

Instructions for Implementation of the Criteria (Technical Instructions) – official consolidated text no. 5

Pursuant to point 14 of Article 52 of the UL Statutes (Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, no. 4/2017 with amendments) and Article 3 of the official consolidated text no. 5 of the Criteria for Appointment to the Titles of University Teachers, Researchers and Associates at the University of Ljubljana, at its 39th session of 17 June 2025 the Senate of the University of Ljubljana adopted amendments and additions, and the

Official consolidated text of the Instructions for Implementation of the Criteria (Technical Instructions)

Terms used in these Instructions in the masculine gender shall apply equally to men and women as gender-neutral terms.

I. Instructions for candidates

Candidates shall send their applications in *electronic form* to the competent professional department of the UL member institution.

Applications should contain:

1. A **request** with a statement of the habilitation field in which the candidate wishes to be habilitated, and the title to which they wish to be appointed. The request should contain a signed statement by which the candidate guarantees that the information set out in the application (in the presentation of the candidate or biography, the points system, bibliography and attachments) is accurate. Applications must include the candidate's e-mail address in the contact details.
2. **If the candidate is not employed at UL**, they must enclose with each application a **declaration from the senate of the member faculty responsible for the field in which the candidate seeks habilitation** (home member faculty) stating that UL is interested in collaborating with the candidate and thus in the implementation of the appointment procedure.
3. A **presentation of the candidate** in the suggested format for the individual field of habilitation, where the candidate seeks the title of professor, senior research fellow, associate professor, senior research associate, assistant professor, research associate, senior instructor, instructor or lector. In cases of other titles, candidates may submit a professional biography clearly showing their academic, artistic, educational and professional work.
If a candidate has been appointed to titles in different habilitation fields, at different member institutions or other institutions outside UL, they must provide information on all appointments in column 3 "Appointment to titles" in the model form "Presentation of candidate" or in the professional biography.
4. A **points tally and bibliography** with highlighted important sections and information on international reception (citations, h-index, other data on international impact of works). The bibliography must be drawn up using the bibliography indicators of success for appointment to a title tool in the Sicris system for all candidates that have a researcher code number and are being appointed in academic habilitation fields. Candidates who are not employed in research organisations may obtain a temporary researcher code via the web link:

[http://www.sicris.si \(forms\)](http://www.sicris.si/forms). Other candidates must compile a points tally and bibliography by making analogous use of the same document structure as used in the aforementioned tool.

If they use the *bibliography indicators of success for appointment to a title* tool, candidates should be aware that the readout is made on the basis of data in the Cobiss system and, through manual entries in the places envisaged for this in the points system, make relevant additions or amendments to the printout, for instance adding works accepted for printing but not yet published, adding data on guest educational or research positions abroad lasting at least 30 days, information on mentorship for Prešeren Prizes and other. In these cases, candidates should also appropriately correct the number of works and points. In the automatically generated record, where necessary and where the programme allows, they should change the categories of individual works, include them in or exclude them from the recent period, change the points, separate out individual works from the bibliography and so forth.

In the case of an application for first appointment to a higher title, the recent period should list works from the date of submission of the application for first appointment to the current title, and in reappointments the works from the date of submission of the application for the latest appointment. In the first election to assistant professor (docent), the assessment shall take account of the candidate's entire body of work. In this case, due regard shall be paid to all works from the most recent period.

In the bibliography, candidates may only state works that have already been published or accepted for publication up to the date the application was submitted. For works that are not yet published, evidence of acceptance for publication must be attached. In the case of a monograph, information on the total number of pages must be submitted, and for parts of monographs the number of pages of the chapter.

Candidates should check and where necessary correct the number of points/work (ŠTD =) and number of points/candidate (ŠTK =) under each bibliographic unit, where the tool enables this. The ŠTK is calculated by dividing the ŠTD by the number of authors.

In supplementing and adjusting the points and bibliography, candidates should observe the Criteria, the annex to the Criteria of the member institution to which they are applying, and these Instructions. A link to explanations concerning use of the tool is at the top of the readout of the automatic points system and bibliography:

(http://home.izum.si/cobiss/bibliografije/bibl_hab_UL_help.html)

Candidates should select their most important works, ones that they believe will qualify them for appointment to the requested title, where they should observe the Criteria and the annex to the Criteria of the member institution to which they are applying. The list must contain at least as many important works with first and/or lead authorship as are required for the requested title in the Criteria, but not more than twice as many. In the list of important works, for each work candidates should indicate if they were the first and/or lead author.

5. **Numbered list of all attachments as evidence.** Each attachment should then be appropriately numbered at the top of the first page.
6. **Evidence for the statements in the points tally or bibliography**, not based on Cobiss data, for instance evidence of articles being accepted for publication, if they are not yet published, confirmation of guest work abroad, evidence of heading projects not under the aegis of the Slovenian Research Agency (ARRS), evidence of average survey rating in the upper 10%, which should be in the form of an abstract from the entire readout of the results of student surveys or confirmation from the professional department, evidence of international response or citations not evident from WoS data or Sicris, and other.

7. **Evidence** of higher education, academic, master's, specialist or doctor's degree **diplomas** or evidence of the recognition of artistic works, *if documents have not been issued by UL*.
8. **Evidence of active knowledge of a widely spoken foreign language**. Only for first appointment to a title at UL. Evidence does not need to be submitted in cases referred to in paragraph 2 of Article 52 of the Criteria. The requirement to demonstrate an active knowledge of a foreign language is explained in detail in point IV.
9. **Evidence of fulfilment of other minimum requirements** for appointment to an individual title that are stipulated by the Criteria and annex of the member institution to which the application for appointment to a title was submitted.

Candidates who *submit an early application* for appointment to a title or application for appointment that deviates from the sequential order should also submit the grounds for such appointment in which the dates of previous appointments make clear that this is an application for early appointment or for skipping to a higher title. Exceptional achievements should be highlighted in the grounds, with an explanation of how they are exceptional. Candidates must also submit appropriate evidence of such achievements. The early attainment of qualitative and quantitative criteria does not in itself suffice for early appointment or skipping a title, and the decision of the UL Habilitation Committee will be based on the relevance of the exceptional achievements and the substantive opinions of the reviewers.

Candidates shall sign their applications with an advanced or qualified digital signature. The presentation of the candidate or biography and the points tally and bibliography should be converted into PDF format to enable searching within the text. In the electronic version, all documents must be merged into a single file.

In the event that candidates do not use the *bibliography indicators of success for election to a title* tool, they should take the following additional instructions into account:

1. Works must be set out by bibliographic units in accordance with the assignment of units in the points system, in chronological order. Each category of works must be visibly divided into two periods. The first, in the case of an application for first appointment to a higher title, should list works from the date of submission of the application for first appointment to the current title, and in reappointments the works from the date of submission of the application for the latest appointment. The second should list works that were published in previous appointment periods.
2. Works should be numbered in sequence through the entire application, and not starting at 1 for each category of works.
3. The authors and title of the work should be given for each work.
4. Listings of articles should state the title of the journal, year number, year of publication, volume and page number. For journals that have an impact factor (IF according to WoS), candidates must state the value for the year in which the article was published or the year in which the WoS IF was known. If the annex to the criteria of the UL member institution requires the classification of articles into groups by quartiles of the journal, for articles under the Cobiss system candidates should add the places in which the journals are classified among all journals in the field, together with a statement of the field to which the classification of the journal relates. For journals that do not have a WoS IF, the ISSN (International Standard Serial Number) must be given along with the database managed by the journals. The impact factor under Scopus (SNIP) should also be stated in an identical procedure, but with an indication that it is that particular impact factor.

5. For monographs, the name of the publisher and the ISBN (International Standard Book Number) must be given, along with the total number of pages, and for parts of monographs the length of the chapter (number of pages).
6. The title of the work, programme, place and date of creation must be given for artistic works.
7. For works published in proceedings of meetings, candidates should state the authors, title of work, title of proceedings, editors, publishing house, year of publication, page of publication (start page and end page) and the total number of pages of the proceedings.
8. Under each bibliographic unit, candidates should enter the number of points/work (ŠTD =) and number of points/candidate (ŠTK =). The ŠTK is calculated by dividing the ŠTD by the number of authors.

II. Instructions for reviewers

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

The reports should contain the following elements:

Introduction

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

Opinion on the bibliography submitted and the points system

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

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

Fulfilment of the minimum conditions for an application to be considered

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

- whether the candidate fulfils the common, general and special conditions for appointment to a title;
- whether the candidate fulfils the minimum qualitative requirements set out in Articles 56, 61, 72, 76, 77 or 81 for the relevant title, for instance guest work abroad, mentorship, heading projects, etc.; if work abroad is required for appointment to a title, the report should contain an assessment of whether the candidate's work abroad complied with the requirements of

- the Criteria and within the wider field (e.g. natural sciences, technology, medicine, biotechnology, social sciences, humanities, art) in which the candidate works;
- whether the candidate fulfils the quantitative conditions set out in Articles 57, 62, 68, 73, 78 or 82 (points, number of important works cumulatively and in the last appointment period, sufficient number of first and/or lead authorships and so forth);
- whether the candidate fulfils other required minimum criteria under the annex to the Criteria of the member institution to which the application for appointment was submitted.

Qualitative assessment of academic or artistic work

In this section the report should contain a reasoned analytical evaluation of the importance of the candidate's academic or artistic output, with an analysis and assessment of the quality of the candidate's submitted works. In the analysis the reviewer should take a reasoned and structured view regarding:

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

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

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

- at least two for appointment to the title of assistant professor;
- four for appointment to the title of associate professor; and
- six for appointment to the title of professor.

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

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

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

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

Qualitative assessment of professional work

A brief description and assessment of the quality and importance of the candidate's professional work (leading and participating in professional projects, patent applications and patents awarded, the appearance of papers given in professional circles, papers given at conferences, participation in professional associations and so forth).

Conclusion

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

These Instructions shall also be used analogously for first appointments to the title of teaching assistant or junior researcher, where the assessment of the candidate's qualifications shall be made for this purpose by the panel appointed by the member institution's senate.

III. Instructions for UL member institutions

The member institution's competent department shall first check whether the candidate's application is complete and has been prepared in accordance with these instructions. The candidate shall be asked to supplement their application if it is incomplete.

The senate of the member institution where the procedure for appointment to a title is taking place shall discuss the submitted application and appoint at least three reviewers to assess the professional or artistic capacity of the candidate and, in the event that the candidate has already carried out teaching work at UL, shall invite the Student Council of the member institution where the candidate has been teaching to provide an opinion on the candidate's work as a teacher.

In the procedure of the first appointment to the title of teaching assistant or junior researcher, the assessment of the candidate's professional qualifications shall be drawn up by the permanent committee at the member institution appointed for this purpose by the member institution's senate for duration of its term of office. This option shall only be used for the first appointment to the above titles. For every subsequent appointment, the assessment of the candidate's qualifications shall be made by at least three reviewers appointed by the member institution's senate. The appointment of the committee shall be at the discretion of the member institution, meaning that the member institution may decide not to appoint a permanent committee. In this case, it shall appoint at least three reviewers to assess the candidate's professional qualifications.

If the candidate is not employed at the University, the senate of the member institution shall also decide whether the university is interested in collaborating with the candidate and therefore in conducting the appointment procedure. The senate shall decide on this in the manner specified in the member institution's internal rules.

If a member institution that is not responsible for the field in which the candidate is seeking habilitation demonstrates an institution in collaborating with the candidate, the senate of that member institution shall send a reasoned declaration indicating its interest in collaboration to the senate of the member institution responsible for the field. In that case the senate of the member institution responsible for the field may not refuse to carry out the procedure, but merely takes note of the interest shown and adopts a declaratory decision as the basis for initiating the procedure.

The reviewers must have the same title as or higher title than that being requested by the candidate. At least two reviewers must hold their title in the same field in which the candidate wishes to be appointed. If there is no university teacher holding the same or a higher title in the field in which the candidate seeks to be appointed, the reviewer may be a university teacher holding the same or a higher title in a related field of habilitation. In procedures for a first or reappointment to the titles of senior instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, research associate or senior research associate, at least one reviewer must not be employed at the member faculty where the candidate is seeking habilitation or where they work. In procedures for appointment to the title of professor or senior research fellow, at least one reviewer must not be employed at UL and not have been appointed to a title at UL. Reviewers may also be retired university teachers or members of research staff and foreign university teachers and researchers holding a suitable title. In procedures involving an interdisciplinary field, members of the reviewers' panel must represent all the relevant fields.

In reappointments to a title, reviewers shall, as a rule, have a higher title than the candidate.

When appointing reviewers, the member institution's senate shall take care to ensure that no circumstances exist between a reviewer and the candidate that constitute or could constitute a conflict of interest. The reviewer is also obliged to draw the member institution's senate's attention to the existence of any such circumstances. Such circumstances shall be deemed, in addition to the circumstances set out in the [Rules on avoiding conflict of interest and on conditions for performing work outside UL](#), a higher number of instances of joint authorship, and mentorship or joint mentorship of the candidate's doctoral work.

Foreign reviewers should, as a rule focus, on the qualitative assessment of the candidate's academic, educational and professional work. They are not required to take a view on the points tally or on fulfilment of the minimum requirements for appointment to the title. In each case, at least two reviewers must take a view on the appropriateness of the points tally and on fulfilment of the minimum conditions for an application to be considered (see: Instructions for reviewers).

If a candidate has performed educational work at multiple member institutions, the UL member institution conducting the habilitation procedure must, in such cases, request the opinion of the Student Councils of all the member institutions at which the candidate works. The representatives of the Student Councils may opt to draw up a single opinion or several separate opinions.

The member institution must notify the candidate when it has received all the reviewers' assessments. In the event of a negative assessment, it must, within three days of receiving it, apprise the candidate of the negative assessment and notify them of the possibility of responding to the assessment, whereby care must be taken to ensure that the names of the reviewers are removed from the documentation, along with any other information that could serve to identify the reviewers. The candidate is also notified of the opinion of the student council (Article 26 of the Criteria).

After receiving all the assessments, opinions and any responses from the candidate, the competent department of the member institution sends all the material to the member institution's senate, or the UL Habilitation Committee when the Instructions so stipulate (Article 27 of the Criteria).

The documentation shall contain the following documents (in the order given below):

1. a cover letter from the dean of the member institution, providing:
 - a statement to the effect that the reviewers did not report any conflict of interest with the candidate,
 - an explanation in the event of variances regarding the required composition of the panel,
 - an explanation of the reasons for any delay in the event that more than six months have elapsed between the date of the candidate submitting their application and the submission of the material to the Habilitation Committee,
 - a statement to the effect that the Student Council has failed to formulate an opinion on the candidate's teaching performance by the deadline set for the formulation of the opinion by the Senate,
 - a statement to the effect that the candidate was informed of negative assessments and/or opinions and that the candidate did not comment on this by the deadline,
 - any other necessary explanations regarding the procedure for processing the application;
2. a document showing the decision of the member institution that is responsible for the relevant field regarding its interest in collaborating with the candidate (only if the candidate is not employed at UL);

3. a cover sheet with information introducing the candidate (information on the cover sheet shall be drawn up and provided by the professional department of the member institution, using the standardised university form);
4. the complete original (unamended) application of the candidate containing: a presentation form, the points tally, a list of works and numbered annexes;
5. copies of assessments and results of official student surveys, i.e. a collective readout of the results of student surveys from completed questionnaires;
6. independent reports from at least three reviewers. (the member institution shall submit all the collected reports from reviewers to the UL Habilitation Committee, irrespective of whether they are positive or negative);
7. an assessment of a trial lecture for first appointment to a teaching title (the reviewers and representative of the Student Council shall formulate a joint assessment, and shall submit it in the form of a record of trial lecture drawn up on the basis of the model provided in the Rules on Trial Lectures);
8. the opinion of the Student Council of the member institution, or institutions (if the candidate has worked at several UL member institutions);
9. any response by the candidate to the reviewers' negative assessments and the Student Council's opinion, and other associated documentation.

The member institution shall send the UL Habilitation Committee all the documentation (the candidate's signed application, the reviewers' assessments, the Student Council's opinion, the candidate's response, etc.) in electronic (PDF) form, which should be formulated in such a way as to enable all documents to be searched, with no qualified digital signature required and the document accessible in a form that can be converted. All the documentation must be contained in a single file which should be named in the following manner: abbreviation of the title to which the candidate is being appointed, the abbreviation of the member institution, and the name and surname of the candidate. Example: DOC AG Janez Novak or IP FMF Janez Novak or GOST UČ FF Janez Novak.

If the application is incomplete or where additional information or additional clarifications of a reviewer's assessment are required, the UL Habilitation Committee shall issue a resolution postponing the decision on the application and set a deadline for the provision of additional information or clarifications. The member institution shall send the resolution referred to in the previous sentence to the candidate or reviewer, and notify the UL Habilitation Committee when the deadline for the provision of additional information or clarifications expires.

IV. Additional clarifications

Appointment of visiting university teachers and researchers

The appointment of a visiting teacher shall not involve appointment to a habilitation title as determined by Article 6 of the Criteria, but a temporary appointment to the rank of a title under Article 6 of the Criteria. If the member institution needs to collaborate further with the teacher, we suggest that the teacher/candidate submit an application for appointment to a habilitation title or an application for recognition of the title.

Demonstration of active knowledge of a widely spoken foreign language

Active knowledge of a widely spoken foreign language is demonstrated with a relevant certificate or proof from the competent institutions (universities or accredited language-

teaching centres) confirming the attained level of knowledge B2, C1 or C2 under the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages or with an internationally valid certificate of proficiency in the specified language.

A candidate for appointment to a title who received a doctoral degree at a foreign university in a programme conducted in a widely spoken foreign language and who wrote their doctoral thesis in that language is not obliged to submit evidence of active knowledge of a widely spoken language. A certificate issued by a national examinations centre on the basis of school-leaving examination results is deemed to be adequate proof.

Active knowledge of a widely spoken foreign language can also be demonstrated by providing suitable evidence:

- that they have obtained a bachelor's, master's or doctoral degree in another country (attaching the certificate as evidence of the knowledge of a widely spoken foreign language);
- that they have passed an examination in a widely spoken foreign language at bachelor's or master's level (attaching copies of confirmations of exams passed);
- that they have received a certificate attesting to active knowledge of a widely spoken foreign language issued by a national examinations centre on the basis of school-leaving examination results.

Active knowledge of a widely spoken foreign language shall be demonstrated only for a first appointment at the University of Ljubljana.

First and lead authorship in publications with several authors

The first author is the author who is named first among the authors in a publication, or in accordance with Article 44 of the Criteria. If first authorship is split, this must be unambiguously indicated in the published work.

The following applies to work accepted for publication by 31 December 2025: The first author is the author who is named first among the authors in a publication, or as is agreed in exceptional circumstances (i.e. in the listing of authors in alphabetical order) in writing by all the co-authors. In the event of an agreement on first authorship with co-authors, a statement from all the co-authors that they agree with this must be attached. For works published since 2010 inclusive, this statement must be signed by *all* co-authors within six months of the work being published.

Unless explicitly stated otherwise in the article, the lead author is the author named in last place, along with any corresponding authors, or in accordance with Article 44 of the Criteria.

The following applies to work accepted for publication by 31 December 2025: The lead author is the author that designed and headed the research. If the lead author is not at the same time the first author, they shall be stated in the publication as corresponding author or listed in last place among the authors (usually preceded by the word 'and'; example: J. Kovač, J. Novak and J. Kralj), or as is agreed in exceptional circumstances (i.e. in the listing of authors in alphabetical order) in writing by all the co-authors. In the event of an agreement on lead authorship with co-authors, a statement from all the co-authors that they agree with this must be attached. For works published since 2010 inclusive, this statement must be signed by *all* co-authors within six months of the work being published. Lead authorship may also be demonstrated by the candidate being the corresponding author. In this case, the candidate must submit in the application a copy of the page of the article indicating that they are the corresponding author.

In all requirements under the Criteria that relate either to first or lead authorship, the two authorships shall be deemed to have equal status.

A total of one first and one lead author is permitted per work. In cases where multiple first/lead authors on a work have been listed, the first/lead authorship being claimed on this basis shall be settled by 1 being divided by the number of first/lead authors. Member institutions may also address this issue in another manner in an Annex, but the total claim of first/lead authorship per work may not exceed 1.

Points for works with multiple authors

Points may not be allocated disproportionately among authors of an article.

Affiliations

The affiliations of authors of articles shall reflect the institutional framework within which the scholarly work was conducted. The author shall state all those institutions that offered logistical, academic and financial support to the author during implementation of the work. Any subsequent change in the citing of affiliations is therefore only justified in the event of an erroneous stating of the actual situation.

Artistic work

This covers an artistic product, artistic project, artistic competition project, artistic conceptual project, the staging of an artistic work, the performance of an artistic work and other forms of creation or presentation of artistic work. It is usually individual work, but may also be work created in a collaboration of two or more persons. In the event of collaboration of several artistic contributors, they shall all appear with equal value, and such work, if it meets the criteria of important work, may be listed for all contributors as work that qualifies them for appointment to the requested title. In such cases the share contributed by the candidate in the creation of the work must be clearly visible and identifiable.

Articles where the candidate has collaborated on research but is not a co-author

Where a candidate has collaborated on research (as is evident from a reference in the article) but is not a co-author of the article, the work shall not be included in the group of works with articles in the bibliography. If candidates nevertheless wish to list such work in the bibliography, they may do this in column 4.8, where they may also allocate points to such work at their discretion.

Monographs

An academic monograph is a publication which takes a scholarly, systematic, exhaustive and all-encompassing approach to addressing a problem, issue or subject, a person or event in a single volume or set number of volumes, which are published simultaneously or in accordance with a predetermined timetable. An academic monograph is a specialised book written for a specialised audience.

A professional monograph (expert book) is a publication that professionally addresses a problem, issue or subject, a person or event in a single volume or set number of volumes, which are published simultaneously or in accordance with a predetermined timetable.

A popular science book is a publication that professionally addresses a certain issue and presents it in a popularly accessible way.

A book is a non-periodical printed publication that comprises a minimum of 49 printed pages (excluding the cover). Brochures are works that comprise at least five and a maximum of 48 pages (excluding the cover). A monograph must be reviewed by at least two academic

associates with doctoral degrees. A monograph must have a catalogue record of publication with the ISBN designation.

Points for monographs and parts of monographs

An academic monograph published abroad shall be allocated up to 25 points, and an academic monograph published in Slovenia shall be allocated up to 20 points.

If a discussion is published in an academic monograph published in Slovenia, it shall be evaluated under the following system:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| - contribution of 40 pages or more: | up to 4 points; |
| - contribution of 20 to 40 pages: | up to 3 points; |
| - contribution of 10 to 20 pages: | up to 2 points; |
| - contribution of up to 10 pages: | up to 0.5 points. |

If a discussion is published in an academic monograph by a publisher abroad, it shall be evaluated under the following system:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| - contribution of 40 pages or more: | up to 8 points; |
| - contribution of 20 to 40 pages: | up to 6 points; |
| - contribution of 10 to 20 pages: | up to 4 points; |
| - contribution of up to 10 pages: | up to 1 point. |

A popular science book in Slovenian counts for up to 3 points, and in a foreign language for up to 6 points.

Points may not be allocated disproportionately among authors of a monograph or part of a monograph.

International meeting

A meeting (conference, congress) is international if it is organised by an international organisation or if the proceedings are compiled by an international editorial board and are published in a language used by the international research community in the field covered by the meeting. If a candidate's bibliography and points system re-categorises a publication from a publication at a domestic conference to one at an international conference, the candidate should submit appropriate evidence clearly indicating that the conference meets this condition.

Organisation of exhibitions

If an exhibition is the result of academic, research, artistic or professional work, the exhibition is usually accompanied by a publication (article, monograph, exhibition catalogue) and the work is thereby documented. In such cases, the accompanying publication should be listed in the classified bibliography and allocated points appropriately, where the listing in the relevant bibliographic category should match the nature of such work (academic, research, artistic, professional), which the expert reviewers must assess.

The substance of the exhibition (e.g. selection or production and presentation of works, their set-up (composition), accompanying text) may be listed in the bibliography and allocated points only in exceptional cases, if the exhibition has no accompanying publication, and if it is the result of academic or professional work, regarding which the reviewers must again take a view. The technical and administrative organisation of exhibitions cannot be listed in the classified bibliography or be allocated points, but may be taken into account in the overall quality assessment of the candidate's work. It may therefore be listed under non-allocated work.

Textbooks and study materials

A university textbook is a reference book intended for students as prescribed learning material for a specific branch of study or course. If the course comprises lectures/seminars and exercises, a university textbook may cover the entire teaching material required for the lectures/seminars or exercises. A textbook for exercises is not a set of instructions for the exercises or a workbook, but also contains theoretical bases, examples of tasks and similar material. A textbook may be published in printed or electronic form, and must be reviewed by at least two university teachers. It must have a catalogue record with ISBN designation. It may be awarded up to 10 points.

Other textbooks with reviews are textbooks for primary and secondary schools and other pre-university education, which are compiled in accordance with the prescribed curriculum and adopted in the relevant procedure. They may be awarded up to 5 points.

Part of a university textbook (to calculate ŠTK) is valued such that 10 points (ŠTD) are divided by the number of parts of the textbook or contributions to the textbook and the number of co-authors of the part (contribution) of the textbook. Part of "another textbook" (to calculate ŠTK) is valued such that 5 points (ŠTD) are divided by the number of parts of the textbook and the number of co-authors of the part of the textbook.

Other learning material includes the first systematic processing of learning materials under a study programme that the author compiles using their own or another's material (lecture notes, script, collection of exercises and tasks for a specific subject and other learning tools such as audio material). The materials must relate to the entire learning material and not just specific parts of them (one course, one set of learning material for the subject of lectures and one set of material for exercises or practicals). Material for professional seminars shall be treated in the same way. It may be published in printed or electronic form. Learning material shall be awarded up to 2 points.

Reprints shall not be awarded separate points, while new supplemented editions shall be awarded half the number of points. An edition is considered to be supplemented if at least a third of the text is changed or supplemented.

Points may not be allocated disproportionately among the authors, unless there is an explicit indication of the authors of individual parts of a textbook or study material.

For the purposes of appointment to a title, the reviewers and the UL Habilitation Committee must have access to all the teaching material that the candidate is including in the habilitation procedure.

Points allocated for work at a foreign university

For all guest work at foreign universities, a candidate may attain an overall total of 8 teaching points. Only guest work lasting at least 30 days without interruption may be allocated points. If a period of guest work had the nature of research and the candidate did not teach abroad, no teaching points may be claimed. However, such work may serve as fulfilling the condition of guest work at a foreign institution depending on the required length of uninterrupted guest work for a specific title. For guest work eligible for points or that signifies fulfilment of the condition of guest work at a foreign institution, the candidate must submit confirmation from the host university or institution that clearly indicates information on the host, the content of the work undertaken and its duration, along with the start- and end-dates of the guest work. In order to claim teaching points, the confirmation must show how and to what extent the candidate worked in a teaching capacity at the financial institution.

Points for co-mentorship

In the case of co-mentorship, the number of points envisaged for mentorship shall be divided equally among all mentors and co-mentors. The maximum possible number of points for the

mentoring of work, regardless of the total number of mentors and co-mentors, is set out in the points system. The bibliography should clearly indicate for the work whether the candidate was a mentor with co-mentors or just a co-mentor.

Manuals, dictionaries, lexicons, popular science books

A manual is a type of reference book that contains information and instructions presented in an accessible way in a certain field or subject. Dictionaries and lexicons are a special kind of reference literature. They are evaluated as professional monographs or popular science books.

Part of a popular science book is valued such that 3 points (for domestic professional monographs) or 6 points (for foreign professional monographs) are divided by the number of parts of the book and the number of co-authors of the part of the book.

Requirement of heading projects

A minimum criterion on the UL level is the requirement to demonstrate one (1) leadership of a project, where as part of the professional assessment of the candidate the reviewers are bound to assess the relevance of the project, as one of the conditions for election to a title.

For elections to titles requiring the leadership of a project or projects, due regard shall be paid to research, technological development, teaching and professional projects that demonstrate:

- an ability to obtain research and material resources in the wider academic environment, business or society;
- the design and coordination of complex and wider-ranging research or development tasks over a longer period of time;
- the management of material and human resources.

Requirement to lead projects in habilitation in artistic fields

A work in an artistic field is deemed to be work that, in addition to the realisation of the work itself (e.g. musical performance, publication of a musical composition, an exhibition of fine arts, a theatre or film role, film direction, etc.), contains other aspects of artistic work, such as:

- research in design or the arts (idea, substance, concept);
- the organisation of work and processes that lead to performance (e.g. acquiring performance venues or material resources for performance, finding and engaging collaborators, organising work, etc.).

An artistic project does not need to be fully financially definable or measurable.

The author must demonstrate lead authorship of an artistic work presented as a project for habilitation purposes.

Presentation of the project in the habilitation application: the candidate should present the highlights/stages of work in the design, organisation and realisation of the artistic project along an appropriate timeline.

In the Annexes to the Criteria, the member institutions shall define in detail the conditions applying to leadership of a project or projects for a specific title and field of election, as well as the indicators and the way in which fulfilment of the conditions is established.

Requirement of works in the Slovenian language

The condition of works in the Slovenian language may be satisfied by co-authorship. The work must appear in the COBISS bibliographic database.

Clarifications regarding points allocation in individual categories of the points system

The table sets out clarifications regarding points allocation in individual categories of the points system. In allocating points, candidates must also observe the annex to the Criteria of the member institution to which they are submitting an application.

1.	ACADEMIC RESEARCH	
1.0	Outstanding achievements in accordance with Article 48 of the Criteria	Up to 25 points
1.1	Peer-reviewed articles National and international journals with peer-review, international exchange and a summary in a foreign language	
1.1.1	Group I (the top 5% of most quoted journals from individual fields)	Up to 12 points for a bibliographic unit
1.1.2	Group II (SSCI, SCI, AHCI)	Up to 8 points for a bibliographic unit
1.1.3	Group III (journals substituting SSCI, SCI, AHCI)	Up to 6 points for a bibliographic unit
1.1.4	Group IV (other reviewed journals)	Up to 2 points for a bibliographic unit
1.1.5	Group V (other journals)	Up to 1 point for a bibliographic unit
1.2	Monographs	
1.2.1	Monograph (foreign)	Up to 25 points for a bibliographic unit
1.2.2	Monograph (domestic)	Up to 20 points for a bibliographic unit
1.3	Parts of monographs	
1.3.1	Part of monograph (foreign)	Up to 8 points for a bibliographic unit In allocating points, the number of pages of the part of the monograph is considered (see Points for monographs and parts of monographs)
1.3.2	Part of monograph (domestic)	Up to 4 points for a bibliographic unit In allocating points, the number of pages of the part of the monograph is considered (see Points for monographs and parts of monographs)
1.4	Invited and published plenary paper:	
1.4.1	- at domestic academic conferences	Up to 2 points for a bibliographic unit
1.4.2	- at international academic conferences	Up to 5 points for a bibliographic unit
1.5	Published section papers:	

1.5.1	- at domestic academic conferences	Up to 1 point for a bibliographic unit
1.5.2	- at international academic conferences	Up to 3 points for a bibliographic unit
1.6	Documented published papers from academic symposiums and seminars	
1.6.1	- domestic	Up to 0.5 points for a bibliographic unit
1.6.2	- international	Up to 1 point for a bibliographic unit
1.7	Reviews published in the form of an article	Up to 2 points for a bibliographic unit
1.8	Inventions and new plant varieties	
1.8.1	Patent with full substantive examination granted by the EPO, USPTO, JPO or PCT/WIPO	Up to 12 points
1.8.2	Patent with full substantive examination, except for patents granted by the EPO, USPTO, JPO or PCT/WIPO	Up to 8 points
1.8.3	Plant-breeding right awarded for a new plant variety	Up to 12 points
3.	ARTISTIC ACTIVITIES	
2.0	Outstanding artistic achievement in accordance with Article 48 of the Criteria	Up to 25 points for the achievement
2.1	Public performance or presentation of a work of art	Up to 0.5 points for the artistic work
2.2	Public performance, publication or presentation of a work of art with a published review	Up to 2 points for the artistic work
2.3	Public performance, publication or presentation of a work of art at important events of national significance	Up to 4 points for the artistic work
2.4	Public performance, publication or presentation of a work of art on an international level	Up to 5 points for the artistic work
2.5	Public performance, publication or presentation of a work of art defined by the profession as a top-level achievement of national significance	Up to 8 points for the artistic work
2.6	Public performance, publication or presentation of a work of art defined by the profession as a top-level achievement in an international context	Up to 20 points for the artistic work
2.7	Other documented artistic activity at the discretion of reviewers' panels	Up to 5 points for the artistic work
3.	TEACHING ACTIVITY	

3.1	Textbooks	
3.1.1	Peer-reviewed university textbook	Up to 10 points for a bibliographic unit Reprints are not awarded separate points
3.1.2	New, updated edition	Up to 5 points for a bibliographic unit
3.1.3	Other peer-reviewed non-university textbooks	Up to 5 points for a bibliographic unit
3.1.3.1	- study aids (including video lectures)	Up to 2 points for a bibliographic unit
3.1.3.2	- study material (printed or electronic)	Up to 2 points for a bibliographic unit
3.2	International projects for developing study programme curricula, teaching methods, etc.	Up to 3 points for a unit Candidates should submit evidence of collaboration
3.3	Certified teaching activity at a foreign university	Up to 8 points cumulatively See Points allocated for work at a foreign university Candidates should attach evidence
3.4	Mentorship	
3.4.1	- for diplomas (UNI) or second cycle (Bologna system)	Up to 1 point for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.4.2	- for first-cycle diplomas (VŠ) or first cycle (Bologna system)	Up to 0.5 points for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.4.3	- student research papers	Up to 1 point for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.4.4	- student art projects	Up to 1 point for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.4.5	- in national classifications in highly competitive contests	Up to 1.5 points for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.4.6	- in international classifications in highly competitive contests	Up to 2 points for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.4.7	- for faculty Prešeren awards	Up to 1.5 points for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship Mentorships in works produced as bachelor's or master's theses and given Prešeren awards cannot be allocated duplicate points, i.e. as a bachelor's or master's thesis and at the same time as a Prešeren award. Candidates should allocate points for such works only in this column.
3.4.8	- for University Prešeren awards	Up to 2 points for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship Mentorships in works produced as bachelor's or master's theses and given Prešeren awards cannot be allocated duplicate points, i.e. as a bachelor's or master's thesis and at the same time as a Prešeren award.

		Candidates should allocate points for such works only in this column.
3.4.9	- master's theses (pre-Bologna system)	Up to 2 points for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.4.10	- doctoral theses	Up to 3 points for a unit In the case of co-mentorship, see Points for co-mentorship
3.5	Student evaluation with an average rating in the top 10% of the assessment scale at a member institution; only one subject is taken into account per year	Up to 3 points cumulatively Candidates may allocate a maximum of half a point each for the results of student surveys for one year, even if the candidate has attained good ratings in several subjects (one subject will suffice), and in all appointment periods together (cumulatively) they may attain a maximum of 3 points. In their applications, candidates should submit an extract from the entire readout of the survey results, showing only the results that support the points allocated (not the entire readout), or appropriate certification from the professional services.
3.6	Students' award for teaching (awards are defined by the member institutions' specific guidelines)	Up to 3 points for an award Candidates should attach evidence
3.7	Organisation of summer school, seminar, competition	
3.7.1	- with predominantly foreign participation	Up to 2 points for a unit Candidates should attach evidence
3.7.2	- with predominantly domestic participation	up to 1 point for a unit Candidates should attach evidence
3.8	Participation in organised teacher training (at university level or in an international context), with proof of participation	Up to 1 point cumulatively, even if the candidate attended several such trainings Candidates should attach evidence
4.	PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY	
4.1	Popular science book	
4.1.1	- domestic publisher	Up to 3 points for a bibliographic unit See Manuals, dictionaries, lexicons, popular science books
4.1.2	- international publisher	Up to 6 points for a bibliographic unit See Manuals, dictionaries, lexicons, popular science books
4.2	Editor or co-editor of a journal, book or conference proceedings	
4.2.1	- domestic	Up to 3 points for publication
4.2.2	- international	Up to 6 points for publication

4.3	Professional article or computer program	Up to 1 point for a bibliographic unit
4.4	Published presentations, reports and expert papers	Up to 0.5 points for a bibliographic unit
4.5	Popular papers	Up to 0.1 points for a bibliographic unit
4.6	Knowledge transfer to the wider community	
4.6.1	Mentorship for start-ups that develop innovative products and services	Up to 2 points
4.6.2	Managing R&D (commercial) projects commissioned by commercial entities	Up to 1 point, maximum of 12 points in total
4.6.3	Knowledge transfer (a sold or licensed patent, patent application, plant-breeding right and/or expertise and experience), in which the candidate for appointment to a title is involved via a contract concluded between the UL and a company in accordance with Articles 18 and 19 of the Rules on the Management of Industrial Property Rights at the University of Ljubljana	Up to 1 point, maximum of 12 points in total
4.6.4	Project-based cooperation through innovative products and services at educational, cultural, art, health and humanitarian institutions	Up to 1 point, maximum of 12 points in total
4.6.5	Participation in drafting of laws, regulations or standards	Up to 1 point, maximum of 12 points in total
4.7	Involvement in a top sporting achievement	
4.7.1	Highly promising athletes	Up to 3 points
4.7.2	Athletes of international class	Up to 5 points
4.7.3	Athletes of world class	Up to 10 points
4.7.4	Top-ranking professional achievements in a field	Up to 12 points
4.8	Other documented professional activity at the discretion of reviewers' panels	Total (cumulatively) up to 12 points Candidates should attach evidence

The official consolidated text of the Instructions for Implementation of the Criteria (Technical Instructions) No 5 shall take effect on the day after its publication on the University of Ljubljana website.

Reference no.: 012-1/2015
Date: 17 June 2025

Professor Gregor Majdič
President of the Senate of the University of Ljubljana
Rector of the UL