

Masaryk University Directive No. 7/2017

HABILITATION PROCEDURES AND PROFESSOR APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

(in the version effective from 1 January 2021)

In accordance with section 10 subsection 1 of Act No. 111/1998 Coll., on Higher Education Institutions and on the Modification and Amendment of Other Acts (Higher Education Act), as subsequently amended (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"), I hereby issue this directive:

Part One General Provisions

Section 1

Subject

This directive specifies the basic rules stipulated for the process of habilitation procedures and professor appointment procedures at Masaryk University by the Masaryk University Statutes and Habilitation Procedure and Professor Appointment Procedure Regulations (hereinafter referred to as "Regulations"). This directive specifies the manner of submitting proposals for the initiation of habilitation procedures and professor appointment procedures (hereinafter referred to as "procedures" in general and common provisions) as well as the associated requirements and procedural steps employed at Masaryk University (hereinafter referred to as "MU").

Section 2

General Provisions

- (1) The habilitation procedure at MU is implemented in accordance with sections 71 and 72 of the Act. Proceedings on the invalidation of an appointment to associate professor are implemented in accordance with sections 74a to 74c of the Act.
- (2) The professor appointment procedure at MU is implemented in accordance with sections 73 and 74 of the Act.
- (3) The initiation, course and conclusion of the procedure are documented in a habilitation or appointment file, which includes namely the following:
 - a) proposal for procedure initiation and all annexes,
 - b) habilitation thesis in the case of a habilitation procedure,
 - c) reviewer's reports and other relevant written evaluations,
 - d) minutes of board meetings and records of the board's voting results (including an evaluation of the public lecture and the board's position regarding the appointment),
 - e) written records of the corresponding parts of scientific board sessions and records of the board's voting results with respect to an applicant's nomination for appointment to associate professor or professor,
 - f) scientific board's (or boards') nomination for appointment to associate professor or professor.

- (4) All records associated with the procedure are archived in accordance with the relevant provisions of the valid version of the MU Records Management Regulations. All documents are also electronically archived in a relevant Inet MU database.
- (5) In accordance with section 72, subsection 7 and section 74, subsection 7, all MU bodies, faculty bodies and boards shall perform duties associated with procedures without undue delay.

Part Two Habilitation Procedure

Section 3

Habilitation Procedure Initiation

- (1) The habilitation procedure begins with the submission of a proposal by the applicant to the dean of a faculty through a designated office tasked with the implementation of the habilitation procedure in a given field. Prior to the submission of a proposal for procedure initiation, the applicant should contact the designated faculty office to discuss faculty-specific aspects of the procedure in question. In case the accreditation to carry out procedures in a given field is implemented by a higher education institution, the proposal is submitted to the rector. The habilitation procedure begins on the day when the submitted proposal is accepted.
- (2) The applicant submits a proposal for initiating a habilitation procedure, including all documentation in accordance with section 4 of this directive, in English, with the exception of notarized copies of university diplomas, which must be submitted in original form. In accordance with section 2, subsection 3 of the Regulations, the language of the habilitation thesis is stipulated by section 5, subsections 4 and 5. All other documents relevant to the habilitation procedure are administered in Czech, Slovak or English, always in such a way so that they are comprehensible to all who certify them by their signature. All in-person meetings (e.g. at board meetings or scientific board sessions) are conducted in a language understandable to all present habilitation procedure participants.
- (3) The formal requirements of the proposal for initiating a habilitation procedure are inspected by an authorized employee of the relevant faculty unit immediately after the initiation of the proceedings (i.e. prior to any subsequent stages of the habilitation procedure). In case any formal deficiencies in the proposal for initiating a habilitation procedure are established, the dean shall notify the applicant in writing, setting a deadline for correcting the indicated deficiencies (no fewer than 30 calendar days). Should the applicant fail to correct the indicated deficiencies within the allocated period of time, the procedure is terminated by a ruling issued by the dean.

Section 4

Habilitation Procedure Proposal Requirements

- (1) A written proposal for initiating a habilitation procedure structured in accordance with Annex No. 1 is submitted by the applicant (the proposal must include a date and the applicant's signature). All information included by the applicant in the proposal for initiating a habilitation procedure and its annexes must be provided truthfully.
- (2) The proposal for initiating a habilitation procedure must include the following materials documenting the applicant's scholarly or artistic qualifications:
 - a) CV, structured in accordance with Annex 3,
 - b) certified copies of materials documenting the completion of higher education and academic degrees obtained and used by the applicant in the proposal for initiating a habilitation procedure. A certified copy may constitute either a notarized copy or a copy certified by a registry office or a statement issued by an authorized employee of the relevant faculty office, attesting to the fact that the copy

corresponds to the original document and confirmed by his/her signature and stamp. Materials documenting higher education and academic degrees obtained by the applicant include:

1. materials documenting the completion of higher education and academic degrees obtained by the applicant (university diploma), in the case of international doctoral studies also materials relevant to the recognition of education obtained abroad,
 2. materials documenting the awarding of the degree of MUDr. in the case of medical faculty graduates (1953–1964),
 3. materials documenting the awarding of the degree of CSc. or DrSc. (or DSc.), or materials documenting the awarding of the degree of Dr.,
 4. certificate of replacement of the abbreviation "Dr." with "Ph.D." under section 99 subsection 10 of the Act.
- c) documents certifying pedagogical experience in accordance with Annex 4. In case the applicant is not employed in a teaching position at MU, the dean may ask the dean of the faculty or the rector of the higher education institution in question to provide information regarding the applicant's pedagogical experience or otherwise request equivalent materials documenting his/her pedagogical experience at a foreign higher education institution.
 - d) list of published scholarly and artistic works structured in accordance with Annex No. 5,
 - e) list of citations and additional responses to published works in accordance with Annex No. 6,
 - f) comprehensive information on scholarly and pedagogical works and their citations and additional responses structured in accordance with Annex No. 7,
 - g) list of scholarly or artistic placements in accordance with Annex No. 8,
 - h) additional materials documenting scientific or artistic qualifications structured in accordance with Annex No. 9,
 - i) an as the case may be, other information whose structure is determined by the dean of the relevant faculty upon its Scientific Board's approval,
 - j) an outline describing the applicant's concept of scholarly or artistic activity and his/her results and achievements; the outline includes a brief description of the area investigated by the applicant, the state of scholarship in an international context and an accurate description of the applicant's key contributions to scholarship in his/her chosen area; the outline is only submitted if so requested by the faculty scientific board or of the applicant's own free will,
- (3) Documents under subsection 2 must be arranged in the above mentioned order. Except for documents under subsection 2 letter b and c the documents must bear the date and the applicant's signature at least on the last page of each document. Documents under subsection 2 must also be submitted electronically, i.e. in the form of an electronic version (scan) of the signed document. Electronic documents submitted by the applicant are to be provided as separate files in *.pdf format – each document (Annex) = one file.
 - (4) The applicant shall also submit to the dean or Rector a copy of his/her three works considered the most significant by the applicant and copies of other publications whose number and type are requested by the dean.
 - (5) The applicant may update documents under subsection 2 (with the exception of public lecture proposals) at any time during the procedure, but always in such a manner so that such documents are made available to all other parties participating in the procedure (i.e. habilitation board and scientific board members) no later than 5 workdays prior to their evaluation. If necessary, the applicant shall also update or supplement the submitted documents in accordance with the instructions of the

dean or a person authorized by the dean. Each updated document must include a current date and the applicant's signature; an electronic version, i.e. an electronic image (scan), of the signed document must also be submitted.

- (6) In case the habilitation procedure is terminated or in case the proposal is retracted by the applicant, all materials are returned to the applicant in accordance with subsections 2 and 4. Electronically submitted documents remain archived in a relevant Inet MU database.

Section 5

Habilitation Thesis

- (1) In addition to the proposal for initiating a habilitation procedure, the applicant also provides a habilitation thesis, submitted in the form of one of the following options, as specified by section 72 of the Act:
 - a) Written thesis introducing new scholarly or scientific findings, including an abstract. The abstract must include a brief characteristic of the investigated matter, thesis objectives, employed methodologies and obtained results.
 - b) Collection of previously published scholarly or engineering works with commentary. The commentary must correspond to standard expectations in the field and must include a brief characteristic of the investigated matter, objectives of the work, employed methodologies, obtained results and, in case of co-authored works, a passage characterising the applicant's contribution in terms of both quality and content.
 - c) Previously published monograph introducing new scholarly or scientific findings, including an abstract. In case the monograph is the work of more than one author, a commentary characterising the applicant's contribution in terms of both quality and content must be supplied.
 - d) Work of art or an artistic performance or a collection thereof, supplemented by an expert commentary.
- (2) A habilitation thesis in accordance with subsection 1, letters a to c, including an abstract or commentary, must be submitted by the applicant in quadruplicate as well as electronically. The habilitation thesis must be submitted electronically as a *.pdf file.

In the case of a habilitation thesis in accordance with subsection 1, letter d, where the work is not submitted in written form, the applicant must include written information identifying the work or performance, including a commentary, submitted in quadruplicate as well as electronically.
- (3) Habilitation theses are published at MU under section 16 and section 17 hereof, in accordance with section 75, subsection 4 of the Act. The publication of a habilitation thesis is conducted while respecting the protection of information protected by special legal measures, the protection of trade secrets and the protection of the legitimate interests of third parties. Should the publication of a habilitation thesis or its parts result in or threaten to result in a breach of such protection, the applicant is required to indicate so in the proposal for initiating a habilitation procedure, list relevant grounds and specify sections excluded from publication. A thesis abstract and commentary are always published. In case the entire habilitation thesis cannot be published, the applicant must submit in electronic form both the full version of the work, including the abstract and commentary (to be electronically archived in an Inet MU database but not published), as well as a version of the work which consists of sections suitable for publication (including the abstract and commentary).
- (4) A habilitation thesis submitted in accordance with section 1, letters a to d, i.e. all of its parts, may be submitted in Czech, Slovak, English or other foreign language commonly used in a given field. The thesis abstract or commentary must be submitted in English.

- (5) In case the habilitation procedure is terminated or in case the proposal is retracted by the applicant, the habilitation thesis is returned to the applicant. An electronically submitted habilitation thesis remains archived in a relevant Inet MU database.

Section 6

Proposal Assessment by the Habilitation Board

- (1) Unless the procedure is prematurely terminated due to formal deficiencies found in the submitted proposal in accordance with section 4, subsection 3, the dean presents the proposal for initiating the habilitation procedure to the faculty scientific board along with a request for the establishment of a habilitation board. The habilitation board is composed of five members, including professors, associate professors and other distinguished experts in the relevant field or in associated fields. The habilitation board is chaired by a professor, usually an employee of MU. The habilitation board members and chairperson are appointed by the dean following approval by the faculty scientific board.
- (2) At least three panel members must be associated with an institution other than MU. Such experts may not be involved in the following labour-law relationships with MU: employment contract, agreement to perform work. An MU emeritus professor is not considered a habilitation board external member.
- (3) At least one board member must be a foreigner. A foreign expert constitutes a person of foreign nationality (with the exception of citizens of Slovakia) not permanently working in the Czech Republic. In exceptional cases, a Czech or Slovak citizen who has not been working in the Czech Republic or Slovakia for over 10 years may be considered a foreign expert.
- (4) A co-author of a work or, in the case of a collection of previously published scholarly or engineering works, a co-author of part of a work submitted by the applicant as the habilitation thesis cannot be appointed member of the habilitation board.
- (5) A frequent co-author of the applicant cannot be appointed member of the habilitation board – the share of co-authored results submitted by the applicant in accordance with section 4, subsection 2, letters c and d may not exceed 20 %.
- (6) In all matters regarding the proposal, the habilitation board decides by a simple majority of the votes of all members. Habilitation board proceedings may be conducted by correspondence or electronically (e.g. in the form of a videoconference). As a rule, the final secret vote on the proposal to appoint the applicant to associate professor is generally conducted in person; alternatively, an electronic vote must make use of a dedicated Inet MU application. Minutes must be recorded at all habilitation board sessions and included in the file.
- (7) The habilitation board designates at least three reviewers, who are subsequently appointed by the habilitation board chair. Only one of the reviewers shall be an expert from MU, other reviewers shall be experts from institutions other than MU, i.e. experts who are not involved in the following labour-law relationships with MU: employment contract, agreement to perform work. An MU emeritus professor is not considered an external reviewer. A habilitation board member cannot be appointed reviewer.
- (8) The co-author of a work or, in the case of a collection of previously published scholarly or engineering works, the co-author of part of a work submitted by the applicant as the habilitation thesis cannot be appointed reviewer. A frequent co-author of the applicant's publications submitted in accordance with section 4, subsection 2, letters c and d cannot be appointed reviewer. A direct superior or subordinate of the applicant cannot be appointed reviewer. The reviewer must have an expert command of the language of the habilitation thesis.
- (9) Reports are prepared by the reviewers in writing in accordance with Annex 10; they must include an assessment of the scholarly merits of the habilitation thesis. Report

conclusions must explicitly state whether or not the habilitation thesis meets the quality criteria required of a habilitation thesis in a given field. In case a report is submitted in a language other than Czech, Slovak or English, a translation into one of these languages (the selected language must be understood by all habilitation board members) must be attached. In case the board chair masters the language of the report on the professional level, he/she shall verify its translation in writing. If not, a certified translation of the report shall be submitted. The applicant is informed of the reports at least two weeks prior to a public session of the scientific board at which he/she is to defend the thesis.

- (10) The habilitation procedure includes a public lecture given by the applicant. The lecture topic is selected by the habilitation board out of three options suggested by the applicant in the proposal for procedure initiation. The public lecture may not be replaced or combined with the habilitation lecture held at the end of the public faculty scientific board session dedicated to the assessment of an associate professor appointment proposal. Three or more designated habilitation board members must attend and assess the public lecture, subsequently issuing a written evaluation in accordance with Annex 11. The evaluators must explicitly state whether or not the lecture sufficiently demonstrated the applicant's scholarly qualifications and pedagogical capabilities.
- (11) The habilitation board evaluates the scholarly or artistic qualifications of the applicant, his or her publication activity in the Czech Republic and abroad, the applicant's recognition by international experts in the relevant field, his or her pedagogical qualification, and the quality of the habilitation thesis, referring to materials submitted by the applicant together with the proposal for initiating the habilitation procedure or their updated versions, reports supplied by the reviewers and evaluation reports of the applicant's public lecture. The habilitation board votes by secret ballot on whether or not the applicant should be nominated for appointment to associate professor. The evaluation, including explicit statements regarding individual aspects of the applicant's activity, is recorded in a written report compiled by the board in a prescribed format in accordance with Annex No. 12). The result is communicated to the dean by the habilitation board chairperson or board member authorized to do so by the chairperson.
- (12) In case the nomination to associate professor receives a simple majority of the votes of all habilitation board members, the dean or person authorized by the dean communicates the outcome to the applicant and the habilitation board chair or authorised person submits the board's nomination to the faculty scientific board.
- (13) In case the nomination to associate professor fails to receive a simple majority of the votes of all habilitation board members, the dean or person authorized by the dean presents the applicant with the habilitation board's recommendation to halt the procedure and informs the applicant that he/she may retract the proposal. In case the applicant does not retract his/her proposal for appointment, the habilitation board chairperson or board member authorized by the chairperson presents the relevant scientific board with a proposal for the termination of the habilitation procedure. The subsequent course of the habilitation procedure is governed by section 7, subsection 1 et seq.

Section 7

Proposal Assessment by the Faculty Scientific Board

- (1) The applicant's habilitation lecture and habilitation thesis defence (section 72, subsection 9 of the Act) take place at a public session of the faculty scientific board. The dean shall notify the applicant sufficiently in advance of the date and place of the scientific board's session where the associate professor appointment proposal shall be discussed and shall ask him/her for the topic of the public lecture. Should the applicant fail to appear at the faculty scientific board's session, the procedure shall be suspended until the scientific board is able to discuss the proposal for appointment in the presence of the applicant. The dean shall decide on the next date of inclusion of the associate professor appointment proposal to the agenda of

the faculty scientific board's session and shall inform the applicant of the date sufficiently in advance.

- (2) The applicant is required to inform the faculty scientific board chairperson of his/her selected habilitation lecture topic at least four weeks prior to the scientific board session, communicating through the relevant faculty office. At the faculty scientific board's session, the applicant is provided with an opportunity to defend his/her habilitation thesis, react to evaluation reports and comment on his/her existing scholarly or artistic and pedagogical achievements. The actual course of the faculty scientific board's conduct regarding the proposal for appointment to associate professor adheres to its rules of procedure. Present habilitation board members and reviewers may participate in the closed part of the session. The scientific board decides by a simple majority of the votes of all members on whether or not the applicant is to be appointed associate professor.
- (3) In case the nomination for appointment to associate professor attracts the votes of a majority of the faculty scientific board, the dean – as the faculty scientific board chair – submits the nomination, along with all relevant materials (except for the habilitation thesis and documented copies of the applicant's publications) to the Rector through a designated Rector's Office unit. In case the nomination for appointment to associate professor fails to attract the votes of a majority of the faculty scientific board, the procedure is terminated.
- (4) The Rector may ask the dean for the submission of additional materials. In case the Rector ascertains that the existing course of the procedure does not meet the requirements of this directive, the procedure is interrupted until the identified deficiencies are remedied. In case serious deficiencies are established, the Rector proceeds individually at his/her own discretion, e.g. requesting a repeated discussion of the nomination for appointment to associate professor by the faculty scientific board or submitting the procedure for debate by the MU Scientific Board.

Section 8

Habilitation Procedure Termination

- (1) The proposal may be retracted by the applicant in writing at any stage of the habilitation procedure.
- (2) The procedure is terminated by the dean in case the applicant fails to remedy proposal initiation deficiencies in accordance with section 3, subsection 3.
- (3) The procedure is terminated by the faculty scientific board in the case the nomination for associate professor fails to attract a majority of the votes of all of its members in accordance with section 7, subsection 3.
- (4) In case the Rector confirms the faculty scientific board's nomination for appointment to associate professor, the procedure is concluded by the applicant being appointed associate professor under section 71 of the Act. The applicant is appointed associate professor effective on the first day of the month following the month during which the appointment certificate is signed by the Rector.
- (5) In case the Rector does not confirm the faculty scientific board's nomination for appointment to associate professor, the nomination is submitted for consideration to the MU Scientific Board along with the Rector's substantiation. The actual course of the MU Scientific Board's conduct regarding the proposal for appointment to associate professor adheres to its rules of procedure. In case a nomination for the appointment to associate professor attracts the votes of a majority of all MU Scientific Board members, the procedure is concluded by the appointment of the applicant to associate professor (the applicant is appointed to associate professor as of the first day of the month following the month in which the appointment decree is signed by the Rector). If not, the procedure is discontinued.

Part Three

Proceedings Invalidating an Associate Professor Appointment

Section 9

Proceedings Invalidating an Associate Professor Appointment

- (1) The Rector shall decide to invalidate an appointment to associate professor in case the invalidation proceedings prove that a person whose pedagogical, scientific or artistic qualifications were verified during a habilitation procedure demonstrated his/her qualifications as a result of
 - a) an intentional criminal act, or
 - b) intentional unauthorized use of the work of another person grossly infringing laws governing the protection of intellectual property, or other deliberate actions incompatible with good morals not mentioned under letter a.
- (2) Proceedings invalidating an associate professor appointment may be initiated by the Rector
 - a) no later than three years from the date of entry into force of a sentence by which the person in question had been convicted for committing an intentional criminal act in accordance with subsection 1, letter a, or
 - b) no later than five years from the date of termination of the habilitation procedure in cases listed in subsection 1, letter b.
- (3) Documentation which forms the basis for the Rector's decision on the invalidation of an associate professor appointment includes the position of the review panel. The review panel is composed of five members, including professors, associate professors and other distinguished experts in the relevant field or in associated fields. The review panel is chaired by a professor, usually an employee of MU. At least three panel members must be experts from an institution other than MU and simultaneously at least three panel members must be experts from an institution other than the home institution of the participant subject to proceedings invalidating an associate professor appointment. One panel member is appointed by the Rector upon a suggestion by the Minister of Education, Youth and Sports (hereinafter referred to as the "Minister") from among the employees of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic (hereinafter referred to as the "MEYS"). A direct superior or direct subordinate of a person subject to proceedings on the invalidation of an associate professor appointment cannot be appointed to the panel. Panel members and chair are appointed by the Rector following approval by the MU Scientific Board.
- (4) The panel's position on the invalidation of an associate professor appointment is decided by a simple majority of the votes of all review panel members. Review panel discussions may be conducted in person, by correspondence or by electronic means, with the exception of the final secret ballot on the panel's position on the invalidation of an associate professor appointment, which must be conducted in person.
- (5) In case the Rector does not find grounds for the invalidation of an associate professor appointment, the proceedings invalidating an associate professor appointment are terminated.
- (6) In case the Rector does find grounds for the invalidation of an associate professor appointment, he or she issues a decision on the invalidation of an associate professor appointment. A decision on the invalidation of an associate professor appointment must be issued within one year of the initiation of the proceedings. The decision enters into force on the first day following the expiration of a two-month period from the date of decision announcement. The Rector's decision on the invalidation of an associate professor appointment cannot be appealed; however,

the timely filing of a legal action with an administrative court does carry a suspensive effect.

- (7) In case an appointment to associate professor is invalidated, the person in question ceases to be an associate professor on the day of the Rector's decision issuance. The effects of previous actions, procedures or decisions made by the person in question, even if they are associated with the performance of activities for which appointment to associate professor is required, are not affected by the invalidation of the associate professor appointment. Re-appointment of the person in question to associate professor may only take place on the basis of a new habilitation procedure.
- (8) Should the Rector, by issuing a decision on the invalidation of an associate professor appointment or a resolution on the cessation of proceedings on the invalidation of an associate professor appointment, deviate from the position of the review panel, he or she must provide a justification for doing so in his or her decision or resolution.
- (9) All documentation associated with proceedings invalidating an associate professor appointment are placed in the relevant habilitation procedure file, which is not publicly available with the exception for the Rector's final decision.

Part Four

Professor Appointment Procedure

Section 10

Professor Appointment Procedure Initiation

- (1) A professor appointment procedure is initiated:
 - a) On the basis of a proposal submitted by the applicant to the dean of a faculty which conducts professor appointment procedures in a relevant field on the basis of valid accreditation; the proposal must be submitted through a relevant faculty unit and begins on the day of acceptance of the proposal. Prior to the submission of a proposal for procedure initiation, the applicant should contact the designated faculty office to discuss faculty-specific aspects of the procedure in question. In case the accreditation to carry out procedures in a given field is implemented by a higher education institution, the proposal is submitted to the rector.
 - b) On the basis of a proposal submitted by the dean or the Rector to the scientific board of a faculty, on the basis of accreditation, conducts professor appointment procedures in the relevant field. The proposal is either submitted directly by the dean to the faculty scientific board or by the Rector to the dean (i.e. the chairperson of the faculty scientific board); the procedure begins on the day when the proposal is submitted by the dean or by the Rector to the faculty scientific board.
 - c) Independent incentive on the part of the faculty scientific board, i.e. an incentive based on a vote; in this case, the procedure begins on the day when its initiation is approved.

In case a professor appointment procedure is not initiated following a proposal submitted by the applicant, the applicant may terminate the procedure by filing a written complaint. In case a professor appointment procedure is not initiated following a proposal submitted by the applicant, the dean shall determine the period for submitting or supplementing documents under section 11. Should the applicant fail to submit the required documents within the prescribed period, the procedure is terminated.

- (2) A proposal for the initiation of a professor appointment procedure may be submitted by an applicant who has been appointed associate professor in an

identical or associated field in case the submission of a habilitation thesis was part of the habilitation procedure. In case of an unclear connection between the fields in question, the faculty scientific board shall examine their affinity in terms of content. In case the appointment field does not exhibit a content affinity to the field in which the applicant has been appointed associate professor, the procedure is terminated based on a decision issued by the dean.

- (3) In case an applicant participating in a professor appointment procedure has been previously appointed professor by a prestigious foreign higher education institution, the Rector may in exceptional cases, following a proposal by the MU Scientific Board in accordance with the provisions of section 74, subsection 1 of the Act, waive provisions requiring the applicant to be appointed associate professor first. In the case of a request for an exemption from a previous appointment to associate professor (hereinafter referred to as "request for exemption"), the following procedure applies:
- a) The applicant submits a request for exemption to the dean of a faculty tasked with the implementation of the professor appointment procedure in a given field in accordance with its accreditation. The request for exemption precedes the actual initiation of the professor appointment procedure. The request for exemption must include the following attachments:
 1. materials documenting the fact that the applicant is (or was) a professor at a foreign higher education institution,
 2. materials confirming the reputation of the foreign higher education institution where the applicant holds (or held) the position of professor,
 3. proposal for professor appointment procedure initiation, including all materials required in accordance with section 13.
 - b) In case the proposal for professor appointment procedure initiation meets all other formal requirements stipulated by this directive, the dean submits the request for exemption to the Rector. In addition to documentation in accordance with letter a, the request also includes the position of the faculty scientific board on this matter (including the minutes of the relevant session or the relevant part of the minutes).
 - c) The Rector submits a request for exemption along with all received materials to the MU Scientific Board, which decides by secret vote on a waiver of the requirement of a previous appointment to associate professor (hereinafter referred to as "requirement waiver"). In case the requirement waiver attracts the vote of a majority of all MU Scientific Board members, the Rector may comply with the applicant's request. In such a case, the proposal for professor appointment procedure initiation is considered to have been adopted in accordance with section 10, subsection 1, letter a and the procedure is initiated on the date when the Rector's decision is issued. In case the requirement waiver fails to attract the vote of a majority of all MU Scientific Board members or in case the Rector does not agree with the requirement waiver, the request for exemption is not granted by the Rector's decision, the procedure is not initiated and all documentation under letter a is returned to the applicant.
- (4) The applicant submits a proposal for initiating a professor appointment procedure – including all documentation in accordance with section 11 – in English, with the exception of notarized copies of university diplomas, which must be submitted in the original wording. All other documents relevant to the professor appointment procedure are administered in Czech, Slovak or English, always in such a way so that they are comprehensible to all who certify them by their signature. All in-person meetings (e.g. at board meetings or scientific board sessions) are conducted in a language understandable to all present professor appointment procedure participants.
- (5) The formal requirements of the proposal for initiating a professor appointment procedure are inspected by an authorized employee of the relevant faculty unit immediately after the initiation of the proceedings (i.e. prior to any subsequent

stages of the professor appointment procedure). In case any formal deficiencies in the proposal for initiating a professor appointment procedure are established, the dean shall notify the applicant in writing, setting a deadline for correcting the indicated deficiencies (no fewer than 30 calendar days). Should the applicant fail to correct the indicated deficiencies within the allocated period of time, the professor appointment procedure is terminated by a decision issued by the dean.

Section 11

Professor Appointment Procedure Proposal Requirements

- (1) A written proposal for initiating a professor appointment procedure structured in accordance with Annex No. 2 is submitted by the applicant (the proposal must include a date and the applicant's signature). All information included by the applicant in the proposal for initiating a professor appointment procedure and its annexes must be provided truthfully.
- (2) The proposal for initiating a professor appointment procedure must include the following materials documenting the applicant's scholarly or artistic qualifications:
 - a) two letters of recommendation from professors in identical or similar fields or experts holding a comparable position abroad; a foreign expert means a person of foreign nationality (with the exception of citizens of Slovak republic) not permanently working in the Czech Republic. In exceptional cases, a Czech or Slovak citizen who has not been working in the Czech Republic or Slovakia for over 10 years may be considered a foreign expert; in case these letters of recommendation are written in a language other than English, the applicant shall also provide a certified translation into English; all letters of recommendation must be drawn up for a specific procedure;
 - b) applicant's CV, structured in accordance with Annex 3 or in accordance with CVs found in the MU Information System,
 - c) certified copies of materials documenting the completion of higher education and academic degrees obtained and used by the applicant. A certified copy may constitute either a notarized copy or a copy certified by a registry office or a statement issued by an authorized employee of the relevant faculty office, attesting to the fact that the copy corresponds to the original document and confirmed by his/her signature and stamp. Materials documenting higher education and academic degrees obtained by the applicant include:
 1. materials documenting the completion of higher education and academic degrees obtained by the applicant (university diploma), in the case of international doctoral studies also materials relevant to the recognition of education obtained abroad,
 2. materials documenting the awarding of the degree of MUDr. in the case of medical faculty graduates (1953–1964),
 3. materials documenting the awarding of the degree of CSc. or DrSc. (or DSc.), or materials documenting the awarding of the degree of Dr.,
 4. certificate of replacement of the abbreviation "Dr." with "Ph.D." under section 99 subsection 10 of the Act,
 5. materials documenting a previous appointment to associate professor, in case the applicant does not seek a waiver in accordance with the provisions of section 74, subsection 1 of the Act.
 - d) materials documenting pedagogical experience structured in accordance with Annex No. 4; in case the applicant is not employed in a teaching position at MU, the dean may ask the dean of the faculty or the rector of the higher education institution in question to provide information regarding the applicant's pedagogical experience or otherwise request equivalent materials documenting his/her pedagogical experience at a foreign higher education institution.

- e) list of published scholarly and artistic works structured in accordance with Annex No. 5,
 - f) list of citations of published works in accordance with Annex No. 6,
 - g) comprehensive information on scholarly and pedagogical works and their citations structured in accordance with Annex No. 7,
 - h) list of scholarly or artistic placements in accordance with Annex No. 8,
 - i) additional materials documenting scientific or artistic qualifications in accordance with Annex No. 9,
 - j) an as the case may be, other information whose structure is determined by the dean of the relevant faculty upon its Scientific Board's approval,
 - k) an outline describing the applicant's concept of scholarly or artistic activity and his/her results and achievements; the outline includes a brief description of the area investigated by the applicant, the state of scholarship in an international context and an accurate description of the applicant's key contributions to scholarship in his/her chosen area; the outline is only submitted if so requested by the faculty scientific board or of the applicant's own free will,
- (3) Documents in accordance with subsection 2 must be arranged in the above mentioned order. Except for documents under subsection 2 letters a, c and d, the documents must bear the date and the applicant's signature at least on the last page of each document. Documents under subsection 2 must also be submitted electronically, i.e. in the form of an electronic version (scan) of the signed document. Electronic documents submitted by the applicant are to be provided as separate files in *.pdf format – each document (Annex) = one file.
 - (4) The applicant shall also submit to the dean or Rector a copy of his/her three works considered the most significant by the applicant and copies of other publications whose number and type are requested by the dean.
 - (5) The applicant may update documents under subsection 2 (with the exception of public lecture proposals) at any time during the procedure, but always in such a manner so that such documents are made available to all other parties participating in the procedure (i.e. evaluation board and scientific board members) no later than 5 workdays prior to their evaluation. If necessary, the applicant shall also update or supplement the submitted documents in accordance with the instructions of the dean or a person authorized by the dean. Each updated document must include a current date and the applicant's signature; an electronic version, i.e. an electronic image (scan), of the signed document must also be submitted.
 - (6) In case the professor appointment procedure is terminated or in case the proposal is retracted by the applicant, all materials are returned to the applicant in accordance with subsections 2 and 4. Electronically submitted documents remain archived in a relevant Inet MU database.

Section 12

Proposal Assessment by the Evaluation Board

- (1) Unless the procedure is prematurely terminated due to formal deficiencies found in the submitted proposal in accordance with section 10, subsection 5, the dean presents the proposal for initiating the professor appointment procedure to the faculty scientific board along with a request for the establishment of an evaluation board. The board is composed of five members, including professors, associate professors and other distinguished experts in the relevant field or in associated fields. The evaluation board is chaired by a professor, usually an employee of MU. The evaluation board members and chairperson are appointed by the dean following approval by the faculty scientific board.
- (2) At least three board members must be associated with an institution other than MU. Such experts may not be involved in the following labour-law relationships with MU:

employment contract, agreement to perform work. An MU emeritus professor is not considered an external board member.

- (3) At least one board member must be a foreigner. A foreign expert constitutes a person of foreign nationality (with the exception of citizens of Slovakia) not permanently working in the Czech Republic. In exceptional cases, a Czech or Slovak citizen who has not been working in the Czech Republic or Slovakia for over 10 years may be considered a foreign expert.
- (4) A frequent co-author of the applicant cannot be appointed member of the board – the share of co-authored results submitted by the applicant in accordance with section 11, subsection 2, letters d and e may not exceed 20 %.
- (5) In all matters regarding the proposal, the board decides by a simple majority of the votes of all members. Board proceedings may be conducted by correspondence or electronically (e.g. in the form of a videoconference). As a rule, the final secret ballot on the proposal to appoint the applicant to professor is generally conducted in person; alternatively, an electronic ballot must make use of a dedicated Inet MU application. Minutes must be recorded at all board sessions and included in the file.
- (6) The professor appointment procedure includes a public lecture given by the applicant. The lecture topic is selected by the board out of three options proposed by the applicant in the proposal for procedure initiation. The public lecture may not be replaced or combined with the evaluation lecture held at the end of the public faculty scientific board session dedicated to the assessment of a professor appointment proposal. Three or more designated board members must attend and assess the lecture, subsequently issuing a written evaluation in accordance with Annex 11. The evaluators must explicitly state whether or not the lecture sufficiently demonstrated the applicant's scholarly qualifications and pedagogical capabilities.
- (7) The board evaluates the scholarly or artistic qualifications of the applicant, his or her publication activity in the Czech Republic and abroad, the applicant's recognition by international experts in the relevant field, his or her pedagogical qualification and role as an outstanding and recognized scholarly or artistic figure in the given field, referring to materials submitted by the applicant together with the proposal for initiating the procedure or their updated versions, and evaluation reports of the applicant's public lecture. The evaluation board votes by secret ballot on whether or not the applicant should be nominated for appointment to professor. The evaluation, including explicit statements regarding individual aspects of the applicant's activity, is recorded in a written report compiled by the board in a prescribed format in accordance with Annex No. 13). The board is required to explicitly state whether or not the applicant is a respected and recognized scholarly figure in a given field, whether he/she has made a significant contribution to the development of the field and whether he/she constitutes a leading figure in his/her field of scholarship or research. The result is communicated to the dean by the board chairperson or board member authorized to do so by the chairperson.
- (8) In case the nomination to professor receives a simple majority of the votes of all board members, the dean or person authorized by the dean communicates the outcome to the applicant and the board chair or authorised person submits the board's nomination to the faculty scientific board.
- (9) In case the nomination fails to receive a simple majority of the votes of all board members, the dean or person authorized by the dean presents the applicant with the board's recommendation to halt the procedure and informs the applicant that he/she may retract the proposal. In case the applicant does not retract his/her proposal for appointment, the board chairperson or board member authorized by the chairperson presents the relevant scientific board with a proposal for the termination of the procedure. The subsequent course of the professor appointment procedure is governed by section 13, subsection 1 et seq.

Section 13

Proposal Assessment by a Faculty Scientific Board and MU Scientific Board

- (1) A faculty scientific board invites an applicant to present a lecture at its public session (section 74, subsection 5 of the Act). The dean shall notify the applicant sufficiently in advance of the date and place of the scientific board's session where the professor appointment proposal shall be discussed and shall ask him/her for the topic of the public lecture. Should the applicant fail to appear at the faculty scientific board's session, the procedure shall be suspended until the scientific board is able to discuss the proposal for appointment in the presence of the applicant. The dean shall decide on the next date of inclusion of the professor appointment proposal to the agenda of the faculty scientific board's session and shall inform the applicant of the date sufficiently in advance.
- (2) The applicant shall choose a lecture topic so as to ensure that it covers the characteristics of the field in question, the applicant's own results and achievements, his/her own concept of scholarly or artistic activity and his/her own concept of teaching in the field. The applicant must inform the faculty scientific board chairperson of the lecture topic no later than four weeks prior to the scheduled lecture date. The applicant is provided with an opportunity to comment on his/her existing scholarly or artistic and pedagogical achievements. The actual course of the faculty scientific board's conduct regarding the proposal for appointment to professor adheres to its rules of procedure. Present evaluation board members may participate in the closed part of the session. The scientific board decides by a simple majority of the votes of all members on whether or not the applicant is to be appointed professor.
- (3) In case the nomination for appointment to professor attracts the votes of a majority of the faculty scientific board, the dean – as the faculty scientific board chair – submits the nomination, along with all relevant materials to the MU Scientific Board through a designated Rector's Office unit. In order to supply MEYS with all necessary information, the faculty submits, in addition to documents listed in section 2, subsection 3, two copies or second originals of the applicant's CV and one copy or second original of all documents listed in section 11, subsection 2, letters d, e and i. In addition to the above, the faculty also submits two copies or additional originals of the board's reports. In case the nomination for appointment to professor fails to attract the votes of a majority of the faculty scientific board, the procedure is terminated.
- (4) The Rector may ask the dean for the submission of additional materials. In case the Rector ascertains that the existing course of the procedure does not meet the requirements of this directive, the procedure is interrupted until the identified deficiencies are remedied. In case serious deficiencies are established, the Rector proceeds individually at his/her own discretion, e.g. requesting a repeated discussion of the nomination for appointment to professor by the faculty scientific board.
- (5) A discussion of the proposal for appointment to professor before the MU Scientific Board is attended by the applicant and the board chair or a person authorized by the board chair. The Rector shall notify the applicant sufficiently in advance of the date and place of the MU Scientific Board's session where the professor appointment proposal shall be discussed. Should the applicant fail to appear at the MU Scientific Board's session, the procedure shall be suspended until the MU Scientific Board is able to discuss the proposal for appointment in the presence of the applicant. The Rector shall decide on the next date of inclusion of the professor appointment proposal to the agenda of the MU Scientific Board's session and shall inform the applicant of the date sufficiently in advance.
- (6) As part of the discussion of the proposal for appointment to professor before the MU Scientific Board, the applicant presents his/her concept of scholarship and pedagogical work. The actual course of the MU Scientific Board's conduct regarding the proposal for appointment to professor adheres to its rules of procedure. The MU

Scientific Board decides by a simple majority of the votes of all members on whether or not the applicant is to be appointed professor. In case the nomination for appointment to professor attracts the votes of a majority of the faculty scientific board, the Rector – as the MU Scientific Board chair – submits the nomination for appointment to professor to the President of the Czech Republic via the Minister. If not, the procedure is discontinued.

Section 14

MU Scientific Board Procedure in Ministerial Nomination Rejection Cases

- (1) In case the nomination for the appointment to professor submitted by the Rector is rejected by the Minister (section 73, subsection 3 of the Act), the nomination is presented to the MU Scientific Board along with the Minister's justification.
- (2) In case the MU Scientific Board, voting by secret ballot, voices agreement with the position of the Minister, the nomination process returns to the phase in which legal procedure was not followed.
- (3) In case the MU Scientific Board, voting by secret ballot, voices disagreement with the position of the Minister, the nomination for appointment to professor is re-submitted to the Minister along with a resolution issued by the MU Scientific Board.

Section 15

Professor Appointment Procedure Termination

- (1) The proposal may be retracted by the applicant in writing at any stage of the professor appointment procedure.
- (2) The procedure is terminated by the faculty dean in case an applicant fails to remedy deficiencies in the procedure initiation proposal in accordance with section 10, subsection 5, or in case the applicant's habilitation procedure field is not related to his/her professor appointment procedure field in accordance with section 10, subsection 2.
- (3) The procedure is terminated by the faculty scientific board in the case the nomination for professor fails to attract a majority of the votes of all of its members in accordance with section 13, subsection 3.
- (4) A nomination for appointment to professor, approved by the MU Scientific Board, is submitted to the President of the Czech Republic via the Minister. The procedure is subsequently terminated in accordance with the provisions of section 73 of the Act.
- (5) The procedure is terminated by the MU Scientific Board in case the nomination for appointment to professor fails to attract a majority of the votes of all of its members in accordance with section 13, subsection 6.

Part Five

Common, Transitional and Final Provisions

Section 16

Publication of Information on Procedures

- (1) The publication of information on procedure initiation, changes to the procedure and procedure completion/termination in accordance with section 75, subsection 1 of the Act includes:
 - a) publication of information on www.muni.cz,
 - b) submission of the "Publication of information on a habilitation procedure" or "Publication of information on a professor appointment procedure" MEYS form, signed by the Rector or authorized vice-rector, to a designated MEYS office.

- (2) In accordance with subsection 1, an authorized employee of the designated faculty office or a Rector's Office employee is tasked with entering and updating information regarding the current state of an ongoing procedure, without delay and starting with procedure initiation, using a designated Inet MU database.
- (3) Proposals for habilitation procedure initiation and proposals for professor appointment procedure initiation are available to the public without delay through a designated faculty office or through a Rector's Office unit entrusted with the administration of the procedures. Information included in files which are not electronically available to the public in accordance with section 19 may not be used by the public (e.g. copying, creating digital images, disseminating or further processing of such documents is prohibited).

Section 17

Electronic Archival and Publication of Procedure Documentation

- (1) The following materials are archived using a relevant Inet MU database:
 - a) In the case of a habilitation procedure:
 - 1. proposal for habilitation procedure initiation, including all enclosures in accordance with section 4; these materials are available to habilitation board members, faculty scientific board members, MU Scientific Board members, the applicant, and other persons determined by the decision of the Rector or the dean of the relevant faculty. All materials must be deposited in the electronic database without delay following their submission by the applicant;
 - 2. habilitation thesis, publicly available in accordance with section 75, subsection 4 of the Act and section 5, subsection 3; regardless of the status or result of the procedure;
 - 3. reviewers' reports, public lecture evaluation report and habilitation board's decision, which must be deposited in the electronic database at least five days prior to the date scheduled for the thesis defence at a faculty scientific board session, must be publicly available regardless of the status or result of the procedure;
 - b) In the case of a professor appointment procedure:
 - 1. proposal for the procedure initiation, including all requisites in accordance with section 10; these materials are available to the evaluation board members, faculty scientific board members, MU Scientific Board members, the applicant, and other persons determined by the decision of the Rector or the dean of the relevant faculty. All materials must be deposited in the electronic database without delay;
 - 2. public lecture evaluation report and the board's decision; the materials must be deposited in the electronic database at least five days prior to the date scheduled for the applicant's lecture before the faculty scientific board. Both documents are publicly available regardless of the status or result of the procedure.
- (2) The electronic archival of submitted materials is carried out by the designated faculty department.
- (3) Materials updated by the applicant in accordance with section 4, subsection 5, or section 10, subsection 5, must be deposited in the designated electronic database without delay. The original versions of materials previously deposited in the electronic archive are preserved.

Section 18

Procedure Suspension at the Applicant's Request

Following the reception of a written request submitted by the applicant, the dean may, in justified cases (e.g. long-term stay abroad, medical reasons, etc.), after securing the

approval of the faculty scientific board, decide to suspend his/her procedure. When assessing a request for procedure suspension, reasons stated in the request as well as the status of the procedure shall be taken into account. The dean issues a substantiated decision, which, if he/she decides to comply with the request, indicates the date on which the procedure is to be suspended and also establishes the duration of the suspension period (as appropriate, in view of the decision justification).

Section 19

Objections to the Course of a Procedure

- (1) The applicant may lodge a complaint regarding the course of the habilitation procedure in accordance with section 72 of the Act within 30 days of its conclusion. Complaints must be addressed to the dean in cases decided by a faculty scientific board or to the Rector in cases decided by the MU Scientific Board. In case the complaint is not resolved by the dean, the case is submitted to the Rector along with a substantiation. A substantiated decision issued by the Rector is final.
- (2) The applicant may lodge a complaint regarding the course of the professor appointment procedure in accordance with section 74 of the Act within 30 days of its conclusion; such complaints are handled by the Rector. A substantiated decision issued by the Rector is final.

Section 20

Procedure-related Fees

- (1) Fees applicable to habilitation procedures and professor appointment procedures are stipulated by MU.
- (2) Fee amounts are established by the Rector following a discussion with faculty deans.
- (3) Information on fee amounts is available at www.muni.cz.

Section 21

Transitional and Final Provisions

- (1) The procedure set out in this directive applies to procedures commenced on or after the effective date of this directive.
- (2) This directive repeals MU Directive No. 7/2017 – “Habilitation Procedures and Professor Appointment Procedures” of 17 January 2019, effective from 1 February 2019.
- (3) I authorize the vice-rector authorized under the MU Organizational Regulations to interpret the individual provisions of this Directive.
- (4) This directive is part of the methodological procedure “Habilitation Procedures and Professor Appointment Procedures”.
- (5) The compliance with this directive shall be inspected by the vice-rector authorized under the MU Organizational Regulations.
- (6) This directive shall enter into force on the day of its execution.
- (7) This directive shall enter into effect on 1 January 2021.

Annexes:

No. 1 – Habilitation procedure initiation proposal

No. 2 – Professor appointment procedure initiation proposal

No. 3 – Curriculum Vitae

No. 4 – Documents certifying pedagogical experience

No. 5 – List of published scholarly and artistic works

No. 6 – Citations and additional responses to published works

No. 7 – Comprehensive information on the applicant’s scholarly and pedagogical works, citations and additional responses

No. 8 – List of scholarly or artistic placements

No. 9 – Additional information documenting scientific or artistic qualifications

No. 10 – Habilitation thesis reviewer’s report

No. 11 – Public lecture evaluation

No. 12 – Habilitation board decision on the nomination for appointment to associate professor

No. 13 – Evaluation board decision on the nomination for appointment to professor

The annex structure is binding.

electronic signature

Martin Bareš
Rector