

## Evaluation criteria and principles used/recommended by the Scientific Council of the Babeş-Bolyai University

As a general rule in scientific evaluations (and unless there are explicit contrary instructions), the UBB Scientific Council (CS-UBB) will pursue the assignment of three types of ratings:

- a. Significant/extended impact\* in the international sense (IE)
- b. Significant impact at South-East European/Regional Level (IR)
- c. Yet to meet the 'exceptional' criterion (potential impact, IP)\*\*

Examples of achievements that may justify assignment of such qualifications are listed below. The criteria will be applied by the evaluators in a liberal manner, in order to avoid abuses of scientometry, be they in a positive or negative sense. Annex 1 provides suggestions for situations where more than 3 categories are defined in the evaluation procedure.

**a. Of significant/extended impact\* in the international sense (IE): *mutatis mutandis*, candidates with this rating would be considered to have a reasonable chance of being shortlisted when applying for an academic position at any prestigious university in the world**

i) **books** present in at least 100 WorldCat indexed libraries ([www.worldcat.org](http://www.worldcat.org), excluding conference volumes). The number of authors or the prestige of the publishing house can weigh significantly in the evaluator's decision.

ii) an average of one **article as corresponding author** per year in Q1 journals according to the most recent definitions, over the past 5-10 years of activity. The status of first author bears a weight of 2/3 compared to that of corresponding author. **Book chapters** present in at least 100 WorldCat indexed libraries are equated to Q1 papers. International **patents** (e.g. EU/US/Japan or similar markets) are equated to 3 Q1 papers.

iii) Article in Science/Nature;

iv) over 200 **citations** ("times cited") in international databases (Scopus, Clarivate, or similar prestige), or an average of over 40 / year for people with less than 5 years of activity.

v) over 50 works according to Scopus / WoS / ERIH, or an average of over 5 / year for situations with less than 10 years of activity.

vi) **any other evidence** that the candidate's results, ideas and concepts are accepted and used at the top in the field and/or on society at large, with a major impact (including for achievements with national and local specificity); examples may be contributions of technology transfer or other type to society,\*\* **important translations** of international works into the national language, books or book chapters with an **echo proven to be remarkable** at national level or whose echo is proven in **major catalogues other than WorldCat**, **articles in major impact magazines but not yet included or recognized as such in formal classifications**, **awards of a national Academy** (branch Academies excluded). \*\*\*

**b. Of significant impact at South East European/Regional Level (IR): *mutatis mutandis*, candidates with this rating would be considered to have a reasonable chance of being shortlisted when applying for an academic position at any representative university in South-Eastern Europe**

i) an average of one corresponding author article per year in Q2 journals, or an article in Q1 as co-author (not corresponding/first) over the past 5-10 years. Book chapters present in over 20 catalogues cf. WorldCat are equated with Q2 publications. National patents are equivalent to 3 Q2 articles.

ii) over 100 citations in international databases (the same as in point a), or an average of over 20 / year for situations with less than 5 years of activity

iii) books in at least 20 catalogues abroad according to WorldCat, published in the last two years

iv) **any other evidence** that the candidate's results, ideas and concepts are accepted and used in the field; and/or on society at large, with above-average impact; examples may be technology or other transfer contributions to society,\*\* important translations into the Romanian language, books or book chapter with an extraordinary echo at national level or whose echo is proven in major catalogues other than WorldCat, articles in major impact journals but not yet included in UEFISCDI classifications, awards of scientific associations of at least national profile in wide fields (e.g. Sociology).\*\*\*

The decisions of CS-UBB can be appealed within 10 working days from the communication, if not already provided for another deadline.

\* "Significant impact" means achievements with visibility and echo comparable to the most important in the field on the geographical area related to that category. Within the meaning of the above categories, a project that has a deeply local or national specificity may still have a large enough local impact for it to be later also reflected internationally. It is not the physical way or location of dissemination that is the criteria in itself – but the quality of the results and their impact in the scientific community and beyond. It is not necessary to cumulate more than one criterion/condition.

\*\*For technological transfer put into practice (beyond or besides patenting), ad-hoc equivalence is used based on the scale of the project/technology (upper limit – equivalence with international patent; lower limit – equivalence with Q4 work) – based on the assessment made on a case-by-case basis by CS-UBB.

\*\*\*Cs-UBB's recommendation is that the evaluated files do not contain publications on "Beall's list"; colleagues who are not familiar with this list or who have questions or have well-founded exceptions (e.g. the list is not updated) are invited to contact CS-UBB. Also, no articles from journals indexed in socio-human fields from the MDPI publishing house. Also, the diplomas/medals from the "invention salons" – except for the situations where the total prizes/mentions/etc. was less than 20% of the total eligible contributions from the respective event. The contributions published after 1.10.2021 in such sources remain within the margin of academic freedom of expression, but it is not recommended to present them among the representative contributions to the evaluations for which CS-UBB is responsible; otherwise, they will be considered an argument for the assigning the minimal rating (IP).

## ANNEX 1

# Procedure for prioritizing the support for dissemination of articles from specialized journals

## -point of view of the Scientific Council of UBB-

### A. Prioritization order

Regarding articles in specialized journals, the following order of priority is recommended:

1. Science and Nature
2. Journals from the Nature / Science series(ex., Nature Communications, Nature Human Behaviour etc)
3. Journals indexed in the current Nature Index or other exceptional journals in humanities fields (pending approval by SC-UBB)
4. Journals indexed in Nature Index in the past 5 years, or other exceptional journals in humanities fields (pending approval by SC-UBB)
5. Journals in the top 10% or other exceptional journals in humanities fields (with the approval of CS-UBB)
6. Q1 journals according to WoS, or Q1-Scimago journals in fields for which WoS does not calculate quartiles, or other exceptional journals in humanities fields not indexed WoS or Scopus (pending approval by SC-UBB)
7. Q2 journals according to WoS, or Q2-Scimago journals in fields for which WoS does not calculate quartiles, or other exceptional journals in humanities fields not indexed WoS or Scopus (pending approval by SC -UBB)
8. Q3 journals according to WoS, or Q3-Scimago journals in fields for which WoS does not calculate quartiles, or other exceptional journals in humanities fields not indexed WoS or Scopus (pending approval by SC -UBB)
9. Q4 journals according to WoS, or Q4-Scimago journals in fields for which WoS does not calculate quartiles, or other exceptional journals in humanities fields not indexed WoS or Scopus (pending approval by SC -UBB)

### B. Limitations and tiebreakers

1. Such priority rankings are incomplete as long as the qualitative opinion of an expert forum does not overlap them. Within UBB, the SC is permanently available to provide support in this regard – and therefore recommends that it be consulted ex officio whenever there is not explicitly assigned in the respective procedure another such forum of qualitative analysis (e.g., the research committee of the Faculty, the Scientific Council of the Institute, etc.). This expert opinion on a particular article can even change priorities otherwise based only on numerical indicators of journals.
2. SC-UBB excludes from support contributions from predatory and vanity publishing houses and journals, as well as from invention salons that offer prizes to more than 20% of participants, or equivalent activities (see above).

3. Beyond the above-mentioned 1-9 scale, further priority can be assigned, in order, based on: (1) corresponding authors from UBB (counting their proportion, if applicable), (2) first author from UBB, (3) the qualitative peer review (ex officio, from SC-UBB if no other peer review body is specified by regulations; the number of citations can also be considered as an argument here, if contributions from the same field and of similar age are compared, and if the ensuing numbers are significantly different), (4) adherence to the UBB policy of open publishing without payment of fees by authors. When establishing quartiles / top 10%, it is recommended to use indicators as robust as possible (eg AIS), and these classifications should be made according to bibliometric values either from the date of publication or from the date of evaluation - choosing the option that benefits the evaluated file.
4. When several articles still remain on the same priority level in terms of quality, any subsequent selection will take into account the principles of equality and equity of the UBB Charter
5. When all of the above leaves two or more articles on the same priority level, the chronological order shall be used - (1) of the formulation of the request where the comparison is made on the basis of an on-demand competition, or (2) of occurrence.

**C. Scope of application**

1. The SC-UBB believes that the above-described prioritization priorities must be reflected in any evaluation procedure. It is logical that, for simplification and depending on the context, some of the 1-9 levels may be condensed. For instance, levels 1 and 2, or 3 and 4. On the other hand, any procedure that reduces all 9 steps to one or two (e.g., only "indexed WoS" or "WoS vs. others") is counterproductive to UBB's world-class efforts.
2. Human and institutional resource evaluation should not be focused exclusively on journal articles. Implicitly, efforts to support/stimulate/promote should not be limited to journal articles. For example, international patents should in principle be regarded as having an impact similar to a Nature Index article or at least Q1, and national patents with a Q2 or at least Q3 article. Books can have similar impact to any of levels 1-9, depending on the opinion of specialists.