



Director,

Acad. Marius Andruh

REGULATION
on the evaluation of the scientific performance of researchers within the „Costin D. Nenitescu” Institute of Organic and Supramolecular Chemistry

I. General rules

1. The Regulation on the evaluation of the scientific performance of researchers within the „Costin D. Nenitescu” Institute of Organic and Supramolecular Chemistry (ICOS), hereinafter referred to as the „Regulation”, is drafted pursuant to Law no. 183/2024 regarding the status of research, development, and innovation personnel and in accordance with the Organization and Functioning Regulation and the Internal Regulation of ICOS.

2. This Regulation governs the organization and conduct of the periodic evaluation process of scientific performance and the results obtained by research personnel as provided in Art. 9, paragraph 1 of Law 183/2024, namely:

- (i) Principal Researcher (R4): Senior Scientific Researcher, Grade I – CS I.
- (ii) Established Researcher (R3): Senior Scientific Researcher, Grade II – CS II.
- (iii) Recognized Researcher (R2), holding a Ph.D.: Scientific Researcher, Grade III – CS III.
- (iv) Junior Researcher (R1), holding a Ph.D.: Scientific Researcher – CS.
- (v) Assistant in scientific research activity, graduate: Scientific Research Assistant – ACS.

3. (1) The evaluation of scientific performance is carried out every 4 years and represents a formalized procedure to determine the level of achievement of individual scientific activity criteria and indicators.

(2) The performance criteria and indicators, as well as the threshold values for establishing evaluation ratings by job category (ACS, CS, CS III, CS II, CS I) in Annex no. 1, have been approved by the ICOS Scientific Council for the period 2025–2028.

(3) The evaluation process **includes continuous monitoring of the results obtained by researchers**, correlated with monitoring the research activity of the Institute's Programs and Subprograms, to identify development needs and barriers encountered by researchers in achieving optimal scientific professional performance. Individual performance monitoring of researchers is carried out annually, together with monitoring the activity of research Subprograms (themes).

4. The purpose of evaluating researchers in scientific research is to improve organizational performance by developing the individual professional skills and performance of researchers.

5. The evaluation of professional performance applies to each researcher, in accordance with the legislation mentioned in point 1 and with this Regulation.

For the purposes of this Regulation, the following terms are defined as follows:

a) *Evaluation Committees* – established for each professional category mentioned in point 2 of the Regulation and composed of a chairperson and at least two members holding positions with higher professional grades than the category evaluated, plus a secretary.

b) *Appeals Committee* – composed of a chairperson and at least two members holding Grade I or II positions within the institute, plus a secretary.

c) *Evaluation ratings* – „unsatisfactory”, „satisfactory”, „good”, „very good”, established for each research position category and depending on the threshold values of performance indicators that define the ratings specific to the position (**Annex 1**).

d) *Individual performance indicators* specific to each research position category are calculated based on **Annex 1**.

e) *Evaluated period* – the period for which the researcher's evaluation is conducted.

f) *Evaluation period* – the period between January 1 and March 31 of the year following the evaluated period.

6. Program Directors (coordinators of Axes/Laboratories) are responsible for updating the individual performance criteria and indicators of all researchers in the Subprogram teams, in correlation with the objectives/performance indicators of the Subprogram and with the institutional objectives/performance indicators assumed through the Institutional Development Strategy approved by the ICOS Scientific Council.

7. The results of monitoring and evaluating scientific performance are considered when making decisions regarding employment, maintaining researchers in the same position, or promoting them, as well as continuing activity in the same position for researchers who meet the conditions for retirement.

8. The evaluation of researchers' scientific performance is carried out in compliance with the legal regime of conflict of interest concerning researchers in public institutions and in accordance with the provisions of the Labor Code.

9. The results of the scientific performance evaluations of researchers are approved by the head of the research organization and validated by the Scientific Council.

II. **Factors involved in the process of evaluating the professional performance of researchers, their duties, and obligations**

10. *The ICOS Scientific Council* approves – at the beginning of the evaluation period and whenever changes occur – the necessary and mandatory individual performance criteria/indicators for establishing evaluation ratings (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good, very good) for each professional category of researchers (**Annex no. 1**), according to the Institute's priorities and objectives.

11. *The ICOS Director* or the person designated by him/her has the following main duties and obligations:

a) ensures uniform and correct implementation of the evaluation procedure within the institute.

b) approves the performance criteria and indicators of the institute's researchers, in accordance with the applicable legislation.

c) issues the administrative act establishing the evaluation period, the evaluation committees identified for each professional category, as well as the Appeals Committee.

12. *Evaluation Committees* are established once every four years, by professional categories (ACS, CS, CS III, CS II, and CS I), before the start of the evaluation period, and have the following main duties/obligations:

a) analyse and discuss with the evaluated researcher the degree of fulfilment of the criteria based on individual performance indicators.

b) complete the Evaluation Report for the evaluated researcher.

c) propose a rating for professional performance evaluation.

d) send the Evaluation Report to the Human Resources and Payroll Department (CRU).

e) ensure objectivity and impartiality of the scientific performance evaluation results.

f) maintain confidentiality regarding the data in the Evaluation Report.

13. The Appeals Committee is established once every four years and has the following main duties and obligations:

- a) analyse appeals submitted by researchers dissatisfied with the evaluation results.
- b) decide on the outcome of appeals by a simple majority vote of the members present.
- c) prepare an Appeals Report, communicate it to the contesting researcher, and file a copy with the CRU.

14. The Program Director is the scientific and administrative coordinator of the research program team and has the following main duties and obligations:

- a) periodically monitors (at least once a year) the fulfilment of individual performance criteria/indicators for all researchers in the Program team.
- b) identifies training needs and proposes necessary measures together with the monitored researchers.
- c) prepares an annual Subprogram Evaluation Report that includes, in addition to annual monitoring data of the Program's objectives/criteria/indicators, individual monitoring data of researchers.

15. The evaluated Researcher has the following main duties and obligations:

- a) prepares the Evaluation Report (according to the criteria/performance indicators established based on the position held) – **Annex 2**.
- b) provides evidence confirming the achievement of objectives and comments on the assigned evaluation rating.
- c) cooperates in the evaluation process.
- d) Participates in identifying his/her professional development needs.

16. The Human Resources Department (CRU) is responsible for organizing the evaluation process of ICOS personnel and has the following main duties and obligations:

- a) before the start of each evaluation period, prepare the appointment decisions for the Evaluation and Appeals Committees approved by the Scientific Council for all professional categories to be evaluated and inform their members about the process based on the administrative act issued by the ICOS Director.
- b) provides researchers with this Regulation, which contains methodological recommendations for establishing criteria and performance indicators, the scoring grid for criteria/performance indicators (Annex 1), the rating determination grid (Annex 1), and templates for Evaluation Reports (Annex 2); additionally, CRU provides informational and methodological assistance to all stakeholders involved in the evaluation process.

c) designates people to act as secretaries of the Evaluation and Appeals Committees.

d) based on the information contained in the Evaluation Reports and suggestions from the Evaluation Committees, prepares the annual professional training plan.

e) archives all documents related to the evaluation process of researchers' individual performance in their personnel files.

III. Process of Evaluating Researchers' Scientific Performance

Section 1. Establishing/Reviewing Individual Performance Criteria/Indicators

17. (1) Individual performance criteria and indicators represent key priorities in the researcher's activity, involving the desired/expected results to be achieved during the evaluated period.

18. (1) Evaluation criteria are analysed and interpreted based on non-cumulative quantitative and qualitative indicators defined according to Law no. 183/2024, art. 27, but not limited to:

- *Results obtained in research activities and their impact.*
- *Management and/or leadership/coordination of research activities.*
- *Entrepreneurial activity/collaboration with the business environment and applicability of results in the economy/society.*
- *Continuous professional development.*

19. The main criteria and indicators are established at the beginning of the evaluation period for all researchers within ICOS.

20. Criteria and performance indicators are communicated to researchers at the beginning of the evaluated period or whenever changes occur.

21. Individual performance criteria/indicators may be revised whenever changes occur in ICOS's activity or organizational structure that led to changes in the evaluated researcher's tasks and responsibilities. The following situations are considered:

a) changes in priorities, organizational structure of the institute, objectives and/or tasks of the laboratory or institution.

b) change in the researcher's position.

c) newly hired researcher or one returning after suspension of employment (e.g., internship longer than six months, parental leave).

d) other causes: objective circumstances that made the established performance indicators unattainable for reasons not attributable to the evaluated researcher.

22. If the situations mentioned in point 21 occur during the evaluated period, the revision of individual performance criteria/indicators is made and communicated to all researchers within 30 days after their occurrence and affects the evaluation of individual performance only for the percentage of the period between the date of modification and the end of the evaluation period, if the interval exceeds six months.

Section 2. Procedure for Evaluating Researchers' Professional Performance

23. The procedure for evaluating researchers' professional performance is carried out by completing the *Evaluation Report* by the Evaluation Committee based on the *Activity Report* prepared by the evaluated researcher for the evaluated period, according to the pre-established qualitative and quantitative performance criteria and indicators.

24. The researcher's *Evaluation Report* contains information on the manner and level of fulfilment of individual performance criteria/indicators, professional development needs, and the assigned evaluation rating.

25. In the *Evaluation Report*, the Evaluation Committee records the researcher's results, objective difficulties encountered during the evaluated period, and any other relevant observations. If the Evaluation Committee assigns the rating „unsatisfactory“, it must provide relevant arguments in the „comments“ section of the *Evaluation Report*.

26. The evaluated researcher may provide comments in the *Evaluation Report* on any aspect relevant to the evaluation process and procedure within two working days of receiving the document.

27. In case of an „unsatisfactory“ rating, researchers are re-evaluated after 24 months, based on the decision of the head of the research organization.

28. For researchers who receive an „unsatisfactory“ rating in two consecutive evaluations, the research organization may reduce the base salary by up to 20% until the next scientific performance evaluation, reduce all salary bonuses and allowances by 50% until the next evaluation, or terminate the individual employment contract.

29. The Committee and the evaluated researcher may attach relevant documents/materials to the *Evaluation Report*.

30. If the evaluated researcher disagrees with the assigned rating or comments made by the Committee, he/she must justify his/her opinions and record comments in the *Evaluation Report*.

31. If the researcher refuses to sign the Evaluation Report, this refusal is noted in the „Signature“ section.

32. Researchers who disagree with the evaluation result may submit a written appeal to the Appeals Committee within two working days of acknowledgment.

33. The Appeals Committee, within ten working days of the appeal submission, will examine the appeal, requesting viewpoints from both the Evaluation Committee and the researcher evaluated.

34. The appeal result is communicated in writing to the researcher within three working days of the appeal review.

Section 3. Evaluation Ratings

35. Following the evaluation of professional performance, the evaluated researcher is assigned one of the following ratings: „unsatisfactory”, „satisfactory”, „good”, or „very good”.

36. Each evaluation criterion is scored based on indicators presented in **Annex no. 1**. The evaluation rating is determined according to the researcher’s professional category, based on the score ranges presented in **Annex no. 1**.

37. The final score for the evaluated period is obtained by calculating a weighted average between the sum of scores obtained in annual evaluations during the evaluated interval (10%) and the total score obtained for the same time interval based on the criteria in Annex no. 1 (90%). This final score will be used to assign ratings according to the score ranges provided in the same annex.

IV. Final stipulations

38. Scientific researchers who meet the conditions for retirement under public pension legislation may choose between receiving the old-age pension and continuing activity in the same research position, provided they obtained a ‘very good’ rating in the last periodic scientific performance evaluation.

39. For researchers retained in research positions after reaching retirement age, the periodic evaluation of scientific performance is carried out annually.

Annexes 1 and 2 were approved by the ICOS Scientific Council on 12.02.2025 and revised on 13.05.2025 and enter into force after endorsement by the Romanian Academy and the Advisory Board for Research, Development, and Innovation of this Regulation.

Human Resources Department
Economist Doinița Pașalega

Annex 1

**SCORING GRID AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR
RESEARCHERS**

I. Articles published in journals indexed in Web of Science (Clarivate Analytics)	Score/item
Articles published in ISI journals as lead author (first author or corresponding author), Q1 and Q2 zone calculated according to AIS	20
Articles published in ISI journals as lead author (first author or corresponding author), Q3 zone calculated according to AIS	10
Articles published in ISI journals as lead author (first author or corresponding author), Q4 zone calculated according to AIS	4
Articles published in ISI journals as co-author, Q1 and Q2 zone calculated according to AIS	10
Articles published in ISI journals as co-author, Q3 zone calculated according to AIS	5
Articles published in ISI journals as co-author, Q4 area calculated according to AIS	2
Articles published in non-ISI journals	0.1
Books published by renowned foreign publishing houses*	8
Book chapters published by renowned foreign publishers*	4
Plenary lectures delivered at international conferences**	5
Invited/keynote lectures delivered at international conferences**	4
Oral presentations at international conferences**	2
Posters presented at international conferences (only for ASC and CS) as a participant**	1

II. Visibility	
Number of citations according to Scopus or WOS	0.01
III. Grants/research projects	
Grant/project/contract obtained as coordinator/manager >€500,000 (RON 2,500,000) ***	15
Grant/project/contract obtained as coordinator/manager , €20,000–€499,999 (RON 100,000–RON 2,499,999) ***	12
Grant/project obtained as coordinator/manager , €19,999 (99,999 lei) ***	8
Grant/project obtained as a team member	3
Number of projects submitted as coordinator/manager , with a score of > 70%	2
Number of international patents granted	20
Number of national patents granted	2
Technologies/prototypes/technological services, etc., validated by the technology transfer committee within ICOS	10
IV. Other research activities	
Enabling	20
Doctoral supervision****	10*n
Doctoral thesis supervisor	5*n
Member of the doctoral supervision committee	5*n
Mentoring of diploma/dissertation theses	2*n
Total score	

*For published books/book chapters, those published by established publishers will be considered: Academic Press, Appleton & Lange, Birkhauser, Blackwell, Cambridge University Press, CRC Press, Elsevier, Garland Publishing, Kluwer Academic Publishers, McGraw-Hill, Mosby, Nova Science Publishers, Oxford University Press, QMP, Springer Verlag, Thieme, Willey-Liss, Williams and Wilkins, World Scientific Publishing, Intech, other foreign publishers of the same caliber (to be validated by the ICOS Scientific Council).

**Points for conferences/oral presentations will be awarded exclusively to the person who gave the presentation. For published scientific articles, the quartile of the year of publication of the article will be considered.

*** For the annual score, the budget allocated to ICOS will be considered, within the budgetary thresholds mentioned.

**** Doctorate defended/doctoral intern.

Cumulative score of the researcher for a period of 4 years:

Rating	ACS	CS	CSIII	CSII	CSI
Very good	≥ 20 p.	≥ 25 p	≥ 35 p	≥ 60 p	≥ 150 p
Good	15 – 19 p	20 – 24 p	30 – 34 p	55 – 59 p	130 – 149 p
Satisfactory	10 – 14 p	15 – 19 p	25 – 29 p	50 – 54 p	129 – 110 p
Unsatisfactory	< 10 p	< 15 p	< 25 p	< 50 p	< 110 p

Annex no. 2**EVALUATION REPORT – period:**

Name, surname (evaluated researcher):

Research position:

Program:

Results	Score/item	Score earned
I. Articles published in journals indexed in Web of Science (Clarivate Analytics)		
Articles published in ISI journals as lead author (first author or corresponding author), Q1 and Q2 zone calculated according to AIS	20	
Articles published in ISI journals as lead author (first author or corresponding author), Q3 zone calculated according to AIS	10	
Articles published in ISI journals as lead author (first author or corresponding author), Q4 zone calculated according to AIS	4	
Articles published in ISI journals as co-author, Q1 and Q2 zone calculated according to AIS	10	
Articles published in ISI journals as co-author, Q3 zone calculated according to AIS	5	
Articles published in ISI journals as co-author, Q4 area calculated according to AIS	2	
Articles published in non-ISI journals	0.1	
Books published by renowned foreign publishing houses*	8	

Book chapters published by renowned foreign publishers*	4	
Plenary lectures delivered at international conferences**	5	
Invited/keynote lectures delivered at international conferences**	4	
Oral presentations at international conferences**	2	
Posters presented at international conferences (only for ASC and CS) as a participant**	1	
II. Visibility		
Number of citations according to Scopus or WOS	0.01	
III. Grants/research projects		
Grant/project/contract obtained as coordinator/manager >€500,000 (RON 2,500,000) ***	15	
Grant/project/contract obtained as coordinator/manager , €20,000–€499,999 (RON 100,000–RON 2,499,999) ***	12	
Grant/project obtained as coordinator/manager , €19,999 (99,999 lei) ***	8	
Grant/project obtained as a team member	3	
Number of projects submitted as coordinator/manager , with a score of > 70%	2	
Number of international patents granted	20	
Number of national patents granted	2	
Technologies/prototypes/technological services, etc., validated by the technology transfer committee within ICOS	10	
IV. Other research activities		
Enabling	20	

Doctoral supervision****	10*n	
Doctoral thesis supervisor	5*n	
Member of the doctoral supervision committee	5*n	
Mentoring of diploma/dissertation theses	2*n	
Total score		

Proposals for the professional training of the evaluated researcher:

Evaluation Committee – date:		
<i>First name, last name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Signature</i>

Comments from the employee being evaluated (if applicable):

Evaluated researcher – date:		
<i>First name, last name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Signature</i>