STATUTE OF THE CTU RECTOR'S AWARDS

for outstanding academic, institutional and social impact

1. General Provisions

a) The Rector of the Czech Technical University in Prague (hereinafter "CTU") awards the CTU Rector's Awards (hereinafter the "Award") on an annual basis. The Award is an institutional recognition of outstanding results achieved in research, development, innovation, knowledge transfer, doctoral studies, teaching, professional and institutional activities and the social engagement of CTU.

b) The purpose of the Award is to recognise professional excellence, support the fulfilment of CTU's strategic priorities, strengthen the good reputation of CTU and raise the visibility of results and activities with a significant scientific, educational, applied, institutional and social contribution.

c) In the evaluation, considerable weight is given not only to the quality of the result or activity but also to its contribution to the strategic development of CTU. Detailed evaluation criteria and their weights are laid down in the Guidelines for the Evaluation of the CTU Rector's Awards (hereinafter the "Guidelines").

d) The Awards are conferred in the following categories:
   - **Basic Research Award**,
   - **Applied Research Award**,
   - **Doctoral Dissertation Award**,
   - **Teaching Excellence Award**,
   - **Professional Service Award**,
   - **Social Impact Award.**

e) The Awards are conferred at a single level. In each year, one or more awards may be conferred in each category, on the recommendation of the relevant evaluation body and with regard to the quality of the nominations submitted and the funds allocated for that year.

f) The Rector may decide not to confer the Award in a given category if none of the nominations reaches the required level of quality.

2. Evaluation Period

a) The evaluation period is the previous calendar year, i.e. the period from 1 January to 31 December of the year preceding the year in which nominations are submitted. Proposals for the conferral of the Awards are submitted annually by **31 October** at the latest.

b) In the Basic Research Award category, the result evaluated must have been completed during the evaluation period. For a publication result, the moment of completion is the date on which it was accepted for publication ("accepted"), as evidenced by the publication itself or by confirmation from the publisher. Subsequent publication, assignment of a DOI or inclusion in a specific issue or volume has no bearing on the determination of this moment. The result must be

publicly available in its final published form no later than the date the nomination is submitted.

c) In the Applied Research Award category, a result is considered completed at the moment it reaches a form that allows it to be verified, made available or put to practical use. This may include in particular a verified proof of concept, a released or deployed version of software, a published or accessible dataset, a functional prototype, a technology, a methodology or another comparable result. The specific way in which completion of the result is documented is assessed with regard to its nature.

d) Where the fundamental significance of a result became apparent only after some time, an older result may exceptionally be nominated, but no more than four years old (as at the end of the evaluation period), provided that its substantial scientific, applied or social impact occurred during the evaluation period. The age of the result is determined by the moment of its completion under letters c) and d). This exception does not apply to the Doctoral Dissertation Award category.

e) In the Doctoral Dissertation Award category, only a dissertation successfully defended during the evaluation period may be nominated, and the defence must have taken place within the standard period of study plus one year from the commencement of the relevant doctoral studies. In justified cases, periods of interrupted study may be taken into account when assessing this time limit, in particular for reasons of parenthood, long-term illness or other serious personal circumstances.

f) In the Teaching Excellence Award category, the evaluation focuses primarily on teaching activity carried out during the evaluation period; its long-term contribution may also be taken into account.

g) In the Professional Service Award category, the evaluation focuses primarily on professional activity, an initiative, a result or an institutional contribution that took place or became significantly apparent during the evaluation period; the long-term contribution of the nominee to the functioning, development or culture of CTU may also be taken into account.

3. Eligibility of Nominees and Affiliation with CTU

a) Persons employed at or studying at CTU, graduates of CTU doctoral study programmes to the extent set out in this Statute, and teams may be nominated, provided they meet the conditions of the relevant category.

b) The decisive factor is the nominee's link to CTU at the time the evaluated result or activity was created or carried out. The nominated result or activity must also fall within the evaluation period set for the relevant category under Article 2. The fact that the nominee is no longer employed at or studying at CTU at the time of nomination does not in itself preclude the nomination. For results of basic and applied research, it must be unambiguously clear from the result and its presentation that it was created while the nominee or team was active at CTU. In all cases where affiliation is a standard part of the output, the affiliation with CTU must be stated.

c) For results created in cooperation between several institutions, a substantial and specific contribution by the nominee or team active at CTU must be documented. A formal affiliation alone, without a demonstrable share in the result, is not sufficient.

d) In the Doctoral Dissertation Award category, a person may be nominated who has successfully completed a doctoral study programme delivered at CTU and whose dissertation was successfully defended at CTU during the evaluation period.

e) In the Teaching Excellence Award category, a person may be nominated who carried out teaching activity at CTU during the evaluation period, regardless of the specific type of employment or similar relationship, provided they meet the other conditions set out in this Statute and the Guidelines.
f) In the Professional Service Award category, a person may be nominated who held a non-academic position at CTU during the evaluation period and whose professional activity significantly contributed to the functioning, development, quality of services, institutional culture or fulfilment of the strategic objectives of CTU.
g) In the case of a team nomination, the composition of the team, the person in charge of the team or the contact person, the roles of the individual team members and their relationship to CTU must be stated. The team may also include persons working outside CTU, provided that a substantial part of the result is linked to CTU and this fact is duly documented in the nomination.

4. Proposals for the Conferral of the Awards

a) Proposals may be submitted by persons in leadership positions at CTU from the level of heads of departments or institutes, deans of faculties, directors of university institutes and of other constituent parts of CTU. In the Doctoral Dissertation Award category, a proposal may also be submitted by the chair of the relevant doctoral subject-area board or of the dissertation defence committee.
b) A nomination may also be submitted directly by the person concerned, i.e. as a self-nomination.
c) A nomination submitted by another person requires the consent of the nominee before it is included in the evaluation. In the case of a team, the consent of the person representing the team is sufficient, unless the Guidelines provide otherwise.
d) The proposal is submitted electronically via a form published by the CTU Rectorate on its website and contains in particular:
   - basic information about the nominee; for teams, their composition and the identification of the person in charge of the team or the contact person,
   - the workplace and information on the link and affiliation with CTU,
   - the category,
   - a description of the result or activity and the justification for the nomination,
   - a definition of the role and specific contribution of the nominee or team,
   - evidence of the impact and strategic contribution to CTU,
   - other documents and annexes required by the Guidelines.
e) There is no limit on the number of nominations submitted by one unit of CTU.
f) A single result may be nominated in only one category in a given year. The same person may be nominated in several categories in a given year only if the results or activities concerned differ in substance.
g) A result or activity for which the Award has already been conferred may not be nominated again. The same applies to a result or activity that constitutes merely a further development, continuation or partial extension of a result or activity that has already received the Award.

5. Inadmissible Nominations and Formal Check

a) A nomination cannot be accepted for evaluation if it:
   - was submitted after the closing date,

- does not meet the conditions of the evaluation period or the eligibility of nominees,
- does not contain the mandatory information or documents and was not completed within the set time limit,
- does not allow the relationship of the result or activity to CTU to be verified,
- relates to a result or activity that has already received the Award,
- is connected with a breach of legal regulations, ethical rules, principles of research integrity or rules of good scientific practice that has been finally established or reliably ascertained.

b) The formal check of nominations is carried out by the Department for Science and Research of the CTU Rectorate. The Department is entitled to ask the proposer to complete or clarify the information within a reasonable time limit.

c) Decisions not to include a nomination in the expert evaluation on formal grounds are taken by the authorised unit of the Rectorate; in case of doubt, the Rector or a Vice-Rector authorised by the Rector decides.

6. Assessment of Proposals

a) Nominations in all categories are assessed by the Rector's Board. For this purpose, the Rector's Board acts as the Rector's evaluation and advisory body.

b) The evaluation body assesses nominations in accordance with this Statute and the Guidelines. The evaluation covers the professional quality of the result or activity, its impact and its strategic contribution to CTU. Strategic contribution is a separate and significant component of the evaluation; its specific weight may vary according to the nature of the individual categories.

c) The evaluation body may request additional information, an expert opinion or an external review. It may also recommend that the Award not be conferred in a given category.

d) The evaluation body submits a reasoned recommendation on the conferral of the Award to the Rector. The final decision on the conferral of the Award rests with the Rector.

7. Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality

a) Every member of the evaluation body is obliged to report any actual or potential conflict of interest without delay and to refrain from evaluating the nomination concerned.

b) A conflict of interest is understood to include in particular co-authorship of the nominated result, direct collaboration on the evaluated project, a direct superior-subordinate employment relationship, a supervisory relationship, a close personal or family relationship, or any other circumstance that may give rise to reasonable doubts as to impartiality.

c) Mere membership of the same faculty or unit of CTU does not automatically constitute a conflict of interest; the evaluator is, however, obliged to report any circumstances that could affect their impartiality.

d) Members of the evaluation bodies and persons involved in the administration are obliged to maintain confidentiality regarding non-public information contained in the nominations and regarding the course of the evaluation.

8. Conferral of the Awards

a) The Awards are conferred by the Rector of CTU on the recommendation of the relevant evaluation body.
b) The Award is normally presented at a ceremonial session of the CTU Scientific Board or on another ceremonial occasion designated by the Rector.
c) Each year the Rector sets the total amount allocated to the financial rewards for laureates. For each year, an amount is allocated to the Rector's Awards, and its distribution among the individual categories is determined by the Rector on the recommendation of the relevant evaluation bodies.
d) For a team Award, the distribution of the financial reward is determined by the Rector on the recommendation of the evaluation body or on the proposal of the leader of the awarded team.

9. Verification of Information and Withdrawal of the Award

a) The CTU Rectorate is entitled to verify the information given in a nomination at any time during the evaluation and to request additional supporting documents.
b) If a nomination is found to contain false, substantially incomplete or misleading information, it may be excluded from the evaluation.
c) If such facts come to light only after the Award has been conferred, or if a serious breach of legal regulations, ethical rules, principles of research integrity or other rules relevant to the awarded result, activity or contribution is subsequently proven, the Rector may, after consulting the relevant evaluation body, decide to withdraw the Award.

10. Final Provisions

a) The Award may be conferred on the same person more than once, provided that the result or activity differs in theme and substance.
b) There is no legal entitlement to the conferral of the Award. Decisions taken in the course of the evaluation of nominations are not subject to appeal.
c) Details of the content of nominations, the criteria, weights, scoring system, evaluation procedure and the role of public presentations are laid down in the Guidelines issued by the Rector. Organisational and technical details, forms and the timetable for the relevant year are published by the CTU Rectorate.

prof. Dr. Ing. Michal Pěchouček, MSc.
Rector of CTU

Annex No. 1 Guidelines