Annex No. 1

Guidelines for the Evaluation of Nominations for the CTU Rector's Awards

Article 1

Purpose of the Guidelines

1. These Guidelines describe how nominations for the CTU Rector's Awards are evaluated, the criteria according to which points are allocated, and the procedure followed by the evaluation bodies.
2. The Guidelines are binding on everyone involved in the administration or evaluation of nominations.

Article 2

Principles of Evaluation

The evaluation is based on the following principles:

a) expertise,
b) transparency,
c) impartiality,
d) equal treatment,
e) proportionality with regard to differences between disciplines,
f) quality of the documents submitted.

In addition to the quality and exceptional nature of the result, activity or contribution, their significance, impact and contribution to the fulfilment of CTU's strategic priorities under the Strategic Plan 2026+ are also evaluated.

Article 3

Nomination Form and Supporting Documents

1. Nominations are submitted via an electronic form published on the website.
2. The form has a common part for all categories and a part specific to the selected category.
3. A nomination contains in particular:
   a) a brief justification for the nomination,
   b) a description of the quality, originality or exceptional nature of the result, activity or contribution,
   c) a description of the significance, impact or contribution,
   d) a description of the link to CTU's strategic priorities,
   e) relevant annexes or references to information systems.
4. When assessing whether a nomination constitutes a repeat nomination of a result or activity that has already received an Award, its substantive content is assessed, not merely its title, form or manner of presentation. In particular, a mere continuation, update, partial extension or further phase of implementation is not considered a new result or activity.
5. Where a nomination is submitted by a person other than the nominee, the proposer confirms in the nomination form that the nominee's consent to the nomination was obtained before it was submitted. In the case of a team nomination, the consent of the person representing the team is sufficient.

6. Information available in CTU information systems or public registers does not need to be documented again.
7. For publication results, bibliographic data, affiliations and other recorded information are verified primarily in V3S. For other results, the relevant university or public information systems may be used.

Article 4
Evaluation Procedure

1. Nominations in all categories are considered by the Rector's Board.
2. The evaluation consists of three consecutive steps:

a) a formal check of the nominations,
b) consideration of the nominations by the evaluation body and a recommendation to the Rector,
c) the Rector's final decision on the conferral of the awards.

The administrative unit prepares the necessary documents for the evaluation body. Individual evaluators, however, assess the nominations independently. Where necessary for the decision, the evaluation body may request additional documents or an expert review.

Article 5
Scoring

1. Each criterion is scored on a scale of 0 to 5 points.

Points	Level
5	Exceptional
4	very high
3	high
2	medium
1	limited
0	does not meet the criterion or not documented

2. The criteria and their weights for the individual categories are set out in Articles 6 to 11 of this Annex.
3. The points for the individual criteria are converted, according to their weights, into an overall score in the range of 0 to 100 points. The contribution of each criterion is calculated using the formula:
   (points awarded / 5 × weight of the criterion) × 100
   The sum of the converted points for all criteria constitutes the overall score of the nomination in the range of 0 to 100 points.
4. Evaluators briefly justify in particular scores of 0 or 5 points. The justification is based on documented facts and relates to the specific criterion.
5. The points help to assess and compare nominations in a structured way, but they do not replace the expert judgement of the evaluation body.
6. Strategic contribution to CTU means the extent to which the nominated result, activity or contribution supports the long-term development of CTU, its strategic priorities, its quality and international competitiveness, its good reputation, cooperation across the university or CTU's ability to fulfil its academic and social mission. The specific strategic contribution is assessed with regard to the nature of the relevant category.

Article 6

Basic Research Award

1. The following are evaluated:

Criterion	Weight
Professional quality and originality of the result	35 %
Significance of the result for the development of the discipline	25 %
Scientific impact of the result	20 %
Strategic contribution to CTU	20 %

2. Professional quality includes in particular the novelty of the result, the difficulty of the problem addressed and the persuasiveness of the methods used.
3. Scientific impact is assessed in the context of the discipline and with regard to the time elapsed since the result was published. Bibliometric indicators may support the evaluation but are not its sole basis.
4. For results with multiple authors or institutions, the specific contribution of the nominee or the CTU team is evaluated.

Article 7

Applied Research Award

1. The following are evaluated:

Criterion	Weight
Professional and technical quality and originality	25 %
Degree of practical application	30 %
Demonstrable or credibly documented impact	25 %
Strategic contribution to CTU	20 %

2. Practical application includes in particular the use of the result in practice, its putting into operation, licensing, commercialisation or use by public administration or another target group.
3. The result need not be commercial in nature. Demonstrable use in the public, health, security, environmental or non-profit sector is also relevant.
4. A patent, utility model, prototype or other formal result does not in itself demonstrate impact. The decisive factor is primarily actual or imminently expected use.

Article 8

Doctoral Dissertation Award

1. The following are evaluated:

Criterion	Weight
Professional quality and originality of the dissertation	35 %
Contribution to the development of the discipline	25 %
Quality and significance of the results achieved	20 %
Strategic contribution to CTU	20 %

2. The evaluation takes into account in particular the degree of independence of the author of the dissertation, the methodological standard of the work, the quality of the publication or applied outputs and the potential for further development of the results.
3. Publication and other outputs are assessed in the context of the relevant discipline. The number of publications alone or other purely quantitative indicators are not decisive.

4. The evaluation takes into account the length of the doctoral studies and documented circumstances that may have affected the opportunities for professional activity. These circumstances must not in themselves lead to the nominee being disadvantaged.
5. The evaluation focuses primarily on the quality of the dissertation and the results of its author.

Article 9
Teaching Excellence Award

1. The following are evaluated:

Criterion	Weight
Quality of teaching activity	30 %
Innovation and development of teaching	25 %
Contribution to students and the learning environment	25 %
Strategic contribution to CTU	20 %

2. The evaluation may draw in particular on:
   a) the results of student evaluations of teaching,
   b) a description of teaching innovations,
   c) courses, study materials or educational tools created,
   d) a documented contribution to the development of study programmes,
   e) support for students and early-career teachers,
   f) other verifiable results of teaching activity.
3. Student evaluation of teaching is a supporting source and is assessed in the context of the size of the course, the type of teaching, the response rate and other relevant circumstances.
4. The number of courses taught, students or hours alone is not indicative of the quality of teaching activity.

Article 10
CTU Rector's Award – Professional Service Award

1. The following are evaluated:

Criterion	**Weight**
Quality and exceptional nature of the professional contribution	30 %
Impact on the functioning or development of CTU	30 %
Innovation, initiative and transferability of good practice	20 %
Strategic contribution to CTU	20 %

2. The quality and exceptional nature of the professional contribution is assessed in particular according to the extent to which the activity of the nominee or team goes beyond the normally expected performance of work duties and represents an above-standard professional, organisational or institutional contribution.
3. The impact on the functioning or development of CTU as a whole or of its constituent parts may consist in particular in:
   a) improving the quality or availability of services,
   b) making processes more efficient or simpler,
   c) improving cooperation between workplaces or units of CTU,
   d) increasing professionalism, the quality of management or the support of academic activities,
   e) a significant contribution to the development of research, education or other academic activities and to the conditions for achieving high-quality results,

f) a significant contribution to obtaining and successfully implementing externally funded projects or to developing strategic partnerships,
g) a significant contribution to the working or institutional culture,
h) creating or developing a solution with wider use within CTU.

4. Innovation, initiative and transferability of good practice include in particular the ability to identify the need for change, to propose and implement a suitable solution, to introduce new approaches or to develop procedures that can also be used at other CTU workplaces.
5. The nomination must describe the specific contribution of the nominee or team and demonstrate how this contribution goes beyond the normal scope of the work role performed. The length of service at CTU, the scope of work duties or the proper performance of routine work tasks are not in themselves grounds for a high score.
6. Impact may be documented in particular by:
   a) specific changes to processes, services or the way the workplace operates,
   b) measurable results or indicators,
   c) documented use of the solution created,
   d) statements from users, cooperating workplaces or management,
   e) extension of the solution to other workplaces,
   f) other verifiable facts.
7. The evaluation takes into account the conditions in which the nominee or team operates, the extent of the resources available and the scope for influencing the functioning of the institution. The contribution of a smaller workplace or a locally focused initiative must therefore not be disadvantaged solely because of its smaller scale.

Article 11

CTU Rector's Award – Social Impact Award

1. The following are evaluated:

Criterion	Weight
Significance of the societal problem addressed	20 %
Demonstrable social impact	40 %
Quality and sustainability of the solution	20 %
Strategic contribution to CTU	20 %

2. Nominations are scored in accordance with Article 5. Individual evaluation is governed by Article 12, and the consideration of nominations and the recommendation to the Rector by Article 13.
3. The subject of the evaluation is not primarily the professional or technical quality of the result, but the social impact to which the activity of the nominee or team has demonstrably contributed.
4. Social impact means a demonstrable positive change outside the academic environment, for example for the benefit of the public, civil society, public administration, the non-profit sector, professional or institutional practice, local communities or disadvantaged groups.
5. Impact may take the form of, for example:
   a) improving quality of life or the availability of services,
   b) a change in public policy or in decision-making, professional or institutional practice,
   c) solving an environmental, health, social or security problem,

   d) introducing a new procedure, tool or technology with a demonstrable social benefit,
   e) strengthening civil society or local communities,
   f) increasing access to knowledge, education or technology,
   g) eliminating or reducing inequalities.
6. The nomination describes:
   a) the problem addressed and the target group,
   b) the activities carried out,
   c) the change achieved,
   d) the role of the nominee or the CTU team,
   e) how the impact is documented.
7. Impact may be documented, for example, by data on the use of the result, an independent evaluation, a statement from a partner or the target group, adoption of the result into practice, a change in decision-making, measurable data or other verifiable evidence.
8. Media coverage, attendance figures or the number of communication outputs may support the evaluation but do not in themselves demonstrate social impact.
9. Impact is assessed in proportion to the resources available, the duration of implementation, the nature of the target group and the difficulty of achieving the change. The evaluation takes into account not only the scale but also the depth, significance and permanence of the change achieved. A smaller or local initiative must therefore not be disadvantaged merely because it reached fewer people.

Article 12

Individual Evaluation

1. In all categories, each nomination is individually evaluated by at least five members of the Rector's Board. Nominations may be distributed among the members of the Rector's Board so as to ensure a reasonable distribution of the evaluation workload and the comparability of evaluations.
2. Each evaluator states:
   a) the points for the individual criteria,
   b) a brief overall justification,
   c) any reservations or the need for additional documents,
   d) a recommendation as to whether the nomination reaches the level warranting the conferral of the Award.
3. If the overall scores of the individual evaluators differ substantially, the Rector's Board takes the difference into account during the joint consideration. A difference of at least 20 points out of 100 is considered substantial.
4. The individual evaluation serves as the basis for the joint consideration of nominations by the Rector's Board; in itself it does not determine the ranking or give rise to any entitlement to the Award.

Article 13

Consideration of Nominations by the Rector's Board

1. The Rector's Board considers nominations in all categories on the basis of the individual evaluations and the documents submitted.
2. During its consideration, the Rector's Board in particular:
   a) assesses the results of the individual evaluations,
   b) discusses significant differences between evaluators,

c) assesses the nominations as a whole and their comparability with one another,
d) determines the final ranking or the group of highest-rated nominations,
e) assesses whether the nominations reach the level warranting the conferral of the Award,
f) proposes the number of Awards and the amount of the financial rewards in the relevant category.

3. Only a nomination that achieves at least 70 points out of 100 in the individual evaluation may be recommended for the Award. Reaching this threshold does not in itself give rise to any entitlement to the Award.
4. The individual scores serve as the basis for the joint assessment of nominations. Where scores are equal or differ only slightly, the quality of the nominations as a whole is decisive, not a mechanical ranking by number of points. The Rector's Board briefly justifies its recommendation.
5. Where the conferral of several Awards in one category is recommended, the Rector's Board states the reasons and proposes the amount of each financial reward.

Article 14

Announcement of Results and Presentation of Laureates

1. The results in all categories are announced by the Rector, normally at a ceremonial session of the CTU Scientific Board or on another ceremonial occasion.
2. The ceremonial programme also includes a presentation of the awarded results, activities or personalities.

Article 15

Final Provisions

1. The CTU Rectorate publishes the organisational and technical details, timetable and forms for the relevant year no later than the opening of the nomination period.
2. Once the nomination period has opened, the evaluation criteria, their weights and the scoring system may not be changed for that year.
3. These Guidelines enter into force on 1 October 2026.