaluation committee. (see appendix VI)
  - 1.4. Foreign Language Lecturer**
    - 1.4.1 Necessary criteria
      - (1) Master's studies in the chosen language
      - (2) Grade point average in bachelor's and master's studies
      - (3) Excellent command of the chosen language
    - 1.4.2 Additional contributions for evaluation and justification of the proposal by the evaluation committee. (See Appendix V.b)
2. Appendices I, II, III, IV, V, VI and VII are integral parts of this Regulation.

---

<sup>2</sup> The quantitative assessment of candidates for appointment to the Assistant Professor call is based on Appendix IV, which is an integral part of this Regulation.

## **Article 6**

### **Appointment to the position of Assistant Professor**

1. In accordance with Article 155 of the Statute of the University of Prishtina, for the title of assistant professor, the candidate must meet the following conditions:
  - 1.1. Must hold a Doctoral degree (PhD);
  - 1.2. Must have a number of publications in peer-reviewed international scientific journals, with at least two (2) articles published and peer-reviewed in international journals as either first or corresponding author, with at least one of them as first author;
  - 1.3. Must demonstrate teaching ability by presenting a portfolio of professional work, including a statement of teaching philosophy. A candidate recommended for the position by the evaluation committee will deliver a public lecture before the council of the academic unit and a group of students, prior to the decision of the academic unit council<sup>3</sup>. In exceptional cases, the academic unit council may also invite other candidates with justified reasoning.
2. Reappointment to the same title may only occur if the candidate has at least one additional publication as first or corresponding author, published after appointment to the current title, and has received a positive evaluation according to the performance assessment system, including student evaluations, based on the applicable system at the University of Prishtina.
3. All appointments to academic titles, as well as the duration of employment, are for four (4) years.

## **Article 7**

### **Appointment to the position of University Assistant**

1. In accordance with Article 154 of the Statute of the University of Prishtina, for the title of university assistant, the candidate must meet the following conditions:
  - 1.1. Must have successfully completed a master's degree in the relevant field; specifically, for the Faculty of Medicine, must have completed medical studies. For the position of assistant in clinical subjects at the Faculty of Medicine, a candidate may be appointed for the first time if they are a specialist or at least in their third year of specialization, provided that there is no specialist in the field to which they are applying;
  - 1.2. Must not be older than thirty-five (35) years<sup>4</sup> when first appointed. Exceptionally, a candidate may be appointed as a university assistant up to the age of forty (40)<sup>5</sup> if they hold a doctoral degree (or, in the case of clinical subjects at the Faculty of Medicine, have completed their specialization);
  - 1.3. For the first reappointment, the candidate must be enrolled in doctoral studies. At the Faculty of Medicine, in the case of reappointment for clinical subjects, the candidate must have completed specialization in the relevant field.

---

<sup>3</sup> This requirement does not apply in cases where the competition procedure falls under the competence of the Senate according to paragraph 18, Article 15 of this Regulation.

<sup>4</sup> "Not older than 35 years" is considered to mean up to the day the candidate reaches 35 years of age.

<sup>5</sup> "Not older than 40 years" is considered to mean up to the day the candidate reaches 40 years of age.

- 1.4. The candidate must have a minimum grade point average of eight (8) in both their bachelor's (or integrated) and master's studies in each respective field of study, irrespective of whether they hold a doctoral degree.
- 1.5. For the second reappointment, the candidate must have completed doctoral studies. This requirement applies to appointments earned after the entry into force of the current Statute.
- 1.6. If, at the time of the first reappointment, the candidate is not enrolled in doctoral studies, has not completed specialization in the relevant field (for the Faculty of Medicine), or, in the case of the second reappointment, has not completed doctoral studies, the position will be announced for a public competition, except for the first reappointment, which is governed by paragraph 6 of Article 212 of the Statute, specifically for appointments obtained before the entry into force of the current statute.
2. All appointments, as well as the duration of employment, are for four (4) years.
3. The process of reappointment to the same position is managed at the level of the academic unit, without the need for a public competition, provided the candidate has received a positive evaluation according to the performance assessment system, including student evaluations. This evaluation is based on the system applicable at the University of Prishtina. The final decision is made by the Senate.
4. University assistants conduct tutorials/practical sessions in bachelor's and master's programs. Exceptionally, a reappointed assistant may be authorized to deliver lectures in bachelor's programs in the absence of a professor for the subject, with authorization from the academic unit council and under the supervision of a faculty member from the department.

### **Article 8**

#### **University researcher**

1. In accordance with Article 159 of the Statute of the University of Prishtina, for the title of university researcher, the candidate must meet the following conditions:
  - 1.1. Must have successfully completed a master's degree in the relevant field; specifically, for the Faculty of Medicine, must have completed medical studies (in the case of clinical subjects, must have completed specialization or be at least in the third year of specialization in the case of reappointment) and must have completed doctoral studies in a relevant scientific discipline;
  - 1.2. Must not be older than 35 years (respectively 40 years at the Faculty of Medicine) at the time of first appointment;
  - 1.3. Must have at least three (3) scientific publications in international journals indexed in Web of Science and/or Scopus, of which at least two (2) as first author.
2. All appointments, as well as the duration of employment, are for three (3) years, with the possibility of extension.
3. University researchers carry out research activities and must publish no less than two (2) international scientific papers within a year according to the standards for appointment,

reappointment, and promotion of academic staff. Scientific publications must be affiliated with the University of Prishtina.

4. Under the guidance of the dean of the academic unit and with the approval of the academic unit council, researchers assist or participate in delivering lectures and tutorials at the undergraduate level.
5. The primary role of a researcher is participation in research groups, implementation of research projects, and direct involvement in the design and management of research projects.

### **Article 9**

#### **Appointment to the position of Foreign Language Lecturer**

For the title of foreign language lecturer, the candidate must meet the following conditions:

1. Must have successfully completed a master's degree in the chosen language;
2. Must possess excellent proficiency in the chosen language;
3. Must have a minimum grade point average of eight (8) in both bachelor's and master's studies in each respective program.

### **Article 10**

#### **Criteria for promotion and reappointment for positions without a public competition**

1. The evaluation procedure for promotion to the academic titles of full professor and associate professor is based on the criteria established in the Statute and this Regulation, according to the respective positions.
2. The evaluation procedure for reappointment to the academic titles of university assistant, lecturer in foreign languages, university researcher, assistant professor, and associate professor is based on the criteria established in the Statute and this Regulation, relying on a reasoned report from the evaluation committee.
3. If the candidate has not published at least one (1) additional article as first or corresponding author after appointment to the current title of assistant professor or associate professor, and does not meet the criteria for reappointment to the same title, they shall return to the previous academic title or, if not previously employed before obtaining the last title at the University of Prishtina, the position shall be announced for a public competition<sup>6</sup>.
4. In the case of reappointment to the titles of assistant professor or associate professor, in the next academic staff promotion process for the subsequent title, the candidate's scientific

---

<sup>6</sup> The return to the previous academic title or the announcement of a public competition, in cases where the candidate was not employed at the University of Prishtina before obtaining the most recent title, does not apply in the case of the first reappointment after the entry into force of the current Statute, based on paragraph 6 of Article 212, which stipulates: "The current academic titles held by academic staff in regular employment relationships are not affected by the provisions of this Statute."

publications and other achievements are evaluated from the moment of first appointment to the last relevant title, not from the moment of reappointment to that position.

5. In the evaluation committee report proposing appointment to the titles of associate professor or full professor, in addition to the mandatory criteria assessed from the most recent appointment, the candidate's previous achievements may also be reflected.

## **Article 11**

### **Appointment to the position of full professor**

1. In accordance with Article 157 of the Statute of the University of Prishtina, for the title of full professor of the academic unit, the candidate must have the following qualifications:
  - 1.1. Must hold a doctoral degree (PhD).
  - 1.2. Must demonstrate a high level of academic competence and scientific experience in the relevant subjects, evidenced by:
    - 1.2.1. Have at least one (1) selected chapter published in a book by a credible international publisher after the most recent appointment, or a book for student use or a monograph, which cannot be the doctoral dissertation or a patent, published after the most recent appointment;
    - 1.2.2. Have at least four (4) articles published in international scientific journals after appointment to the most recent title, as first or corresponding author, with at least two (2) as first author;
    - 1.2.3. Regular or periodic participation in national and international conferences;
    - 1.2.4. Leadership experience or participation as a member in projects that result in officially accessible publications, or leadership/participation as a member of a research group in academic/scientific projects, or as a manager of an externally funded project for the university or faculty;<sup>7</sup>
    - 1.2.5. Demonstrated teaching ability according to the performance management and evaluation system, including student evaluations, based on the system applicable at the University of Prishtina;
    - 1.2.6. Successful mentorship of at least three (3) master's theses or theses of an equivalent study level;
    - 1.2.7. Must be at least in the process of mentoring or co-mentoring a doctoral dissertation. Five years after the entry into force of the statute, that is, after 11 July 2029, this requirement will be replaced by successful mentorship or co-mentorship of at least one doctoral dissertation;

---

<sup>7</sup> A leadership or membership position in projects or research groups includes both domestic and international research projects. Meanwhile, a manager in externally funded projects refers to a managerial role or the position of representative of the University of Prishtina or the faculty (manager, academic coordinator, or equivalent) in a project supported by external funding.

- 1.2.8. Must have demonstrated leadership skills within the university, such as performing managerial functions or leading permanent or temporary committees at the university or faculty level, including evaluation committees for academic works.
2. All appointments to this title, as well as the duration of employment, are for an indefinite period.
3. A faculty member holding the title of full professor must publish at least one (1) additional article as first or corresponding author every four (4) years. Fulfillment of this criterion is assessed through the academic staff performance management and evaluation system, based on the system applied at the University of Prishtina.

### **Article 12**

#### **Appointment to the position of Associate Professor**

1. In accordance with Article 156 of the Statute of the University of Prishtina, for the title of associate professor, the candidate must meet the following conditions:
  - 1.1. Must hold a doctoral degree (PhD).
  - 1.2. Must have at least one selected chapter published in a book by a credible international publisher, or a book for student use, or a monograph, which cannot be the doctoral dissertation;
  - 1.3. Must have at least three (3) articles published in international scientific or artistic journals after appointment to the current title, as first or corresponding author, with at least one (1) as first author;
  - 1.4. Must demonstrate teaching ability according to the academic staff performance management and evaluation system, including student evaluations.
2. Reappointment to the same title may only occur if the candidate has published at least one (1) additional article as first or corresponding author after appointment to the current title, and has received a positive evaluation according to the performance assessment system, including student evaluations, based on the system applied at the University of Prishtina.
3. All appointments to academic titles, as well as the duration of employment, are for four (4) years.

### **Article 13**

#### **Duration of appointment and limitations on appointment**

1. All appointments for titles as well as the duration of employment are made in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Statute and this Regulation.
2. Promotion is not an automatic process, but is transparent and meritorious for all positions.
3. Appointments to the academic titles of professor follow the order: assistant professor, associate professor, full professor. Skipping a title or early appointment is not permitted.
4. The age criterion, as defined in Article 154 of the Statute, applies to candidates applying for the establishment of a regular employment relationship as a university assistant and is

considered up to the application deadline for the competition. If a candidate has previously been engaged at the University of Prishtina as an external collaborator or on an honorarium before reaching the age specified in Article 154, this does not exempt them from the age criterion at the time of establishing a regular employment relationship.

5. According to Article 153, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Statute, candidates cannot be appointed if they have family members employed in the relevant academic unit. For the purpose of preventing conflicts of interest and nepotism, family relationships are defined as: *spouse or cohabiting person, direct blood relatives without limitation<sup>8</sup>, relatives in the collateral line up to the fourth degree<sup>9</sup>, adoptive or adopted persons, as well as in-laws up to the second degree.<sup>10</sup>*
6. The limitation described above, under 5, applies to first-time appointments to the positions of university assistant, lecturer, university researcher, and assistant professor. This limitation does not apply to academic staff in regular employment who held an academic title at the University of Prishtina before the Statute came into force (2024).
7. Applicants must submit a sworn declaration (affidavit) regarding conflicts of interest along with their application documents.
8. The Senate reserves the right to revoke any appointed academic title at any time if it is found that a conflict of interest was not identified during recruitment or competition, or if the candidate provided false declarations at the time of appointment.
9. Academic staff who are in regular employment outside the University of Prishtina, hold a mandate, or have other engagements, and who are affiliated with UP only as external collaborators or with secondary remuneration, cannot participate in the academic promotion process. For promotion to a higher academic title, such academic staff may only advance after a one (1) year period following the completion of the external mandate, regular employment, or other engagement<sup>11</sup>.
10. The duration of an academic appointment<sup>12</sup> cannot be counted during any period in which the academic staff member has suspended their employment relationship with the University of Prishtina.

---

<sup>8</sup> Direct bloodline: unlimited – great-grandfather, grandfather, father, son, grandson/granddaughter, great-grandson/great-granddaughter.

<sup>9</sup> The collateral line of descent up to the fourth degree is defined as follows: first degree – parent–child; second degree – sibling; third degree – uncle/aunt and nephew/niece; fourth degree – children of siblings (i.e., cousins). The same applies to adoption.

<sup>10</sup> Affinity (relatives by marriage) up to the second degree is defined as follows: first degree – daughter-in-law and father-/mother-in-law, son-in-law and father-/mother-in-law; second degree – daughter-in-law and sister-/brother-in-law, son-in-law and wife’s sister/brother; stepmother and stepson (husband’s son), stepfather and stepdaughter (wife’s daughter).

<sup>11</sup> This restriction does not apply to the academic staff of the Faculty of Medicine, according to the specifics of teaching and research activities, as defined in Article 162 of the Statute.

<sup>12</sup> According to the Statute, the duration of the appointment for professor (assistant professor and associate professor) is four years, whereas for the appointment of university assistant, the duration is three years.

11. Foreign citizens and stateless persons in the Republic of Kosovo establish employment relationships in accordance with the Labor Law, under the conditions and criteria defined by the applicable legislation for the employment of foreign citizens and according to the provisions of the Statute.

#### **Article 14**

##### **Public Competition Procedures**

1. The procedure for first-time appointment to the positions of assistant professor, university assistant, lecturer, and university researcher is carried out transparently through the announcement of a public competition for the respective position.
2. The competition for appointment is announced by a Senate decision, following the approval of: (1) the proposal of the academic unit council, or (2) the proposal of the dean of the academic unit, justified by a needs assessment report prepared by the Dean's Office after consultation with the relevant department, institute, or center within the academic unit, in cases where new positions are not approved by the academic unit council despite program needs and the existence of a norm for the respective position, or (3) the rector's well-reasoned proposal.
3. Proposals must be based on real needs, including a sufficient number of hours in accredited programs, corresponding to the necessary workload for the position to be filled (assistant professor, university assistant, university researcher, or lecturer).
4. Proposals for new full-time positions may be considered only if evidence is provided that the workload<sup>13</sup> for that position exists within an academic year. Meeting the necessary teaching hours for announcing new positions, as referred to in this paragraph, cannot be fulfilled using hours from lectures or tutorials already assigned to currently employed teaching staff.
5. The rector, with a well-founded reasoning, may propose to the Senate the announcement of a competition to fill specific academic staff positions even if the position was not included in the proposal of the academic unit council or the dean, according to paragraph 2 of this article.
6. The competition is announced on the university's website. The duration of the competition is 15 calendar days.
7. Applicants must submit the required documents electronically, via the University of Prishtina's electronic platform, which is managed by the Office for Academic Affairs in collaboration with the IT service.
8. Submission of documentation and other specific requirements are determined in the competition announcement.

#### **Article 15**

##### **Evaluation committees for new positions for which a public competition is announced**

---

<sup>13</sup>The proposal for announcing new positions takes into account aspects related to workload, as determined by the regulations on academic staff salaries and compensations, as well as the assessment of needs and budgetary aspects/framework.

1. The faculty is obliged to appoint an evaluation committee for each position announced in a public competition.
2. Within 10 days<sup>14</sup> after the opening of the competition, the Dean of the Faculty convenes a meeting of the Faculty Council, during which the decision is made to appoint the evaluation committees and the appeals committee, each consisting of three members.
3. The academic unit shall appoint a special evaluation committee composed of three (3) members for each position announced through a public competition. The same committee may evaluate more than one position within a related field.
4. Depending on the needs and specific circumstances, and with a justified rationale, the academic unit may also appoint a single committee of five (5) members, which may evaluate more than one announced position in a related field.
5. Members of the evaluation committee may not include academic staff holding managerial positions, such as Rector, Vice-Rector, Dean, or Vice-Dean.
6. The evaluation committee is appointed by the faculty council based on the Dean's proposal, referencing the list of academic staff and in consultation with relevant departments, divisions, or units within the academic entity.
7. Participation of academic staff in evaluation committees is considered part of their work obligations and is mandatory, except in cases of conflict of interest or justified refusal due to health reasons preventing participation, which must be documented with a medical report.
8. Members of the evaluation committee must hold a higher academic rank than, or at least equal to, the position for which the competition is announced.
9. The committee member with the highest academic rank automatically serves as the chairperson of the committee. If multiple members hold the same highest rank, or all members have a rank equal to the position being applied for, the chairperson shall be the oldest member or the member agreed upon by consensus of the other committee members.
10. Each evaluation committee must include at least one member from the specific field relevant to the announced position. If no members from the specific field are available, other members from the study program offering courses related to the announced position may be appointed. For multidisciplinary subjects, at least one member should be from one of the fields covering the relevant subject.
11. In the absence of staff in regular employment, retired academic staff engaged at the University of Prishtina, who hold the necessary academic rank in the relevant or a related field, may serve on the evaluation committee. Retired members cannot serve as chairperson. If no suitable faculty staff are available, the chairperson may be selected from the university's broader academic staff.
12. If a sufficient number of qualified members are not available as described above members from accredited foreign universities may be appointed, provided they are from the relevant field, hold a higher academic rank, or at least equal to the position being announced. In this case, at

---

<sup>14</sup>All terms in this Regulation mean calendar days unless otherwise specified.

least one committee member must be in regular employment at the University of Prishtina and shall automatically serve as the chairperson.

13. In cases of identified conflict of interest or health reasons preventing participation, verified with a medical report, a committee member may submit a written withdrawal within five (5) days of receiving the appointment decision. In such cases, the dean of the faculty, within ten (10) days, convenes a faculty council meeting to propose a new member, namely the other evaluation committee.
14. The chairperson of the evaluation committee is responsible for convening the committee and, in cooperation with other members, drafting the evaluation report.
15. The evaluation committee is obliged to submit the evaluation report for the candidates who have applied for the designated position within 30 days from the acceptance of the appointment decision. Failure to submit the report within this period will result in referral of the responsible committee members to the Ethics Council by the faculty dean.
16. Upon a justified proposal by the dean, the faculty council may approve changes to the composition of the evaluation committee or appoint a new committee if it is determined that the committee did not meet the deadline prescribed in this Regulation.
17. After changing the composition of the evaluation committee, the faculty council grants the committee an additional 15 days, from the appointment date, to draft and submit the report for the candidates presented in the competition.
18. If, even after the formation of the evaluation committee as in the previous paragraphs, it fails to make the relevant evaluation according to this Regulation or if the faculty council fails to implement the procedures for the competition, respectively fail to implement the decisions of the Senate regarding the position announced in the competition, after issuing the relevant finding by the Senate, the responsibility for the process transfers to the Senate as the highest academic authority after a corresponding determination by the Senate.
19. The evaluation committee, if deemed necessary, may interview all candidates being appointed for the first time to the positions of University Assistant, University Researcher, Lecturer, or Assistant Professor.
20. Members of the evaluation committees for the positions of Assistant, Lecturer, or University Researcher must hold at least the rank of Assistant Professor.

## **Article 16**

### **Justification of the evaluation committee's report for the positions announced by public competition**

1. The Evaluation Committee prepares the report based on the standard form provided by the University of Prishtina, which includes the proposal for the appointment of candidates for the positions announced through the public competition.

2. The assessments in the committee's report are carried out in accordance with the criteria and requirements established in the Statute and detailed in this Regulation.
3. The report of the Evaluation Committee must include the recommendation with reasoning based on the activities and fields evaluated according to the regulation, specifically the quantitative evaluation criteria for the respective positions, as set out in the appendices of this Regulation.
4. The summarized justification of the recommendation in the committee's report must include, at a minimum: *the determination that the proposed candidate meets all formal requirements according to the Statute, the Regulation, and the quantitative evaluation criteria specified in the appendices, with reasoning provided for each component separately, as well as the determination that the proposed candidate has the highest evaluation or score in comparison with other candidates, based on, but not limited to, the candidate's scientific achievements, publication record, relevant field of study or specialization, and academic and/or professional experience.*
5. The Evaluation Committee is obliged to give priority to candidates who meet the necessary criteria and who, based on the overall assessment in the standard form of their scientific, professional, and academic activities, are superior to other candidates.
6. The Evaluation Committee is required to prepare a report also for candidates who meet the minimum requirements but are not proposed for appointment. For candidates who do not meet the minimum requirements, it is sufficient to indicate which conditions were not fulfilled.
7. If the members of the Evaluation Committee have differing opinions regarding the appointment proposal, the members are required to submit a "separate proposal" to the relevant faculty council. In such cases, the faculty council discusses the proposals and forwards to the University of Prishtina Office for Academic Affairs the proposal approved by the council, including information about the differing opinions. In the case of a committee consisting of five (5) members, there must be a separate opinion of at least two (2) members, so that the faculty council can vote and propose to the senate for approval. If there is only one (1) member who has submitted a "separate proposal", the faculty council reviews the same and this information is sent to the Senate.
8. Members of the Evaluation Committee bear legal, disciplinary, and ethical responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of the data recorded in the evaluation report, and for the recommendations they make. They shall be sanctioned in accordance with the Code of Ethics and other applicable legal provisions if their actions clearly contradict the Statute of the University of Prishtina and this Regulation.

#### **Article 17**

#### **The procedure following the submission of the Evaluation Committee's report for positions announced through the public competition**

1. The faculty council, after submitting the report from the Evaluation Committee, is required to review the report at its next meeting, no later than 10 days after submission.
2. Once the relevant Faculty Council has verified that the evaluation reports are prepared in accordance with this Regulation and signed by the members of the evaluation committee, the reports must be sent in electronic format to the University's Office for Academic Affairs within 7 days.
3. The Office for Academic Affairs, if it determines that any of the reports submitted by the Faculty Council are incomplete or not in accordance with the relevant forms under this Regulation, will notify the respective faculty through the Vice-Rector of the relevant sector to complete the documentation before publication in the bulletin.
4. The University's Office for Academic Affairs is obliged, within 10 days of receiving the evaluation reports from the Faculty Councils, to prepare the bulletins and publish them on the university's website.
5. The bulletins must remain published on the university website for a period of 15 calendar days from the date of publication.
6. During the phase in which the evaluation committee reports are published in the bulletins, dissatisfied candidates have the right to submit an appeal to the appeals committee of the respective academic unit.
7. The appeals committee is appointed by the academic unit council upon the recommendation of the dean and consists of three members from the academic staff of the unit. This committee must be formed within the period during which the bulletins are published on the university website. Members of the appeals committee cannot include the rector, vice-rector, dean, vice-dean, or members of the evaluation committee.
8. The academic unit's appeals committee, no later than 7 days after the end of the appeal period, examines the complainants' claims regarding the evaluation committee's report and submits a report with findings, recommending to the Faculty Council the approval, amendment, or completion of the evaluation committee's report.
9. The Faculty Council is obliged, after the bulletin publication period ends, to review the evaluation committee reports within 15 days and decide whether to approve them and the report of the appeals committee. Within 7 days, the faculty must notify the complaining party in writing.
10. The Faculty Council is also obliged, after reviewing and approving or rejecting the evaluation committee reports, to submit the relevant decision and other details regarding the review of appeals to the University Office for Academic Affairs within 10 days.
11. The Office for Academic Affairs, if it identifies any irregularity (technical or procedural) regarding the approval or rejection of the evaluation committee reports by the respective faculties, must inform the Vice-Rector of the relevant sector, who will request the faculty to complete the missing elements.

12. In cases where the responsibilities are transferred to the Senate for conducting the competition, based on the principle of hierarchy (according to Article 15, paragraph 18 of this Regulation), the procedure is as follows:
- 12.1. The evaluation committee, in the composition provided by this Regulation, is proposed by the Rector and approved by the Senate.
  - 12.2. The evaluation committee bases its work on this Regulation, the provisions of the Statute, and other applicable normative acts.
  - 12.3. The evaluation committee is obliged to submit its evaluation report to the Office for Academic Affairs within 15 days after its appointment by the Senate.
  - 12.4. The Office for Academic Affairs, if it finds that any report submitted by the respective committee is incomplete or not in accordance with the relevant forms under this Regulation, shall notify the respective committee, through the Vice-Rector of the relevant sector, to complete the documentation before publication in the bulletin.
  - 12.5. The Office for Academic Affairs is obliged, within 10 days of receiving the report from the evaluation committee, to prepare the bulletin and publish it on the university website. The bulletin must remain published on the website for 15 calendar days from the date of publication.
  - 12.6. During the phase in which the evaluation committee's report is published in the bulletin, candidates have the right to submit an appeal to a special appeals committee, which is appointed by the Senate upon the Rector's proposal and consists of 3 members from among the full-time professors at the University of Prishtina.
  - 12.7. According to Article 149 of the Statute, the Rector, in exceptional cases, may establish an ad hoc appeals committee, which will have the authority to evaluate all appeal claims submitted by unsuccessful candidates. The appeals committee shall consist of at least three (3) members, who must be full international professors from universities ranked among the top four hundred (400) in the world according to the "Times Higher Education World University Rankings" or the "QS World University Rankings."
    - 12.7.1. The appeals committee shall review the procedural and substantive regularity of the candidate selection process and report its findings to the Rector and the Senate for each appeal.
    - 12.7.2. If the appeal committee reports that it has found serious violations in the selection procedure and if it strongly recommends a different outcome than that of the initial evaluation committee, the Rector and the Senate shall decide on modifying the decision of the initial committee. In such cases, the Rector shall first seek the opinion of the relevant academic unit council and shall notify the original selection committee about the findings.

- 12.8. Any candidate appeals must be submitted to the Rectorate administration and shall be addressed within 10 days by the special appeals committee of the Senate, established for such cases.
- 12.9. The report of the Evaluation Committee and the report of the Senate's special Appeals Committee shall be submitted to the Senate by the Rector within 30 days of receiving the report from the special Senate Appeals Committee.
- 12.10. The University of Prishtina Senate shall review the Rector's proposal, as well as the proposals of other relevant instances, at its next scheduled meeting and make a decision.
- 12.11. An appeal against the Senate's decision may be submitted to the Senate Committee for Appeals and Petitions, which serves as the final appeals instance at the University of Prishtina, no later than 15 calendar days after the decision has been received.

### **Article 18**

#### **Examination of the proposal of the faculty council in the Senate**

1. Based on Article 26, paragraph 4, of the UP Statute, the rector forms an advisory committee regarding the regularity of the procedure and proposals from the faculties for the candidates presented in the competition.
2. Within a period of up to 30 calendar days after the acceptance of the proposals of the faculty council, the Office for Academic Affairs prepares for the Senate the reports with the relevant proposals, including the rector's proposal related to the proposals of the faculty council.
3. The decision of the Senate regarding the proposals of the faculty councils is taken no later than 20 days after the preparation of the statements by the Office for Academic Affairs.
4. If the Senate decides to reject the proposal of the faculty council, the relevant subject, within a period of no more than 7 calendar days, is returned to the faculty council for reconsideration.
5. The faculty council is obliged to, within 10 calendar days after the acceptance of the Senate's decision, re-examine the subjects for re-evaluation and submit the corresponding decision within 7 calendar days to the Office for Academic Affairs of the university.
6. If the faculty council, even after reconsideration, brings the same proposal, the rector's proposal is forwarded to the Senate, while the Senate, in a period not longer than 20 calendar days from the acceptance of the rector's proposal, takes a final decision.
7. The Senate reserves the right to withdraw recognition of publication in questionable journals or questionable publishers at any time, but before the final evaluation of the candidate.

### **Article 19**

#### **The process of promotion and reappointment at the level of the academic unit**

1. The process of promotion in the call of associate professor and full professor, as well as of reappointment in the call of university assistant, lecturer, researcher, assistant professor, associate professor, is managed at the level of the academic unit, without the need for a public competition, while the final decision is taken by the Senate.
2. The initiation of the procedure for reappointment and promotion is done by decision of the council of the academic unit. The academic unit is obliged to initiate the process of promotion or reappointment for all academic staff whose regular work contract expires according to the academic call within the relevant calendar year, but not more than once during the semester. The initiation time of the procedure is decided by the relevant academic unit.
3. After the decision of the council of the academic unit to initiate the procedure for reappointment and promotion, the academic unit notifies the academic staff of the respective unit to apply within the time limit, determined by the academic unit.
4. The academic staff whose contract has expired and who are in the process of promotion or reappointment, by decision of the rector, may have their work contract extended until the end of the procedure.
5. Except from paragraph 2 of this article, in accordance with the provisions of the statute, at the request of the academic staff, the initiation of the procedure for promotion can be postponed for up to a period of 4 years from the date of entry into force of the statute<sup>15</sup>, respectively no later than July 10, 2028. Within this period, the procedure for promotion or reappointment must be initiated according to paragraph 1 of this article.
6. The process of reappointment and promotion according to this Article must be based on the principle of legality, meritocracy and transparency. The academic unit is obliged to appoint an evaluation committee for reappointment and promotion, which prepares an objectively argued report in writing and the same is published in the university bulletin.
7. The evaluation committee, composed of 3 members, depending on the specifics of the academic units and positions/subjects for reappointment or promotion, is proposed by the dean in consultation with the chairs, branches or departments of the relevant academic unit and approved by the faculty council.
8. Members of the evaluation committee cannot be academic staff holding management positions: rector, vice-rector, dean and vice-dean.
9. The participation of academic staff in evaluation committees is a work obligation and as such is mandatory for implementation, except in cases where a conflict of interest is identified or the refusal is justified due to a health condition, which prevents participation in the committee, which is proven by a doctor's report.

---

<sup>15</sup> The Statute of the University of Prishtina was approved on July 11, 2024 with Decision No. 08-V-770 of the Assembly of the Republic of Kosovo and Article 214 stipulates that the Statute enters into force on the day of approval in the Assembly. Paragraph 7 of Article 212 of the Statute states: "With the entry into force of this Statute, the duration of contracts and the validity of academic calls are extended as long as a period of four (4) years will be reached from the date of entry into force of this Statute, or another period. This period cannot be shorter than the period for which the last appointment was made."

10. The members of the evaluation committees are persons with high professional, academic and ethical credibility.
11. The members of the evaluation committee must have an academic rank higher than, or at least equal to, the position for which the promotion or reappointment process has been initiated.
12. The member of the evaluation committee with the highest academic rank is automatically the chairperson of the committee. In cases where more than 1 member of the committee has a higher rank, or where all members of the committee have the same rank as the position for which the candidate has applied, the chairperson will be the oldest member, or the member appointed by consensus of the other members of the committee.
13. The evaluation committee must have at least 1 member from the relevant field. In the absence of members from the narrow field, other members of the study program, within which the courses are offered, for which the promotion or reappointment process has been initiated, can be appointed as members of the evaluation committee. For subjects of a multidisciplinary nature, one of the members of the committee must be from one field that covers the relevant subject. In special cases, members of the evaluation committee can be proposed by other UP units.
14. In the absence of members in a regular working relationship, members of the evaluation committee can also be members of the retired and engaged staff at the University of Prishtina, who have the necessary academic qualifications from the relevant field. Retired staff members cannot be chairpersons of the evaluation committee. In the absence of staff from the ranks of the faculty, the chairperson of the evaluation committee may be from the ranks of the academic staff of the university.
15. In the absence of a sufficient number of members as in the preliminary paragraphs of this Article, members from other universities, abroad, may be appointed as members of the evaluation committee, provided that they are from the relevant field and have a higher academic rank or at least the same academic calling, for which the promotion or reappointment was initiated. In this case, at least 1 member of the committee must be in regular employment at the University of Prishtina and the same is automatically the chairperson of the committee.
16. In the case of identifying a conflict of interest or due to a health condition that prevents participation in the committee, which is proven by a doctor's report, the committee member, within 5 days from the acceptance of the decision for appointment to the evaluation committee, may submit in writing his withdrawal from the committee. In this case, the dean of the faculty, within 10 days, calls the meeting of the faculty council and proposes the member, namely the other evaluation committee.
17. The chairperson of the evaluation committee is obliged to call the meeting of the committee and in cooperation with the other members drafts the evaluation report.
18. The evaluation committee is obliged to submit the evaluation report within 30 days from the acceptance of the appointment decision. If the report is not submitted within this period, the relevant members of the evaluation committee are sent to the Ethics Council by the dean of the academic unit.

19. With a reasoned proposal of the dean, the faculty council approves the change in the composition of the evaluation committee, namely the appointment of a new committee, if it is determined that the committee has not respected the deadline set by this Regulation.
20. After changing the composition of the evaluation committee, the faculty council gives the committee an additional 15 days, from the date of acceptance of the appointment decision, to draft and submit the report for the candidates.
21. The evaluation committee's report is drawn up based on the unique form, prepared by the UP, and must be objectively justified and argued according to the criteria defined by this Regulation, statute, other normative acts that are applicable and in compliance with the spirit of the principles and standards for higher education and the relevant scientific field. The evaluation committee's proposal for promotion to the position of associate professor or full professor must contain: *a determination that the candidate proposed for promotion meets all the formal conditions according to the statute, regulation and other normative acts, justifying each criterion defined for the respective call. In the justification of the recommendation, it must be clearly argued that the candidate has scientific achievements in the relevant field, academic and/or professional experience and service activity for the faculty or university, and in particular the candidate's publications and contribution to the field, for which promotion is proposed, must be justified.*
22. After the submission of the report by the evaluation committee, the faculty council, within 15 days, examines it and, after ascertaining that it was written in accordance with this Regulation, forwards it within 3 days to the Office for Academic Affairs of the university for publication in the electronic version.
23. The Office for Academic Affairs of the university is obliged to draft the bulletins and publish them on the university's website within 7 days after receiving the evaluation reports from the faculty councils.
24. Bulletins must remain published on the university website for a period of 10 days from the day of publication.
25. The appeals committee is appointed by the council of the academic unit on the proposal of the dean of the academic unit and consists of 3 members from the ranks of professors in regular employment. The appeals committee is appointed within the period during which the bulletins remain published on the university's website. Members of the appeals committee cannot be: the rector, the vice-rector, the dean, the vice-dean and the members of the evaluation committee.
26. The appeals committee of the academic unit, no later than 7 days after the end of the appeal period, examines the claims of the complainants against the report of the evaluation committee and submits a report with the findings, recommending to the faculty council the approval, rejection, change of the proposal of the evaluation committee or completion of the evaluation report.
27. The faculty council is obliged to review the reports of the evaluation committees and the appeals committee after the deadline for the publication of the bulletins, within 15 days, and

decide on their approval or not. Within 7 days, the approved reports are sent to the Office for Academic Affairs of the university.

28. The Office for Academic Affairs, within 7 days, prepares the relevant reports and, together with the case files, sends them to the rector's office for review.
29. The rector's office, within a period of no more than 30 calendar days, prepares the proposal of the rector and within the period of 20 days, at the next meeting, the Senate takes a decision on the academic unit's proposal for promotion or reappointment of candidates.
30. Faculties cannot initiate the procedure for promotion or reappointment, for positions related to regular staff, who have six (6) or less months left until retirement. This category of staff, by decision of the rector, has their contract extended for the remaining period until retirement.

## **Article 20**

### **The decision, the appeal period and the duration of the competition**

1. The voting procedure in the Senate for the proposals of the faculty council related to the appointment for the first time according to the public competition, as well as the promotion or reappointment of members of the academic staff, including the cases when the procedure of implementing the competition has passed to the competence of the Senate, is carried out according to the work regulations of the senate.
2. The member of the academic staff, who has a positive evaluation from the previous instances, but who does not win the necessary votes of the members of the Senate for promotion, remains in the same call.
3. Regarding the senate's decision, no later than 15 days after the delivery of the decision, an appeal can be made to the Senate Committee for Appeals and Submissions, which serves as the last instance of appeal in the UP.
4. The Senate Committee on Appeals and Submissions examines the appellants' claims against the senate's decision, and based on its findings, the committee may reject the appeal or, based on a rationale, recommend to the Senate that the appellant's claims be reconsidered.
5. The competition for the appointment of academic staff must be concluded with relevant decisions of the UP Senate for all announced positions, within the deadlines set by this Regulation.
6. In cases where, for objective reasons, the meeting of the collegial body cannot be organized, the deadline for completing the competition procedure does not run.
7. For special cases, before reaching the proposal in the Senate, at the request of the rector, the deadline of the entire procedure can be extended for another 30 days.
8. If the competition is not completed in whole or in part within the deadlines defined in this Regulation, then the respective vacant positions may be re-announced in the next competition.

## **Article 21**

### **Ethical and disciplinary responsibility of evaluation committees**

1. The evaluation committee is obliged to respect the provisions of the Statute, this Regulation, the conditions of the competition and other legal and sublegal acts in force during its work.
2. The members of the evaluation committee are responsible for the report of the evaluation committee to meet the conditions defined in this Regulation and to fulfill their duties according to the procedures defined in this Regulation.
3. For the data recorded in the report and for the recommendations they make, the members of the committee bear legal, disciplinary and ethical responsibility according to the Code of Ethics and other legal provisions in force, if they conflict with the UP Statute and this Regulation.
4. Failure to fulfill these responsibilities represents a disciplinary and ethical violation, which is handled according to the provisions of the Code of Ethics and the relevant regulation for handling disciplinary and ethical violations of academic staff, which are in force at the time of the opening of the competition.

### **Article 22**

#### **Final provisions**

1. With the entry into force of this Regulation, Regulation no. 886, dt. 27.4.2022, for the selection procedures related to the appointment, reappointment and promotion of academic staff at the University of Prishtina "Hasan Prishtina", is repealed.
2. This Regulation enters into force on the day of its approval.

Prof. Arben Hajrullahu,

---

Rector and chairperson of the UP Senate

**APPENDIX I**

**FORM FOR RECORDING AND EVALUATING EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND SERVICE ACTIVITY AND CONTRIBUTION**

**Table I.1** Teaching activities, focusing on the field to which the subjects announced in the competition belong, or for which reappointment/promotion is considered

<b>Learning activities</b>							
<b>Trainings on teaching methodologies</b>							
No.	The name of the training	The provider institution	Certificate type	Training dates	Training title		
<b>Teaching experience</b>							
No.	The institution	Subject	Period	Semester/Year/Level	Approximate number of students	Number of hours per semester	Form of teaching (e.g., lecture, team learning, tutoring, supervision of practical work, online, laboratory work)
<b>Quality in teaching</b>							
		Student evaluation of teaching	Evaluation according to management and performance evaluation				

**Tables I. 2** Activities of mentoring

**Table I.2a** Leadership of master's subjects or subjects of a comparable level of studies

<b>Leadership of master's subjects or subjects of a comparable level of studies</b>						
No.	Name of the candidate	Study program	Department/ Academic Unit	End date	Type of degree obtained	The institution

**Table I.2b** Experience in mentoring or co-mentoring candidates in doctoral studies

Experience in mentoring or co-mentoring candidates in doctoral studies					
No.	Name of the candidate	PhD status (in progress / completed)	Institution of studies	Completion Date / Planned Completion Date	Role (mentor / co-mentor)

**Table I.3** Publications in international and local magazines<sup>16</sup>

Papers in indexed journals: Web of Science – (SCIE, SSCI, AHCI, ESCI), Scopus (Q1-Q4)									
No.	TITLE	author s	Role of the candidate (first author, corresponding author, co-author)	Publication type	Magazine, volumes, screens	ISSN	INDEXATION	Line (DOI)	Link to indexing platform

<sup>16</sup> Based on the Statute of the UP and other legal acts in force, such as works published in scientific journals, during the evaluation of candidates presented in the competition for appointment for the first time, as well as in the procedure for promotion and reappointment, works in the field, published in international and local journals, by credible publishers for scientific publications and which are indexed in the academic bases Web of Science (SCIE, SSCI, AHCI, ESCI) and Scopus are valid (Q1-Q4). Works published in journals indexed in Web of Science and Scopus are not taken into account if, in the evaluation stages until the final decision is made, it is found that the respective journals are included in lists of suspicious journals or publishers or are considered suspicious by the senate in accordance with Article 18, paragraph 7, of this Regulation, or the work in the meantime has been removed from the journal or the journal has been removed from Scopus for any of the following reasons: Publication Concerns, Radar, Metrics, Continuous Curation. (Evaluation committees should take into account the latest Scopus database). In case indexing of the journal is interrupted (*inactive*), but not for the aforementioned reasons, in Scopus or Web of Science and the same is not included in the lists of questionable publishers and journals, the publication is counted only if it appears in the profile of the relevant databases. The provisions of Appendix VII on definitions, terms and clarifications regarding the criteria for appointment, promotion and reappointment of academic staff apply to the acceptance of papers



**Table I.7** Proven participation in basic and applied research programs or projects and international projects

<b>Proven participation in basic and applied research programs or projects and international projects</b>					
<b>No.</b>	<b>Program/scientific project</b>	<b>Time period</b>	<b>Institution/ Country</b>	<b>Role in the program, project/ Contribution</b>	<b>Link to official release or information (if available)</b>

**Table I.8** Other scientific and professional contributions and outstanding achievements

<b>Outstanding Contributions/Achievements</b>				
<b>No.</b>	<b>Contribution/achievement</b>	<b>Date/Period</b>	<b>Institution and country</b>	<b>Brief description of the achievement</b>

**Table I.9** Exercising managerial functions and/or leading committees at the university or faculty level, including evaluation committees for academic works

<b>The candidate's experience in exercising managerial functions and or leading committees at the university or faculty level, including evaluation committees for academic papers</b>						
<b>No.</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Position/ Function exercised,</b>	<b>Time Period</b>	<b>Institution Faculty/Department /University</b>	<b>Brief description of the role</b>	<b>Other relevant data by category</b>

*Forms will be provided for completion in Excel format.*

**APPENDIX II**

**FORMAL CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE TITLE FULL PROFESSOR (PROF.)**

Minimum criteria for appointment to the title of Full Professor			
<b>Academic unit:</b>			
<b>Name of the candidate:</b>			
<b>Date of obtaining the current title (Prof. Assoc.):</b>			
<b>Decision number:</b>			
<b>Subjects for which the position is considered:</b>			
Criterion	The details		Complete d/ not complete d
<b>1</b>	<b>To have the degree of doctor of science</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES  <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Institution and place of obtaining the degree:		
	Date of receiving the degree:		
	Decision and date of nostrification (if applicable):		
	The degree was obtained in the relevant field:	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
<b>2</b>	<b>Have at least one selected chapter published in a text published by a credible international publishing house after the last call or a book for student use or monograph, which cannot be a doctoral or patent thesis, after the last call; (If the candidate has more than one text, the last one that meets the criteria is listed. The complete list is shown in Table I.4 of Appendix I.)</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES  <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Text title:		
	Authors:		
	Publishing house, place of publication and year:		
	<b>Publication type:</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Book chapter</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Published by a credible international publishing house	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>A textbook intended for student use</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed by at least two (2)	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Monography</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Published by a credible international publishing house	

	peer reviewers holding at minimum the title of Dr. Sc.  ISBN: _____ -	<input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed by at least two (2) peer reviewers holding at minimum the title of Dr. Sc.  ISBN: _____	
--	---	--	--

3 **Have at least four (4) papers published in international scientific or artistic journals, published after the appointment in the current title, as first author or corresponding author, of which at least two (2) as first author. (The complete list is evidenced in table I.3 of Appendix I.)**

Paper 1	<b>Paper data (Title, Authors, Journal, Year, Link)</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
	<b>AUTHORSHIP</b>	<b>INDEXATION</b>		<b>Scopus</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> Main author <input type="checkbox"/> Co-author <input type="checkbox"/> The paper is in the relevant field	<input type="checkbox"/> Web of Science <input type="checkbox"/> SCIE <input type="checkbox"/> SSCI <input type="checkbox"/> AHCI <input type="checkbox"/> ESCI		<input type="checkbox"/> Q1 <input type="checkbox"/> Q2 <input type="checkbox"/> Q3 <input type="checkbox"/> Q4

Paper 2	<b>Paper data (Title, Authors, Journal, Year, Link)</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
	<b>AUTHORSHIP</b>	<b>INDEXATION</b>		<b>Scopus</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> Main author <input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<input type="checkbox"/> Web of Science <input type="checkbox"/> SCIE <input type="checkbox"/> SSCI		<input type="checkbox"/> Q1 <input type="checkbox"/> Q2 <input type="checkbox"/> Q3 <input type="checkbox"/> Q4

	<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is in the relevant field	<input type="checkbox"/> AHCI <input type="checkbox"/> ESCI	
Paper 3	<b>Paper data (Title, Authors, Journal, Year, Link)</b>		
	<b>AUTHORSHIP</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Main author <input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<b>INDEXATION</b> <b>Web of Science</b> <input type="checkbox"/> SCIE <input type="checkbox"/> SSCI <input type="checkbox"/> AHCI <input type="checkbox"/> ESCI <b>Scopus</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Q1 <input type="checkbox"/> Q2 <input type="checkbox"/> Q3 <input type="checkbox"/> Q4	
	<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field		
Paper 4	<b>Paper data (Title, Authors, Journal, Year, Link)</b>		
	<b>AUTHORSHIP</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Main author <input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<b>INDEXATION</b> <b>Web of Science</b> <input type="checkbox"/> SCIE <input type="checkbox"/> SSCI <input type="checkbox"/> AHCI <input type="checkbox"/> ESCI <b>Scopus</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Q1 <input type="checkbox"/> Q2 <input type="checkbox"/> Q3 <input type="checkbox"/> Q4	

		<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field	
4	<b>Regular or periodic participation in national and international conferences (The complete list is evidenced in table I.5 of Appendix I.):</b>		
	Number of international conferences, as first author or presenter: _____		<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Number of national conferences, as first author or presenter: _____		<input type="checkbox"/> NO
5	<b>Experience leading or being a member of projects resulting in accessible and official publication of results or leading or participating as a member of a research group of academic/scientific projects or manager of a project with external funding for the university or faculty. (The complete list is evidenced in table I.7 of Appendix I.):</b>		
	The number of research projects, as a leader, member or the number of projects with external funding, as a manager: _____		<input type="checkbox"/> YES
			<input type="checkbox"/> NO
6	<b>Demonstrate teaching skills according to the system of evaluation and performance management of academic staff, including evaluation by students. (Recorded in Table I.1 of Appendix I.):</b>		
	Teaching experience: _____ years		<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	<input type="checkbox"/> The performance evaluation is positive		<input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<input type="checkbox"/> The student evaluation is positive		
7	<b>Successful mentoring of at least three (3) Master's subjects or subjects of a comparable level of studies; (The complete list can be found in Table I.2 of Appendix I)</b>		
		Candidate Name, Institution, Date of Completion	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Her 1:	_____	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Her 2:	_____	
	Her 3:	_____	
8	<b>Be at least in the process of mentoring or co-mentoring a doctorate; five years after the entry into force of this statute, this requirement is replaced by successful mentoring or co-mentoring of at least one doctorate; (The complete list is shown in table I.2b of Appendix I)</b>		
			<input type="checkbox"/> YES
			<input type="checkbox"/> NO

		Name of the candidate, Institution of studies, Doctoral status, Date of completion/anticipated completion (PhD)	
Her 1:		Role: <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Mentor</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Co-mentor</b>	
9	<b>Demonstrated university leadership skills, such as exercising managerial functions or leading permanent or temporary committees at the university or faculty level, including evaluation committees for academic papers. (The complete list can be found in Table I.8 of Appendix I)</b>		
	The candidate has exercised the following functions:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rector <input type="checkbox"/> Vice-Rector <input type="checkbox"/> Dean <input type="checkbox"/> Vice-Dean <input type="checkbox"/> Governing Council <input type="checkbox"/> Senator <input type="checkbox"/> Head of Department <input type="checkbox"/> Director of Institute/Center <input type="checkbox"/> Chair of Permanent Committee <input type="checkbox"/> Chair of Ad Hoc Committee <input type="checkbox"/> Chair of the Evaluation Committee for Academic Works	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO

	<b>The candidate meets the minimum criteria:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<b>Evaluation committee:</b>	1. 2. 3.

**Note:**

The detailed justification of the evaluation committee's report is presented in the unique form from UP.

### APPENDIX III

#### FORMAL CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE TITLE ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR (PROF. ASSOC.)

##### a) Minimum criteria for appointment to the title Associate Professor (Prof. assoc)

Minimum criteria for appointment to the title of Associate Professor			
<b>Academic unit:</b>			
<b>Name of the candidate:</b>			
<b>Date of obtaining the current title (Prof. asst.):</b>			
<b>Decision number:</b>			
<b>Subjects for which the position is considered:</b>			
	Criterion	The details	Completed/not completed
1	<b>To have the degree of Doctor of Science</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Institution and place of obtaining the degree:		
	Date of receiving the degree:		
	Decision and date of nostrification (if applicable):		
	The degree was obtained in the relevant field:	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
2	<b>Have at least one selected chapter published in a text published by a credible international publishing house or a book for student use or a monograph that cannot be a doctoral thesis (If the candidate has more than one text, the last one that meets the criteria is listed. The complete list is evidenced in Table I.4 of Appendix I.)</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Text title:		
	Authors:		

Publishing house, place of publication and year:				
<b>Publication type:</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Book chapter</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Published by a credible international publishing house	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>A textbook intended for student use</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed by at least two (2) peer reviewers holding at minimum the title of Dr. Sc.  ISBN: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Monography</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Published by a credible international publishing house <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed by at least two (2) peer reviewers holding at minimum the title of Dr. Sc.  ISBN: _____		
3	<b>Have at least three (3) papers published in international scientific or artistic journals published after the appointment in the current title, as first author or corresponding author, of which at least one (1) as first author. (The complete list is evidenced in Table I.3 of Appendix I.)</b>			
Paper 1	Paper data (Title, Authors, Journal, Year, Link)			<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<b>AUTHORSHIP</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Main author <input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<b>INDEXATIO</b> <b>N</b> <b>Web of Science</b> <input type="checkbox"/> SCIE <input type="checkbox"/> SSCI <input type="checkbox"/> AHCI <input type="checkbox"/> ESCI	<b>Scopus</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Q1 <input type="checkbox"/> Q2 <input type="checkbox"/> Q3 <input type="checkbox"/> Q4	
<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field				
Paper 2	Paper data (Title, Authors, Journal, Year, Link)			
	<b>AUTHORSHIP</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Main author <input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<b>INDEXATIO</b> <b>N</b> <b>Web of Science</b>	<b>Scopus</b>	

	<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field	<input type="checkbox"/> SCIE <input type="checkbox"/> Q1 <input type="checkbox"/> SSCI <input type="checkbox"/> Q2 <input type="checkbox"/> AHCI <input type="checkbox"/> Q3 <input type="checkbox"/> ESCI <input type="checkbox"/> Q4	
Paper 3	Paper data (Title, Authors, Journal, Year, Link)		
	<b>AUTHORSHIP</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Main author <input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<b>INDEXATIO</b> <b>N</b> <b>Web of Science</b> <input type="checkbox"/> SCIE <input type="checkbox"/> SSCI <input type="checkbox"/> AHCI <input type="checkbox"/> ESCI	<b>Scopus</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Q1 <input type="checkbox"/> Q2 <input type="checkbox"/> Q3 <input type="checkbox"/> Q4
	<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field		
4	<b>Demonstrate teaching skills according to the system of evaluation and performance management of academic staff, including evaluation by students. (Recorded in Table I.1 of Appendix I.)</b>		
	Teaching experience: _____ years  <input type="checkbox"/> The performance evaluation is positive <input type="checkbox"/> The student evaluation is positive		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<b>The candidate meets the minimum criteria:</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<b>Evaluation committee:</b>	1. 2. 3.	
If the candidate does not meet all the criteria mentioned above, the form for the minimum criteria for reappointment in the current title is completed.			

**Note:**

The detailed justification of the evaluation committee's report is presented in the unique form from UP.

**b) Criteria for reappointment to the title Associate Professor (Prof. assoc)**

Minimum criteria for reappointment to the title of Associate Professor																					
<b>Academic unit:</b>																					
<b>Name of the candidate:</b>																					
<b>Date of obtaining the current title (Prof. assoc.):</b>																					
<b>Decision number:</b>																					
<b>Subjects for which the position is considered:</b>																					
Criterion	The details		Completed/n ot completed																		
1	<b>Have at least one additional paper as first author or corresponding author published after appointment to the current title. (The complete list is evidenced in Table I.3 of Appendix I.)</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO																		
	Paper 1	Paper data (Title, Authors, Journal, Year, Link)  <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">AUTHORSHIP</th> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: left;">INDEXATION</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: left;">Web of Science</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Scopus</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Main author</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> SCIE</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q1</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Co-author</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> SSCI</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> AHCI</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q3</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> ESCI</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		AUTHORSHIP	INDEXATION			Web of Science	Scopus	<input type="checkbox"/> Main author	<input type="checkbox"/> SCIE	<input type="checkbox"/> Q1	<input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<input type="checkbox"/> SSCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q2	<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field	<input type="checkbox"/> AHCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q3		<input type="checkbox"/> ESCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q4
	AUTHORSHIP	INDEXATION																			
	Web of Science	Scopus																			
<input type="checkbox"/> Main author	<input type="checkbox"/> SCIE	<input type="checkbox"/> Q1																			
<input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<input type="checkbox"/> SSCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q2																			
<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field	<input type="checkbox"/> AHCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q3																			
	<input type="checkbox"/> ESCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q4																			
2	<b>To have a positive evaluation according to the performance evaluation system, including the evaluation of students, based on the system applicable in UP. (Recorded in Table I.1 of Appendix I.)</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO																		
	<input type="checkbox"/> The performance evaluation is positive <input type="checkbox"/> The student evaluation is positive																				
<b>The candidate meets the minimum criteria:</b>			<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO																		
<b>Evaluation committee:</b>		1. 2. 3.																			

**Note:**

The detailed justification of the evaluation committee's report is presented in the unique form from UP.

**APPENDIX IV**

**CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE TITLE ASSISTANT PROFESSOR (PROF. ASST.)**

**a) Minimum criteria for appointment to the title of Assistant Professor**

Minimum criteria for appointment to the title of Assistant Professor				
<b>Academic unit:</b>				
<b>Name of the candidate:</b>				
<b>Subjects for which the position is considered:</b>				
	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>The details</b>	<b>Completed/ not completed</b>	
1	<b>To have the degree of Doctor of Science</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES	
	Institution and place of obtaining the degree:			
	Date of receiving the degree:			
	decision <sup>17</sup> and date of nostrification (if applicable):			
	Degree in relevant field:	<input type="checkbox"/> YES		
2	<b>Have a number of publications reviewed in international scientific or artistic journals with at least two (2) papers published and reviewed in international journals, as first author or corresponding author, where at least one must be first author. (If the candidate has more than two papers, the papers that are evaluated with the most points are listed. The complete list is shown in Table I.3 of Appendix I.)</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
	Paper 1	Paper data (Title, Authors, Journal, Year, Link)		
		<b>AUTHORSHIP</b>		<b>INDEXATION</b> <b>Web of Science      Scopus</b>

<sup>17</sup> Or proof of application for nostrification

	<input type="checkbox"/> Main author <input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<input type="checkbox"/> SCIE <input type="checkbox"/> SSCI <input type="checkbox"/> AHCI <input type="checkbox"/> ESCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q1 <input type="checkbox"/> Q2 <input type="checkbox"/> Q3 <input type="checkbox"/> Q4	
	<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field			
	Paper data (Title, Authors, Journal, Year, Link)			
	<b>AUTHORSHIP</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Main author <input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<b>INDEXATION</b> <b>Web of Science</b> <input type="checkbox"/> SCIE <input type="checkbox"/> SSCI <input type="checkbox"/> AHCI <input type="checkbox"/> ESCI	<b>Scopus</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Q1 <input type="checkbox"/> Q2 <input type="checkbox"/> Q3 <input type="checkbox"/> Q4	
	<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field			
3	<b>Demonstrate teaching ability by presenting a portfolio of professional work that includes a statement of teaching philosophy.</b>			<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Portfolio contains:	<input type="checkbox"/> Teaching Philosophy Statement		
	The candidate for appointment for the first time in the call Prof. Asst. has signed the declaration under oath to avoid the conflict of interest according to Article 153 of the Statute of the University of Prishtina:			<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If the candidate meets all the criteria mentioned above, i.e. all the answers are YES, it continues with further evaluation. Otherwise, no further evaluation of the candidate is made.			

Criteria/component		MARKS		
A	<b>Quantitative assessment of the candidate's two main works as a necessary criterion.</b> <i>In this category, two main papers that attract the most points from the component of the candidate's scientific publications are evaluated. The maximum assessment for these two papers can reach up to 40 points, where one paper can be assessed with a maximum of 20 points.</i>	<b>First author</b>	<b>Corresponding author</b>	
	Web of science (Clarivate): SCIE, SSCI, AHCI Scopus: Q1	20	15	
	Scopus: Q2	17	12	
	Web of Science (Clarivate): ESCI Scopus: Q3	14	9	
	Scopus: Q4	11	6	
	<b>Maximum points for category A:</b>		<b>40 points</b>	
B	<b>Teaching ability</b> <i>The minimum score for this category is 5 points and the maximum is 10 points.</i>	<b>MARKS</b>		
	Portfolio of professional work and statement of teaching philosophy, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Determination of learning outcomes (learning outcomes)</i></li> <li>○ <i>Methods for enabling active student-centered learning</i></li> <li>○ <i>Pedagogical methods</i></li> <li>○ <i>Evaluation methods</i></li> <li>○ <i>The role of the lecturer</i></li> <li>○ <i>Use of technology</i></li> </ul>	1-5 points		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Teaching training from QPM or international institutions</li> <li>- Evidence of teaching experience</li> <li>- Proof of study visits to international universities.</li> <li>- Proof of giving lectures at international universities/ academic mobility.</li> </ul>	1-5 points		
	<b>Maximum points for category B:</b>		<b>10 points</b>	
	<b>Additional works of the candidate</b> (beyond 2 publications as necessary criteria from Category A) <b>and co-authorship.</b> <i>Additional papers can be evaluated with a maximum of 12 points and a paper in this category can be evaluated with a maximum of 10 points.</i>		<b>MARKS</b>	
C	<b>Candidate's additional works</b> (beyond 2 publications as necessary criteria from Category A)	Up to 12 points		
		<b>First author</b>	<b>Corresponding author</b>	
	Web of Science (Clarivate): SCIE, SSCI, AHCI Scopus: Q1	10	8	
	Scopus: Q2	8	6	

	Web of Science (Clarivate): ESCI Scopus: Q3	6	4
	Scopus: Q4	4	2
C 2	<b>Co-authorship in scientific publications</b>	Up to 3 points	
	Web of science (Clarivate): SCIE, SSCI, AHCI Scopus: Q1	2	
	Scopus: Q2	2	
	Web of Science (Clarivate): ESCI Scopus: Q3	1	
	Scopus: Q4	1	
	<b>Maximum points for category C:</b>	<b>15 points</b>	
<b>D</b>	<b>Additional Candidate Contributions</b> ( <i>scientific, professional, for the university, faculty, society, etc.</i> ) <i>In this category, the candidate can be evaluated with a maximum of 20 points.</i>	<b>MARKS</b>	
D 1	<b>Participation in conferences</b> ( <i>Scientific oral presentations at conferences, congresses, symposiums, scientific workshops</i> )	Up to 5 points	
	<i>Paper invited and presented in the plenary session at the international scientific conference/congress</i>	4	
	<i>Paper presented in session at conference/congress/symposium, international scientific workshop</i>	2	
	<i>Paper invited and presented in the plenary session at the local scientific conference/congress</i>	2	
	<i>Paper presented in the session at the local scientific conference/congress/symposium/workshop</i>	1	
D 2	<b>Participation in research programs and projects (basic and applicable)</b>	Up to 5 points	
	<i>Scientific project leader</i>	3	
	<i>Member of the scientific project</i>	1	
	<i>International project coordinator</i>	2	
	<i>Professional project, individual or group</i>	1	
D 3	<b>Service activities, namely positions in committees/commissions (by decision of the faculty or university)</b>	Up to 10 points	
	<i>For the University of Prishtina</i>	4	
	<i>The faculty to which you apply</i>	4	

	<i>Community, voluntary contribution without financial compensation</i>	2
	<b>Maximum points for category D:</b>	<b>20 points</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>Evaluation of other contributions to the scientific field, qualifications, relevant experience, achievements and other credentials of the candidate related to the relevant field of the position where he applies.</b>	<b>MARKS</b>
<b>E</b>	<p><i>Evaluation of valuable contributions and achievements that are not included in the above categories, which are related to scientific and professional achievements relevant to the relevant position, including:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. scientific impact and contribution in the relevant field (citations according to Scopus, H-Index according to Scopus)</i></li> <li><i>2. study levels and qualifications acquired in prestigious world universities – the four hundred (400) best universities in the world according to the ranking made by "Times Higher Education World University Rankings" or "QS World University Rankings", according to the assessment based on the year of graduation for each level,</i></li> <li><i>3. professional experience relevant to the position being applied for, contributions in the field that increase the quality/qualifications of the candidate,</i></li> <li><i>4. contribution to industry, outstanding professional achievements, awards, patents.</i></li> <li><i>5. particularity and other credentials of the candidate, related to the relevant field of the position for which he applies.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>The maximum score for each of the above components can be up to 5 points.</i></p>	Up to 15 points

	<i>The evaluation of the candidate is done from a comparative perspective in relation to other candidates.</i>	
	<b>Maximum points for category E:</b>	<b>15 points</b>
	<b>Maximum points for categories A, B, C, D and E:</b>	<b>100 points</b>

**b) Quantitative evaluation of the activities of the candidates, who are appointed for the first time in the call prof. asst.<sup>18</sup>**

- Quantitative assessment of the candidate's two main works that attract the most points from the candidate's scientific publications component - maximum up to a total of 40 points; candidates can collect a maximum of 40 points for these two papers, while the maximum of one paper is 20 points, according to the categorization in the table below.

- Beyond the assessment from the preliminary papers (two compulsory main papers according to the minimum conditions according to the statute), the additional papers can attract a total of up to a maximum of 15 points, according to the following table. A paper in this category can be evaluated with a maximum of 10 points

---

<sup>18</sup> Candidates who have completed their doctoral studies at UP and who meet the criteria of the UP Statute, under equal conditions, have priority over candidates who have completed their doctoral studies in other higher education institutions of Kosovo and Kosovo's neighboring countries. This priority does not apply to candidates who are already in a regular employment relationship at UP.

## Score Summary Table

call	Category	The minimum number of points which must be achieved in the respective category	The maximum number of points that can be achieved in the respective category
<b>Assistant Professor (Prof.asst.)</b>	<b>A. Two main papers published in international journals</b> (WoS and Scopus)	17	40
	<b>B. Teaching ability</b>	5	10
	<b>C. Additional works</b> ( <i>authorship beyond 2 publications as necessary criteria from Category A, and co-authorship in scientific publications</i> ).		15
	<b>D. Additional Contributions</b> ( <i>Participation in conferences, Participation in programs and projects, Service activity</i> )		20
	<b>E. Other Contributions, Achievements, and Credentials</b> ( <i>related to the relevant field of the position where you apply</i> )		15
		<b>My. Total = 22</b>	<b>Max. Total = 100</b>

### **Note:**

The detailed justification of the evaluation committee's report is presented in the unique form from UP.

c) Criteria for reappointment to the title of Assistant Professor

Minimum criteria for reappointment to the title of Assistant Professor										
Academic unit:										
Name of the candidate:										
Date of obtaining the current title (Prof. Ass.):										
Decision number:										
Subjects for which the position is considered:										
	Criterion	The details	Completed/n ot completed							
1	<b>Have at least one additional paper as first author or corresponding author published after appointment to the current title. (The complete list is evidenced in Table I.3 of Appendix I.)</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO							
		Paper data (Title, Authors, Journal, Year, Link)								
	Paper 1	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>AUTHORSHIP</th> <th colspan="2">INDEXATION</th> </tr> <tr> <td> <input type="checkbox"/> Main author  <input type="checkbox"/> Co-author                             </td> <th>Web of Science</th> <th>Scopus</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> <input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field                             </td> <td> <input type="checkbox"/> SCIE  <input type="checkbox"/> SSCI  <input type="checkbox"/> AHCI  <input type="checkbox"/> ESCI                             </td> <td> <input type="checkbox"/> Q1  <input type="checkbox"/> Q2  <input type="checkbox"/> Q3  <input type="checkbox"/> Q4                             </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		AUTHORSHIP	INDEXATION		<input type="checkbox"/> Main author <input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	Web of Science	Scopus	<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field
AUTHORSHIP	INDEXATION									
<input type="checkbox"/> Main author <input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	Web of Science	Scopus								
<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field	<input type="checkbox"/> SCIE <input type="checkbox"/> SSCI <input type="checkbox"/> AHCI <input type="checkbox"/> ESCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q1 <input type="checkbox"/> Q2 <input type="checkbox"/> Q3 <input type="checkbox"/> Q4								
2	<b>To have a positive evaluation according to the performance evaluation system, including the evaluation of students, based on the system applicable in UP. (Recorded in Table I.1 of Appendix I.)</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES							

	<input type="checkbox"/> The performance evaluation is positive <input type="checkbox"/> The student evaluation is positive	<input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<b>The candidate meets the minimum criteria:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<b>Evaluation committee:</b>	1.  2.  3.

## APPENDIX V

### CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE TITLE OF ASSISTANT AND LECTURER

#### a) Minimum criteria for appointment to the Assistant call

Minimum criteria for appointment to the Assistant call			
<b>Academic unit:</b>			
<b>Name of the candidate:</b>			
<b>Subjects for which the position is considered:</b>			
	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>The details</b>	<b>Completed/n ot completed</b>
1	<b>To have successfully completed master's studies in the relevant field, respectively for the Faculty of Medicine to have completed the Faculty of Medicine. In the Faculty of Medicine, for the position of assistant for clinical subjects, a candidate who is a specialist or is at least in the third year of specialization can be selected for the first time if there is no specialist in the field in which he applies;</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Institution and place of completion of Master's studies: <b>For the Faculty of Medicine:</b> Institution and place of completion of studies in Medicine:		
	Date of receiving the diploma:		
	decision <sup>19</sup> and date of nostrification (if applicable):		
	Master's studies have been completed in the relevant direction: <b>For the Faculty of Medicine:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	

<sup>19</sup> Or proof of application for nostrification

	The candidate is a specialist in the relevant field, or is at least in the third year of specialization if there is no specialist in the field in which he is applying:	
2	<p><b>Be no older than thirty-five (35) years when first appointed. Exceptionally, the candidate can be selected as a university assistant until the age of forty (40) if he has the degree of doctor of science (or, in the case of clinical subjects in the Faculty of Medicine, has completed specialization);</b></p> <p>Age of candidate: _____</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Has a PhD <input type="checkbox"/> Has completed the specialization (for the Faculty of Medicine)	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
3	<p><b>Have an average grade in bachelor's (or integrated) and master's studies of not less than eight (8), in each of these fields of study, regardless of whether he has the degree of doctor of science.</b></p> <p>Average grade in Bachelor studies: _____  Average grade in Master's studies: _____</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
4	The candidate for appointment for the first time in the Assistant call has signed the declaration under oath to avoid conflict of interest according to Article 153 of the Statute of the University of Prishtina:	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<b>The candidate meets the minimum criteria:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<b>Evaluation committee:</b>	1. 2. 3.
<p>If the candidate meets all the criteria mentioned above, i.e. all the answers are YES, it continues with further evaluation. Otherwise, it is not continued with further evaluation of the candidate.</p>		

b) **Minimum criteria for appointment to the Lecturer call**

<b>Minimum criteria for appointment to the Lecturer call</b>			
<b>Academic unit:</b>			
<b>Name of the candidate:</b>			
<b>Subjects for which the position is considered:</b>			
	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>The details</b>	<b>Completed/not completed</b>
1	<b>To have successfully completed master's studies in the chosen language:</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Institution and place of completion of Master's studies:		
	Date of receiving the diploma:		
	decision <sup>20</sup> and date of nostrification (if applicable):		
	Master's studies have been completed in the chosen language:	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
2	<b>Have excellent language skills of your choice:</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
3	<b>Have the average grade of bachelor and master studies no less than eight (8), in each of these studies.</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO

---

<sup>20</sup> Or proof of application for nostrification

	Average grade in Bachelor studies: _____ Average grade in Master's studies: _____	
4	The candidate for appointment for the first time in the Lecturer call has signed the declaration under oath to avoid conflict of interest according to Article 153 of the Statute of the University of Prishtina:	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<b>The candidate meets the minimum criteria:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<b>Evaluation committee:</b>	1. 2. 3.
If the candidate meets all the criteria mentioned above, i.e. all the answers are YES, it continues with further evaluation. Otherwise, it is not continued with further evaluation of the candidate.		

**Note:**

*The detailed justification of the evaluation committee's report is presented in the unique form from UP.*

c). Quantitative evaluation of candidates who are appointed for the first time in the call of assistant and lecturer, except for the Faculty of Medicine in clinical subjects

	<b>The criteria</b>	<b>MARKS</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Bachelor and Master studies<sup>21</sup></b>	<b>Up to 20 points</b>
	Evaluation of the field of study and bachelor's and master's program in relation to the subjects in which the position is announced. The evaluation of the candidate is done from a comparative perspective in relation to other candidates.	<b>Up to 20 points</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Average grade<sup>22</sup></b>	<b>Up to 30 points</b>
	Average grade of bachelor's and master's studies	Grade point average x 3 <b>Up to 30 points</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Age</b>	It is not graded
<b>D</b>	<b>Doctoral studies</b>	In the case of reappointment, they are a necessary criterion, while in the case of appointment for the first time, it is considered an additional achievement.
<b>AN</b> <b>D</b>	<b>Other contributions and additional achievements of the candidate:</b>	<b>Up to 35 points</b>
E1	Degree of one of the levels of studies completed in one of the four hundred (400) best universities in the world as ranked by "Times Higher Education World University Rankings" or "QS World University Rankings", according to the evaluation based on the year of graduation for each level.	Up to 10 points
	<i>Bachelor studies</i>	<i>5 points</i>
	<i>Master studies</i>	<i>5 points</i>
E2	Doctoral studies	Up to 5 points
	<i>Registered</i>	<i>2.5 points</i>
	<i>Completed</i>	<i>5 points</i>
E3	Scientific publications (in the last 5 years), according to the table for assistant professor, for additional publications (Appendix IV, b, Table, criterion C)	Up to 5 points

E4	Presentations at conferences and symposia (in the last 5 years)	Up to 5 points
E5	Participation in projects	Up to 5 points
E6	Relevant teaching ability	Up to 5 points
E7	Community service activities	Up to 5 points
<b>F</b>	<b>The special and other credentials of the candidate, related to the relevant field and relevant to the position for which he is applying.</b>	<b>Up to 15 points</b>
	<p><i>Evaluation of valuable contributions and achievements that are not included in the above categories, which are related to scientific and professional achievements relevant to the relevant position, including:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. Extra-curricular contributions during studies</i></li> <li><i>2. Outstanding professional achievements, awards</i></li> <li><i>3. Professional or practical experience relevant to the position applied for</i></li> <li><i>4. The special and other credentials of the candidate, related to the relevant field and relevant to the position for which he is applying.</i></li> </ol> <p><i>The maximum score for each of the above components separately can be up to 5 points.</i></p> <p><i>The evaluation of the candidate is done from a comparative perspective in relation to other candidates.</i></p> <p><i>The evaluation of the candidate is done from a comparative perspective in relation to other candidates.</i></p>	<b>Up to 15 points</b>

---

<sup>21</sup> Candidates who have completed their bachelor's and master's studies at UP (for certain fields with the Statute integrated 5, 6-year studies) and who meet the criteria of the UP's Statute, under equal conditions, have priority over candidates who have completed their studies at other Higher Education Institutions of Kosovo and neighboring countries of Kosovo.

<sup>22</sup> The average grade is calculated as the arithmetic mean of the grade in the bachelor and master studies, provided that both grades are above 8.

**d) Quantitative assessment of candidates who are appointed for the first time in the assistant call at the Faculty of Medicine in clinical subjects**

The scoring in categories A, B, F remains the same. The evaluation in the E2 category is done for doctoral studies and specialization, respectively in E2a and E2b, according to the following table:

<b>E2a</b>	<b>Doctoral studies</b>	<b>MARKS</b>
	<i>Registered</i>	1.25
	<i>Completed</i>	2.5

<b>E2b</b>	<b>specialism</b>	<b>MARKS</b>
	<i>Registered, at least in the third year of specialization</i>	1.25
	<i>complete</i>	2.5

**Table: Summary of maximum points, which can be divided into relevant categories**

<b>call</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>The maximum number of points that can be achieved in the respective category</b>
<b>Assistant (and Lecturer)</b>	A – Bachelor and Master studies	Up to 20 points
	B – Average grade	Up to 30 points
	E – Other contributions and additional achievements of the candidate	Up to 35 points
	F- Special and other credentials of the candidate, related to the relevant field and relevant to the position for which he is applying	Up to 15 points
		<b>Max. Total = 100</b>

*Note: The detailed justification of the evaluation committee's report is presented in the unique form from UP.*

e) Minimum criteria for reappointment in the Assistant call

Minimum criteria for reappointment to the title of Assistant				
<b>Academic unit:</b>				
<b>Name of the candidate:</b>				
<b>Date of receipt of current title (Asst.):</b>				
<b>Decision number:</b>				
<b>Reappointment time:</b>				
<b>Subjects for which the position is considered:</b>				
Criterion	The details		Completed/not completed	
1	<b>The candidate for the first reappointment must be enrolled in doctoral studies, as well as having completed the specialization in the relevant field for clinical subjects (for the Faculty of Medicine). In the case of the second reappointment, the candidate must have completed his doctoral studies.</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>The candidate has enrolled in doctoral studies.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>The candidate has successfully completed doctoral studies.</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>The candidate has successfully completed specialization in the relevant field.</b>	Institution:		
		Program:		
		Registration date:		
	End date:			
2	<b>To have a positive evaluation according to the performance evaluation system, including the evaluation of students, based on the system applicable in UP.</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
	<input type="checkbox"/> The performance evaluation is positive <input type="checkbox"/> The student evaluation is positive			
	<b>The candidate meets the minimum criteria:</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	
	<b>Evaluation committee:</b>	1. 2. 3.		

**APPENDIX VI**

**Criteria for appointment to the title of University Researcher**

**a) Minimum criteria for appointment to the university research title**

Minimum criteria for appointment to the University Research call			
Academic unit:			
Name of the candidate:			
	Criterion	The details	Completed/not completed
1	<b>To have successfully completed master's studies in the relevant field, namely for the Faculty of Medicine, to have completed the Faculty of Medicine (in the case of clinical subjects, to have completed specialization or to be at least in the third year of specialization in the case of reappointment) and to have completed doctoral studies in a relevant scientific branch;</b>		
	Institution and place of completion of studies <b>Master:</b> <b>For the Faculty of Medicine:</b> Institution and place of completion of studies in Medicine:		
	Date of receiving the diploma:		
	decision <sup>23</sup> and date of nostrification (if applicable):		
	Master's studies have been completed in the relevant direction: <b>For the Faculty of Medicine:</b> The candidate is a specialist in the relevant field, or is at least in the third year of specialization if there is no specialist in the field in which he is applying:	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Institution and place of completion of studies <b>DOCTORAL:</b>		
	Date of receiving the diploma:		
	decision <sup>24</sup> and date of nostrification (if applicable):		
Doctoral studies have been completed in a relevant scientific branch;	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO		
2	<b>Be no older than 35 years (respectively 40 years in the Faculty of Medicine) when appointed for the first time;</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO

<sup>23</sup> Or proof of application for nostrification

<sup>24</sup> Or proof of application for nostrification

	Age of candidate: _____																				
3	<b>Have at least three (3) scientific papers published in international journals of the Web of Science category and/or Scopus, of which at least two (2) are first author.</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO																		
		Paper data (Title, Authors, Journal, Year, Link)																			
	Paper 1	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>AUTHORSHIP</b></th> <th colspan="2"><b>INDEXATION</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th><b>Web of Science</b></th> <th><b>Scopus</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Main author</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> SCIE</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q1</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Co-author</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> SSCI</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> AHCI</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q3</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> ESCI</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<b>AUTHORSHIP</b>	<b>INDEXATION</b>			<b>Web of Science</b>	<b>Scopus</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Main author	<input type="checkbox"/> SCIE	<input type="checkbox"/> Q1	<input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<input type="checkbox"/> SSCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q2	<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field	<input type="checkbox"/> AHCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q3		<input type="checkbox"/> ESCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q4
	<b>AUTHORSHIP</b>	<b>INDEXATION</b>																			
	<b>Web of Science</b>	<b>Scopus</b>																			
<input type="checkbox"/> Main author	<input type="checkbox"/> SCIE	<input type="checkbox"/> Q1																			
<input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<input type="checkbox"/> SSCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q2																			
<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field	<input type="checkbox"/> AHCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q3																			
	<input type="checkbox"/> ESCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q4																			
Paper 2	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>AUTHORSHIP</b></th> <th colspan="2"><b>INDEXATION</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th><b>Web of Science</b></th> <th><b>Scopus</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Main author</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> SCIE</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q1</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Co-author</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> SSCI</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> AHCI</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q3</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> ESCI</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>AUTHORSHIP</b>	<b>INDEXATION</b>			<b>Web of Science</b>	<b>Scopus</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Main author	<input type="checkbox"/> SCIE	<input type="checkbox"/> Q1	<input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<input type="checkbox"/> SSCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q2	<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field	<input type="checkbox"/> AHCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q3		<input type="checkbox"/> ESCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q4		
<b>AUTHORSHIP</b>	<b>INDEXATION</b>																				
	<b>Web of Science</b>	<b>Scopus</b>																			
<input type="checkbox"/> Main author	<input type="checkbox"/> SCIE	<input type="checkbox"/> Q1																			
<input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<input type="checkbox"/> SSCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q2																			
<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field	<input type="checkbox"/> AHCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q3																			
	<input type="checkbox"/> ESCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q4																			
	Paper data (Title, Authors, Journal, Year, Link)																				
Paper 3	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><b>AUTHORSHIP</b></th> <th colspan="2"><b>INDEXATION</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th><b>Web of Science</b></th> <th><b>Scopus</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Main author</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> SCIE</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q1</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Co-author</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> SSCI</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> AHCI</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q3</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> ESCI</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Q4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>AUTHORSHIP</b>	<b>INDEXATION</b>			<b>Web of Science</b>	<b>Scopus</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Main author	<input type="checkbox"/> SCIE	<input type="checkbox"/> Q1	<input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<input type="checkbox"/> SSCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q2	<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field	<input type="checkbox"/> AHCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q3		<input type="checkbox"/> ESCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q4		
<b>AUTHORSHIP</b>	<b>INDEXATION</b>																				
	<b>Web of Science</b>	<b>Scopus</b>																			
<input type="checkbox"/> Main author	<input type="checkbox"/> SCIE	<input type="checkbox"/> Q1																			
<input type="checkbox"/> Co-author	<input type="checkbox"/> SSCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q2																			
<input type="checkbox"/> The paper is from the relevant field	<input type="checkbox"/> AHCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q3																			
	<input type="checkbox"/> ESCI	<input type="checkbox"/> Q4																			
The candidate for appointment for the first time in the Research call has signed the declaration under oath to avoid conflict of interest according to Article 153 of the Statute of the University of Prishtina:		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO																			
<b>The candidate meets the minimum criteria:</b>		<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO																			
<b>Evaluation committee:</b>	1. 2. 3.																				
If the candidate meets all the criteria mentioned above, i.e. all the answers are YES, it continues with further evaluation. Otherwise, it is not continued with further evaluation of the candidate.																					

- b) **Quantitative assessment of the activities of candidates, who are appointed for the first time in the call of the university researcher.**

<b>Category</b>		<b>MARKS</b>	
<b>A</b>	<b>Works published in international journals (WoS and Scopus)</b>	<b>Up to 80 points</b>	
		<b>First author</b>	<b>Corresponding author</b>
	<i>Web of science (Clarivate): SCIE, SSCI, AHCI Scopus: Q1</i>	20	15
	<i>Scopus: Q2</i>	17	12
	<i>Web of Science (Clarivate): ESCI Scopus: Q3</i>	14	9
	<i>Scopus: Q4</i>	11	6
<b>Maximum points for category A:</b>		<b>80 points</b>	

<b>Other contributions (scientific, professional, for the university, faculty, society)</b>		<b>Maximum up to 20 points</b>	
<b>B</b>	<b>Monographs and textbooks</b>	<b>First author</b>	<b>coauthor</b>
<b>B 1</b>	Special international scientific monograph, in the field of the candidate, with ISBN and cataloged	10	5
	Special scientific monograph, in the field of the candidate, published in Kosovo, with ISBN and cataloged	5	2.5
	International book captain	3	1.5
	University book	5	2.5
	International textbook	5	2.5
	Textbook in Albanian language	3	1.5
	Translated teaching text	2	1
<b>B 2</b>	<b>Other published works</b>	<b>First author</b>	<b>Corresponding author / Co-author</b>
	Papers published in credible international or	2	1

	local journals that are not included in table A		
	Works published in Summary of works from international and local conferences and congresses	2	1
	Papers published in the Summary of Abstracts from international and local conferences and congresses	1	0.5
<b>B 3</b>	<b>Scientific oral presentations at conferences, congresses, symposiums, scientific workshops</b>		
	Paper invited and presented in the plenary session at the international scientific conference/congress		4
	Paper presented in session at conference/congress/symposium, international scientific workshop		2
	Paper invited and presented in the plenary session at the local scientific conference/congress		2
	Paper presented in session at local scientific conference/congress/symposium/workshop		1
<b>B 4</b>	<b>Participation in basic and applied research programs and projects</b>		
	Scientific project leader		3
	Member of the scientific project		1
	International project coordinator		2
	Professional project, individual or group		1
<b>B 5</b>	<b>Service activity</b>		
	For the University of Prishtina		1

	For the Faculty to which you apply	1
	For the community, voluntary contribution without financial compensation	1

c) **Summary table - The minimum number of points that must be achieved in the respective category, respectively the maximum number of points that can be allocated to the respective category**

<b>call</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>The minimum number of points which must be achieved in the respective category</b>	<b>The maximum number of points that can be achieved in the respective category</b>
<b>University researcher</b>	A - Works published in international journals (WoS and Scopus)	25	80
	B - Other contributions (scientific, professional, for the university, faculty, society)	-	20
		<b>My. Total = 25</b>	<b>Max. Total = 100</b>

*Note: The detailed justification of the evaluation committee's report is presented in the unique form from UP.*

## APPENDIX VII

### DEFINITIONS, TERMS AND CLARIFICATIONS REGARDING THE CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND REAPPOINTMENT OF ACADEMIC STAFF

**Book chapter** – is one of the main thematic divisions within an edited book, of relative length (it is not standardized), generally with a homogeneous content. Any written work, regardless of topic, can be divided into chapters. For the purposes of evaluation processes, the chapter must be published by a credible international publishing house.

**Monograph** – is an in-depth scholarly work on a single topic, from a specialized and narrow perspective. The monograph, in the sense of this definition, is characterized by rigorous methodology, detailed analysis, systematic argumentation and reliance on reliable sources. The monograph must be published as a separate publication, with an ISBN and be reviewed by at least two reviewers, with the title dr. sc./PhD in the same or related field. For the purposes of evaluation processes, the monograph cannot be a doctoral thesis and must be published by a credible international or national publishing house.

**Book for student use** - considered a book in Albanian or a foreign language, for the needs of students in the relevant field. The book is published in authorship or co-authorship, in printed or electronic form, and must be reviewed by at least 2 reviewers, qualified as experts in the field with a university academic title of at least assistant professor and have an ISBN and published by a credible international or national publishing house.

**Scientific publication (article).** - is a scientific paper that presents original research results and is subject to the "peer review" process by the relevant scientific journals in which they are published. It is characterized by a clear structure that usually includes the introduction, methodology, results and conclusions, and relies on reliable data. Writings such as reviews of books and works, comments published in scientific journals, abstracts and proceedings of conferences, are excluded from this definition and cannot be used in fulfilling the minimum criteria defined by statute, for the process of appointment, promotion and reappointment of academic staff . Reports or case reports and short communications (*short communication*) that have methodology, original authorial results and a clear structure, which are published after the entry into force of this Regulation, are recognized in the promotion processes, equating three (3) *short communication* with one (1) paper (original research), two (2) *case report* with one (1) paper (original research), but in the total number of published papers required for the respective position, only one (1) paper can be used as an evaluation.

**Thesis mentoring** – (MA/MSc and PhD/Dr.Sc) is the guiding process that the mentor/mentors provide throughout the development of their students' research and thesis writing. This process includes academic support, methodology development, data analysis, organization of scientific

arguments, and personal motivation. This process aims at the final writing and successful defense of the thesis.

**Authorship in scientific publications** – refers to the significant contribution of an individual to the design, realization and interpretation of the findings of scientific research. Authorship also reflects responsibility for the originality and content of the work. In the evaluation processes, the contribution as first author and/or corresponding author, as well as co-authorship according to Appendix IV, for the position of Assistant Professor is recognized.

**Corresponding author** - is considered the author who is identified as such in the paper, at the time of publication, and when more than one corresponding author is specified in the published paper, the first author identified as such is considered the corresponding author. If there are only two authors in the published paper and the corresponding author is not specified, the second author is considered as the corresponding author.

**Credible publisher for scientific publications** - those publishers who have a scientific reputation are considered to be indexed in international databases such as journals listed in Web of Science (Science Citation Index Expanded - SCIE, Social Sciences Citation Index - SSCI, Emerging Source Citation Index - ESCI) and Scopus (Q1 - Q4 query) and who respect ethical standards, clearly document the process of review, submission, acceptance and publication of the work, and are not on lists of suspicious or predatory publishers and journals.

In accordance with the above paragraph, all publications in journals that do not charge a fee for publication of articles and all publications in journals with a hybrid publication path are accepted.

For the purposes of appointment, promotion or reappointment, scientific articles sent for publication and published after the entry into force of this Regulation, in journals indexed in the platforms according to the Statute and this Regulation, which are not included in the previous paragraph, will be accepted only if they are published: (a) in journals indexed in Web of Science that have an Impact Factor (IF) >0.1 according to the Journal Citation Report (JCR) by Clarivate, or (b) in journals indexed in Scopus (Q1-Q4), which are published by public or even non-public universities if the latter are among the four hundred (400) best universities in the world as ranked by "Times Higher Education" or "QS World University Rankings".<sup>25</sup>

**Credible international publishing house** - for the publication of chapters, books, monographs, those entities that enjoy a high academic and scientific reputation are considered, whose publications go through a rigorous process of review by experts in the field ("peer review"), that are indexed in well-known international databases (such as Web of Science, see; <https://wokinfo.com/mbl/publishers/> or Scopus, see:

---

<sup>25</sup> Academic units may form a special committee to provide guidance and support to academic staff according to their needs regarding the selection of credible journals for publication, strictly respecting the standards and criteria of this Regulation.

<https://www.elsevier.com/products/scopus/content#4-titles-on-scopus>), and are not on lists of suspicious or predatory publishing houses. Exceptionally, publications from publishing houses of universities that are among the four hundred (400) best universities in the world as ranked by "Times Higher Education" or "QS World University Rankings" are accepted.

For promotion purposes, book chapters that have been confirmed to have been accepted for publication by these publishing houses are also accepted.

**Credible national publishing house** - for the publication of books, monographs are considered publishers or institutions that respect academic, scientific and professional standards, that are proven for their academic, scientific and professional contribution, whose publications go through a process of professional editing and review by reviewers qualified as experts in the field with the academic title of at least assistant professor and which have publications with a valid ISBN.

**Suspicious journals ("predatory journals")** - journals are considered, which do not apply the real process of review, professional review ("*peer review*"), do not clearly document the process of review, submission, acceptance and publication of the paper, they do not have an editorial board at all or it is not composed of professionals in the field, they do not have a real ISSN, they do not have a website or they have a suspicious one, the legal or natural person publishing has no address or contact number, declares a fictitious address or contact number, presents a false international indexing, declares a false impact factor, their publisher is suspicious in terms of the way of management and the range of magazines it publishes. See e.g. <https://beallslist.net/>, *Cabells' Predatory Reports from www.cabells.com (after providing access from UP)*.