

DOCUMENTOS ANEXOS À ATA

Reunião do dia ____/____/____

Presidente

Assinatura

Secretário

Assinatura

Documento nº _____

Pág. de _____ a _____

**DOCUMENTARY COMPETITION FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN THE SCIENTIFIC AREA OF BUSINESS
SCIENCES – DISCIPLINARY AREA OF ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT
SELECTION AND RANKING CRITERIA FOR CANDIDATES**

GENERAL PROVISIONS

- 1) *The evaluation is based on three main criteria. Each criterion and its respective weighting form a grid to be considered in the assessment of candidates, as follows:*

<i>1 – Candidate's Technical-Scientific Performance (DTC)</i>	<i>35%</i>
<i>2 – Candidate's Pedagogical Capacity (CP)</i>	<i>35%</i>
<i>3 – Other Activities Relevant to the Mission of ESTG P.PORTO (OAR)</i>	<i>30%</i>

- 2) *The subdivisions of each of these three points, along with their respective scoring, shall be those established later in this document*
- 3) *Only elements for which the candidate can provide objective evidence will be evaluated.*
- 4) *The Jury reserves the right not to award the maximum score if the presented elements are manifestly insufficient;*
- 5) *Any action or attribute of the candidates cannot be counted in more than one section of the grid.;*
- 6) *In the event of a tie, candidates will be ranked based on the Technical-Scientific Performance (DTC) score; Pedagogical Capacity (CP) score, and Other Activities Relevant to the Mission of ESTG/P.PORTO (OAR) score.*
- 7) *The Curriculum Vitae and supporting documents must be structured according to the competition's evaluation grid. Failure to comply with this organization may result in the jury disregarding those elements in its evaluation.*

1 – Candidate's Technical-Scientific Performance (DTC)

The Technical-Scientific Performance score considers five components with the following maximum scores:

<i>1.1 – Scientific Publications</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>1.2 – Participation in R&D Activities and Projects</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>1.3 – Supervision of Academic Work</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>1.4 – Participation in Juries Leading to Academic Degrees/Titles</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>1.5 – Scientific Development Project</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>1.6 – Business Activity relevant to the scientific area</i>	<i>5</i>

The scoring is based on a comparative analysis of curricular elements from the last 10 years

1.1 – Scientific Publications

Publications, relevant to the disciplinary area, will be awarded the following scores:

1.1.1. Full scientific-technical book or patent	40
--	-----------

1.1.2. Article published in a journal ranked in Q1 or Q2 of the Journal Citation Reports	35
1.1.3. Article published in a journal indexed in WoS or Scopus (not included above)	25
1.1.4. Full paper published in conference proceedings indexed in WoS or Scopus	10
1.1.5. Abstract or extended abstract published in WoS or Scimago proceedings	8
1.1.6. Article published in a journal (not included above)	10
1.1.7. Book chapter	10
1.1.8. Full paper published in conference proceedings (not included above)	8
1.1.9. Other communications/publications	5
1.1.10. Member of the scientific committee of scientific events (conferences, seminars, etc.)	5

For the scientific publications component (points 1.1.1 to 1.1.9), a total of 20 works selected by the candidate will be considered. For the calculation of point 1.1.10, occurrences are taken into account.

For counting purposes, each occurrence will be multiplied by the respective score.

Once the total sum is calculated for all candidates, the highest-scoring candidate will be awarded 30 points, with the remaining candidates ranked proportionally.

1.2 – Participation in R&D Activities and Projects

Provided they are relevant to the competition's subject area, the following scores will be assigned:

1.2.1 – Director of a Research Center recognized by FCT	10
1.2.2 – Deputy Director of a Research Center recognized by FCT	8
1.2.3 – Integrated Member of a Research Center recognized by FCT	5
1.2.4 – Overall or Institutional Coordination of Projects	8
1.2.5 – Participation in R&D Projects	6
1.2.6 – Participation in Knowledge Transfer Service Activities	4

For scoring purposes:

- Points 1.2.1 to 1.2.3 will be multiplied by the number of years in the role, up to a maximum of five years per role.*
- Points 1.2.4 to 1.2.6 will be multiplied by the number of occurrences within the last ten years.*
- For point 1.2.3, participation as a collaborating member in an FCT-recognized research center will be considered, with a weight of 50% of the score assigned to an Integrated Member.*

Once the total sum is calculated for all candidates, the highest-scoring candidate will be awarded 20 points, with the remaining candidates ranked proportionally.

1.3 – Supervision of Academic Works

The following components will be considered for the supervision of academic works in the scientific area of the competition:

1.3.1. Supervision and Co-supervision of Master's Dissertation/Project/Internship	60
1.3.2. Supervision and Co-supervision of Doctoral Theses	80

For this component, a total of 15 supervisions and/or co-supervisions selected by the candidate will be considered. For scoring purposes, each occurrence will be multiplied by the respective score.

Once the total sum is calculated for all candidates, the highest-scoring candidate will be awarded 15

points, with the remaining candidates ranked proportionally.

1.4. – Participation in Academic Degree/Title Awarding Juries

The following components will be considered for participation in juries awarding academic degrees/titles in the scientific area of the competition:

1.4.1. Examiner for Bachelor's or Technical Superior Course Project/Report	40
1.4.2. Examiner for Master's Dissertation/Project/Internship	60
1.4.3. Examiner for Doctoral Theses	80

For this component, a total of 20 examinations selected by the candidate will be considered.

For scoring purposes, each occurrence will be multiplied by the respective score.

Once the total sum is calculated for all candidates, the highest-scoring candidate will be awarded 5 points, with the remaining candidates ranked proportionally.

1.5 – Scientific Development Project

The candidate must submit a scientific development project with a maximum of 2,500 words.

The jury will evaluate the potential of the submitted project for the scientific development of the discipline under competition – Organisation and Management. This project must align with the mission of ESTG.IPP and will be assessed based on its objectives, proposed actions, and scientific activities.

In analyzing the scientific development project, the following aspects will be considered: Clarity and quality of presentation; Relevance and timeliness of content; Other complementary elements deemed relevant; Special attention to its potential contribution to the scientific development of the discipline; Coherence of the candidate's scientific perspectives, particularly regarding publication intentions (in terms of journals) and submission of projects (and their funding sources)

Four weighting levels will be applied: Highly suitable – 100%; Suitable – 60%; Marginally suitable – 30%; Not suitable – 0%.

Once the total sum is calculated for all candidates, the highest-scoring candidate will be awarded 25 points, with the remaining candidates ranked proportionally.

1.6 – Relevant Business Activity in the Scientific Field

The scoring for Relevant Business Activity in the Scientific Field shall be based on the last ten years and shall only consider professional experience in the business sector, with the following scores assigned:

1.6.1 – Executive management positions in companies	12
1.6.2 – Technical positions related to the scientific field of the competition	10
1.6.3 – Other roles in companies	2

For the purpose of scoring, each position shall be multiplied by the number of years of service in the role, up to a maximum of five years per position.

After summing the scores for all candidates, the highest-scoring candidate shall receive the maximum of 5 points, with the remaining candidates ranked proportionally.

2 – Candidate's Teaching Ability (CP)

The Teaching Ability score will be calculated based on four service components, considered only within the scope of Higher Education, with the following maximum scores:

2.1 – Teaching Activity	35
2.2 – Development of Teaching Resources	35
2.3 – Participation in Pedagogical Groups/Committees	5
2.4 – Pedagogical Development Project	25

The scores for the various components of teaching ability will be determined through a comparative analysis of the curriculum elements presented by candidates, referencing the last five years while respecting the maximum scores mentioned earlier.

2.1 – Teaching Activity

For the Teaching Activity score, the number of curricular units taught per semester in the disciplinary area will be considered. Ten points will be assigned per curricular unit taught, and three points will be awarded for responsibility/coordination of a curricular unit. Once the total sum is calculated for all candidates, the highest-scoring candidate will be awarded 35 points, with the remaining candidates ranked proportionally.

2.2 – Development of Teaching Resources

The candidate must submit a portfolio of the teaching resources used in a curricular unit of their choice. This will be analyzed to assess its actual quality and relevance to the disciplinary area under competition.

Four levels of evaluation will be considered: Very adequate → 100%; Adequate → 60%; Somewhat adequate → 30%; Not adequate → 0%

Once the total scores of all candidates are summed, the candidate with the highest total will receive the maximum score of 35 points, with the remaining candidates ranked proportionally.

2.3 – Participation in Pedagogical Groups/Committees

Participation in scientific area committees will be evaluated with the following scoring system:

- 2.3.1) Committee for the creation of degree-awarding programs : 5 points per participation*
- 2.3.2) Committee for the creation of non-degree programs with 30 or more ECTS or 750+ contact hours : 3 points per participation*

After calculating the total score for all candidates, the candidate with the highest score will receive a maximum of 5 points, while the other candidates will be ranked proportionally.

2.4 – Pedagogical Development Project

The candidate must submit a pedagogical development project with a maximum length of 2,500 words.

The jury will evaluate the potential of the submitted project for the pedagogical development of the

disciplinary area in competition – Organisation and Management. This project must be aligned with the mission of ESTG.IPP will be assessed based on objectives, proposed actions, and pedagogical activities, including organizational aspects, clarity and quality of the presentation, relevance of the content, and other complementary factors. Special attention will be given to the potential contribution to the pedagogical development of the disciplinary area and the coherence of the candidate's pedagogical perspectives.

Evaluation Criteria: Very suitable → 100%; Suitable → 60%; Somewhat suitable → 30%; Not suitable → 0%

Once the total scores for all candidates are summed, the candidate with the highest total will receive the maximum score of 25 points, with the remaining candidates ranked proportionally.

3 – Other Activities Relevant to the Mission of ESTG / P.PORTO (OAR)

The highest possible score for this item will be 100 points, determined through a comparative analysis of the curricular elements presented by candidates over the past 10 years. Candidates will be ranked proportionally, considering the duration, responsibilities of roles/functions, and maximum scoring levels for each category.

3.1	President of a management body of UO/IES	15
3.2	Vice-President of a management body of UO/IES	12
3.3	Member of a management body of UO/IES	8
3.4	Head of Department or equivalent	12
3.5	Deputy Head of Department or equivalent	10
3.6	Course Director or equivalent	10
3.7	Deputy Course Director or course committees	8
3.8	Responsible for laboratories, services, and offices as defined in the organizational chart	10
3.9	Other organizational roles recognized by UO/IES (by order of the UO/IES responsible)	6

For the score calculation, points from 3.1 to 3.8 will be multiplied by the number of years of activity in the role, up to a maximum limit of five years per position held.

After summing up the scores for all candidates, the candidate with the highest total will be assigned the maximum score of 100 points, with the others being ranked proportionally.