



# ISTEC Lisbon Faculty Evaluation Regulation

**ISTEC** | INSTITUTO SUPERIOR  
DE TECNOLOGIAS  
AVANÇADAS DE LISBOA

SGQ-REG-21 RO - 1019

## **ISTEC Lisbon Faculty Assessment Regulations**

This regulation, designated as ISTECLisbon Faculty Evaluation Regulation, hereinafter referred to as R.A.D., is approved, under the terms of the statutes, by the Management of the ITA - Institute of Advanced Technologies for Training (instituting entity) and by the Director of ISTECLisbon, after consultation with the Scientific-Technical Council, the Pedagogical Council and the person responsible for the Internal Quality Assurance System Office.

### **Article 1**

#### **Object**

The present regulation establishes the evaluation scheme for ISTECLisbon faculty members.

### **Article 2**

#### **Principles**

The evaluation of ISTECLisbon faculty members obeys the following principles:

- a. Principle of transparency - The whole process should be clear, unequivocal and subordinated to objective and impartial criteria;
- b. Principle of simplicity - Formalities and bureaucratic procedures should be reduced to the essential, dispensing with repetitive and sterile practices;
- c. Principle of legality - All procedures and methodologies must be formally foreseen and the evaluated have the right to appeal guarantees;
- d. Principle of participation - The recipients of the evaluation process must be aware of all the formalities involved and are entitled to their own self-evaluation.

### **Article 3**

#### **Periodicity and timing**

1. The evaluation of ISTECLisbon faculty members takes place every two years, however, by the end of the 2019/2020 academic year the first evaluation must be completed.
2. The evaluation of teachers focuses on their performance in the academic years immediately preceding the one in which it is carried out.
3. Teachers who eventually obtain a negative classification will be re-evaluated one year after the presentation of that result.

### **Article 4**

#### **Duty to Cooperate**

They are elements of evaluation and are part of each teacher's individual file:

- a. The self-evaluation carried out by the teacher, which will be expressed in an individual report;
- b. The results of the surveys conducted by the Office of the Internal Quality Assurance System in the area of teaching quality and, where appropriate, satisfaction regarding performance in coordination positions.

### **Article 5**

#### **Valuation Areas**

1. Faculty performance evaluation focuses on the following key areas:
  - a. Teaching;
  - b. Fundamental or oriented research/scientific production;
  - c. Provision of services to the community;
  - d. Academic management.
2. The evaluation in each of the areas foreseen in art. 5, no. 1, is carried out by the Commission for Teacher Evaluation, which will formulate and use quantitative and qualitative indicators.
3. The relative weight of each evaluation area, taking into account the specificities of the teacher, should total 100.00 in the final classification.

4. In duly justified cases, the teacher may be exempted from evaluation, namely: total absence from duty, participation in international mobility programs and in other situations susceptible of assessment by the Teacher Evaluation Committee and approved by the ISTEK Director.

### **Article 6**

#### Parameters used in the evaluation

1. In the area of teaching evaluation, the following indicators should be considered:
  - a. Attendance;
  - b. Punctuality;
  - c. Attendance at meetings;
  - d. Organization of events at the level of the course and/or curricular units;
  - e. Guidance of internships and preparation of reports;
  - f. Guidance of global projects and dissertations.
2. In the area of research evaluation, the following indicators should be considered:
  - a. Coordination of research projects;
  - b. Participation in research projects;
  - c. Individual or team research in projects;
  - d. Scientific production in national peer-reviewed journals;
  - e. Scientific production in international peer-reviewed journals;
  - f. Scientific, technical or pedagogical production published in other media;
  - g. Presentation of papers in congresses and scientific meetings;
  - h. Holding seminars;
  - i. Revision of scientific articles;
  - j. Supervision of undergraduate projects, master's dissertations or doctoral theses.
3. In the evaluation area of community service delivery, the following indicators should be considered:
  - a. Coordination and participation in seminars and scientific and cultural dissemination actions;
  - b. Organization, realization and monitoring of professional training courses;
  - c. Coordination or participation in projects aimed at high-level professional development for public or private organizations;
  - d. Participation in juries of competitions or in expert examinations.
4. In the area of assessment of academic management, the following indicators should be considered:
  - a. Scientific direction and coordination of study cycles leading to an academic degree;
  - b. Pedagogical direction and coordination of study cycles leading to an academic degree;
  - c. Scientific direction and coordination of courses that do not confer academic degree;
  - d. Pedagogical direction and coordination of courses that do not confer academic degree;
  - e. Participation in the ISTEK Pedagogical Council;
  - f. Participation in the Scientific-Technical Council of ISTEK;
  - g. Directing ISTEK's Pedagogical Council;
  - h. Directorship of the Scientific-Technical Council of ISTEK;
  - i. Participation in working groups within the Internal Quality Assurance System, preparation of application or internal evaluation projects;
  - j. Directing or participating in nomination or election positions within the scope of higher education.

### **Article 7**

#### Teachers' evaluation

1. The teaching staff member's performance is evaluated according to weighting criteria that consider, predominantly or exclusively, the parameters and indicators defined by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, based on documentary evidence submitted by the teaching staff member to be evaluated.
2. The evaluation is expressed in a numerical classification from 0 to 100, which results from classifications from 0 to 100 weighted according to the specificities and profile of the teacher being evaluated.
3. The Evaluation Committee prepares proposals containing the evaluation areas and the respective scoring grid, taking into account the indicators mentioned in art. 6.

4. The proposal of the Evaluation Committee must be approved by the Scientific-Technical Council and approved by the ISTECE Director.
5. The Director of ISTECE will disclose to each Course Director the evaluation criteria and the scoring grid that he/she will subsequently communicate to the teachers of the respective course.
6. Once the final numerical classification has been determined, it will later be expressed in qualitative mentions, which translate into:
  - a. Excellent (between 90 and 100);
  - b. Very Good (between 80 and 89);
  - c. Good (between 70 and 79);
  - d. Sufficient (between 50 and 69);
  - e. Insufficient (below 50).

#### **Article 8**

##### Stakeholders in the process

In the evaluation process of the professors intervene:

- a. The Director of ISTECE;
- b. The Faculty Evaluation Commission;
- c. The Technical-Scientific Council;
- d. The evaluated faculty member.

#### **Article 9**

##### Procedure of the process

1. The first phase of the faculty evaluation process is the submission of the faculty members' activity report to the ISTECE Director.
2. The Faculty Evaluation Committee accesses the results of the surveys regarding the quality of teaching and student satisfaction, prepared by the Office of Internal Quality Assurance System.
3. For each evaluated teacher, the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall prepare a report which, with reasons, proposes a classification.
4. The evaluated teacher shall be given a copy of the report and shall have 15 working days to make any comments in writing that he or she may deem appropriate.
5. At the end of the period established in the preceding number, the Teacher Evaluation Committee has 15 working days to deliver to the Scientific-Technical Council the final report accompanied by the written response from the evaluated teacher.
6. The Scientific-Technical Council, taking into account the documentation delivered by the Teacher Evaluation Committee, shall decide on the proposed classification.

#### **Article 10**

##### Self-assessment

1. The self-assessment process consists of the following elements:
  - a. Updated resume;
  - b. The Teacher's activity report, presented in the model previously approved by the Scientific-Technical Council.
2. The report must contain the percentage of time allocated to each of the four evaluation areas.
3. As an appendix to the report, the faculty member should submit the documentary supports that support the information in his/her resume and in the report.

### **Article 11**

#### **Composition of the Faculty Evaluation Committee**

1. The Faculty Evaluation Committee consists of three faculty members elected by a majority vote of the members of the Scientific-Technical Council.
2. The term of office of the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall be two (2) years and the three members who constitute it shall elect the President among themselves.
3. The head of the Internal Quality Assurance System Office participates in the Faculty Evaluation Committee in order to present the results of the evaluation carried out by the students; however, he or she has no voting rights.
4. The three voting members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall not be evaluated during the period in which they exercise these functions.

### **Article 12**

#### **Scientific-Technical Council**

1. The classification and respective grounds to be attributed to each teacher shall be decided by a majority of the members of the Teacher Evaluation Committee.
2. The proposal of the Faculty Evaluation Committee is reviewed by the Scientific-Technical Council, which deliberates on the classification to be assigned, sending it for approval by the ISTEC Director.

### **Article 13**

#### **ISTEC Director**

The Director of ISTEC is responsible for:

- a. To set the calendar of the evaluation process;
- b. To control the faculty evaluation process;
- c. Homologate the evaluations, within 15 working days, counting from the receipt of the deliberation of the Scientific-Technical Council;
- d. Submit the complaints to appeal to the Scientific-Technical Council.

### **Article 14**

#### **Notifications**

The notifications involved in the teacher evaluation process are made by e-mail with receipt of delivery, or in person.

### **Article 15**

#### **Complaints**

1. After the notification of the evaluation, the teacher evaluated has a period of 15 working days to file a complaint to the ISTEC Director, who will forward it to the Scientific-Technical Council for final decision.
2. The final decision shall be rendered within 15 working days, counting from the receipt of the complaint.

### **Article 16**

#### **Interpretation and omissions**

Doubts of interpretation and omissions are resolved by deliberation of the ISTEC Director, based on a proposal from the Scientific-Technical Council.

**Article 17**  
Entry into force

This regulation comes into force the day after its publication on ISTECS website ([www.istec.pt](http://www.istec.pt)) and in the other usual places.

Approved on October 22, 2019

(The ITA Board of Directors: Augusto Ferreira Guedes)



(The Director of ISTECS Lisbon: José António Carriço)

ANNEX 1  
(EVALUATION GRID)

AREA	SUB-AREA	INDICATORS	CLASSIFICATION	
			1 to 5	
			Score	Weighted result
TEACHING (20 to 50%) (?)	Teaching Activity (70%)	Attendance		
		Punctuality		
		Participation in meetings		
		Organization of events at the level of the course and/or curricular units		
	Guidance (30%)	Orientation of internships and reports		
		Orientation of global projects and dissertations		
GUIDED RESEARCH / PRODUCTION SCIENTIFIC (30 to 50%) (?)	Research Projects (20%)	Coordination of research projects		
		Participation in research projects		
		Individual or team research in projects		
	Scientific Production (60%)	Scientific production in national peer-reviewed journals by peers		
		Scientific production in peer-reviewed international journals		
		Scientific, technical or pedagogical production published in other media		
		Presentation of papers at congresses and scientific meetings		
	Organization and scientific review (20%)	Holding seminars		
		Review of scientific articles		
		Orientation of global undergraduate projects, master's dissertations or doctoral theses		
PROVISION OF SERVICES TO COMMUNITY (10 to 30%) (?)	Coordination and organization of services to the community (60%)	Coordination and participation in seminars and actions of scientific and cultural dissemination		
		Organization, realization and monitoring of professional training courses		
		Coordination or participation in projects aimed at high-level professional development for public or private organizations		
	Participation in juries (40%)	Participation in juries of competitions or expert examinations		
MANAGEMENT ACADEMIC (0 to 30%) (?)	Course Direction (30%)	Scientific direction and coordination of study cycles leading to an academic degree		
		Management and pedagogical coordination of study cycles leading to an academic degree		
		Scientific direction and coordination of non-degree courses		
		Management and pedagogical coordination of non-degree courses		
	Management Bodies (40%)	Participation in ISTEC's Pedagogical Council		
		Participation in ISTEC's Scientific-Technical Council		
		Direction of ISTEC's Pedagogical Council		
		Management of ISTEC's Scientific-Technical Council		
	Working Groups and Appointment Positions (30%)	Participation in working groups within the scope of the QISM, preparation of application or internal evaluation projects		
		Directing or participating in appointive or elective positions in higher education		
Final Classification:				