

APPROVED WITH
NDAL Senate Decision No.6 of 29.11.2022
Minutes No. 6/2022
In force with the Order No 195
of the NDAL Rector of 02.12.2022

National Defence Academy of Latvia Regulations of the Director of the Study Programme

I. General rules

1. The Regulations of the Director of the Study Programme (hereinafter — the Regulations) determine the tasks, rights and competence of the Director of the Study Programme (hereinafter — Programme Director) at the National Defence Academy of Latvia (hereinafter — NDAL).

2. In his or her activities, the programme director shall comply with the requirements of regulatory enactments, NDAL management orders and decisions of the Senate.

3. Amendments to the Regulations shall be reviewed by the Senate and approved by the rector of the NDAL.

II. Approval, tasks and rights of the Programme Director

4. Each study programme accredited and implemented by the NDAL has an approved programme director who directs the development and implementation of this study programme.

5. The Director of the Programme, upon receipt of a proposal from the NDAL subdivisions or the Council of Studies, is approved by the Senate and the Secretary shall submit this decision to the NDAL Rector for approval.

6. Any NDAL academic staff representative or NDAL officer (preferably an officer with experience of service in the form of the respective forces — Naval Forces (NF), Land Forces (LF) or Air Force (AF)- may be the director of the professional bachelor's degree programme and the professional higher education programme. Any NDAL academic staff representative or an NDAL officer with at least a master's degree and experience in a higher education institution may be the director of a professional master's degree.

1.3.5. The calculated assessment of competences is obtained by summing up the assessment of each competence (excellent = 5, very good = 4, good = 3, must be improved = 2, unsatisfactory = 1) and dividing the obtained amount by 4 (the number of assessments).

1.4. The assessment of professional qualification is obtained by summing up the assessments of the sub-criteria of professional qualification (excellent = 5, very good = 4, good = 3, must be improved = 2, unsatisfactory = 1) and dividing the amount obtained by the number of assessments.

1.5. The overall assessment of work performance is "excellent" if 4.6-5 points have been obtained, "very good" if 3.6-4.5 points have been obtained, "good" if 2.6-3.5 points have been obtained, "must be improved" if 1.6-2.5 points have been obtained, "unsatisfactory" if the number of points obtained does not exceed 1.5 points.

1.6. The overall assessment of the performance of work is obtained by summing up the assessment of the criteria for the performance of work, multiplied by the proportion indicators specified for each position group: fulfilment of the result criteria - 60 per cent, fulfilment of the investment criteria - 40 per cent.

inappropriately. Difficulties working with parallel tasks. Tends to miss deadlines and can not cope with a large amount of work. Struggles to adapt to changes.

1.3.2.5. *unsatisfactory* – does not comply with the requirements – unable to plan his work or follow another proposed plan. Works casually. Does not set priorities. Unable to perform broader and more extensive tasks independently. Inefficient use of resources. Works effectively only under close supervision.

1.3.3. Achieving of results – ability to plan and ensure one's own work and that of the structural unit in such a way that the planned objective and result are achieved.

The competence is assessed:

1.3.3.1. *excellent* – exceeds the requirements – perseveres towards the achievement of goals, removes obstacles to achieve the result. Provides professional high-quality work even at the level of details.

1.3.3.2. *very good* - partially exceeds the requirements – develops procedures for quality assurance, encourages employees to follow them. Develops or continuously improves the internal quality control system.

1.3.3.3. *good* – meets the requirements clearly defines tasks, determines priorities and course of activities. Checks the quality of work, does not accept non-compliant, poor-quality performance of work. Helps to correct errors, anticipates potential difficulties in due time and takes activities to mitigate them.

1.3.3.4. *must be improved* – partially compliant with the requirements – allocates tasks according to the skills of employees. Checks the result of the work, but does not notice or ignore errors.

1.3.3.5. *unsatisfactory* – does not comply with the requirements does not define clear objectives, priorities and course of activities. Does not think about the opportunities to improve the quality, productivity and efficiency of work. Errors in accepting work results are overlooked or ignored.

1.3.4. Ethics – Acceptance of and adherence to the mission, values and ethical principles of the NDAL.

The competence is assessed:

1.3.4.1. *excellent* – exceeds the requirements – defines ethical values, acts according to them, as well as helps others to understand ethical principles and norms. Ensures compliance with ethical standards. Observes ethical norms in private activities, does not engage in lobbying of interests. Is a role model for others, promoting public trust in the institution and public administration.

1.3.4.2. *very good* – partially exceeds the requirements – adheres to ethical principles, helps others to solve ethical dilemmas. Acts directly and openly in situations where violations of ethical standards are suspected. Possesses a high judicial consciousness.

1.3.4.3. *good* – meets the requirements – Ethical principles are observed in relationships with other persons. Identifies ethical dilemmas and conflict of interest situations and take activities to avoid them. Identifies and balances conflicting values when choosing action alternatives. Identifies and considers the different ethical aspects of situations.

1.3.4.4. *must be improved* – partially compliant with the requirements – takes activities to comply with ethical standards. Takes responsibility for his actions, but is not able to justify it and anticipate its consequences. Acts depending on the situation.

1.3.4.5. *unsatisfactory* – does not comply with the requirements – unable to behave with dignity, maintain independence and resist influence. Uses work resources and information acquired in the course of professional activity also for personal interests, takes advantage of the position for personal gain. Fails to provide timely information on the combining of positions. Performing job duties, engages in lobbying of interests. Does not comply with ethical norms in private activities.

1.2. The assessment of the performance of duties of positions.

1.2.1. The employee comments on the performance of his/her duties during the assessment period.

1.2.2. The superior justifies his/her assessment of the employee's performance of his/her duties.

1.2.3. The assessment of the performance of duties of positions consists of one of the assessment (excellent = 5, very good = 4, good = 3, must be improved = 2, unsatisfactory = 1).

1.3. Assessment of competences.

The employee is assessed on 4 competences: teamwork, planning and organizing, achieving of results and ethicality.

1.3.1. Teamwork – activity aimed at successful cooperation with colleagues to promote the achievement of the team's goals. Ability to maintain good relations with teammates, exchange important information, build a sense of a common team.

The competence is assessed:

1.3.1.1. *excellent* – exceeds the requirements – builds and maintains team spirit. Activity shall be taken to ensure that solutions and decisions are taken on the basis of consensus. Demonstrates understanding of the reasons of activities of other team members. Helps to resolve internal team conflicts.

1.3.1.2. *very good* – partially exceeds the requirements – willingly assumes additional responsibilities that contribute to the achievement of the goals of the team. Promotes positive cooperation and involvement of all participants in teamwork. Able to analyse and constructively evaluate the ideas and proposals of others, commends the ideas and proposals of others.

1.3.1.3. *good* – meets the requirements – works for the team. Offers help and support if he/she thinks it's necessary. Respects and understands the opinion of others, positively appreciates the contribution of others to the work of the team. Offers new ideas and solutions.

1.3.1.4. *must be improved* - partially compliant with the requirements – participates in the teamwork, expresses a positive attitude towards the members of the team. Does not make proposals or expresses an opinion on its own initiative. Passes on important information. Supports the team's decisions. Does what the team requires.

1.3.1.5. *unsatisfactory* – does not comply with the requirements – does not participate in teamwork. Does not try to stay in touch with others. His/her behavior can lead to conflicts.

1.3.2. Planning and organizing – ability to prioritise, plan, organize and control one's own and others' work in a short and long-term period of time, ensuring efficient use of time and resources.

The competence is assessed:

1.3.2.1. *excellent* – exceeds the requirements – when planning various tasks, the workload of employees, the availability of resources, possible changes are taken into account. Reacts quickly to changes. Able to control several processes in parallel. Efficient use of resources. Feels responsible not only for personal, but also for the results of colleagues' work. Willingly undertakes organization and supervision of teamwork.

1.3.2.2. *very good* – partially exceeds the requirements – develops complex short- and long-term activity plans. Knows how to set priorities. Able to plan not only his own work, but also the work of other colleagues over a longer period of time. Notices ineffective planning and shortcomings in organizing the work of other colleagues.

1.3.2.3. *good* – meets the requirements – work is planned on the basis of the priorities identified. Able to independently perform tasks at a certain time with the intended resources. Adequately selects the most important and organizes work in a certain system. The tasks are delegated on the basis of the formal allocation of responsibilities. Knows how to work on different tasks simultaneously. Revises plans as the situation changes, able to set realistic deadlines.

1.3.2.4. *must be improved* – partially compliant with the requirements – Able to plan the work within one task. May make mistakes, the available information may be evaluated

Methodology for work performance assessment

1. Assessment of work performance

1.1. Assessment of performance of objectives and tasks.

The objectives achieved and tasks fulfilled during the assessment period are assessed in this section.

1.1.1. The "Name" section sets out the objectives and tasks for the assessment period.

1.1.2. In the result section, employee fills in the result achieved for a given objective or a task.

1.1.3. The employee shall have the right to determine the following performance status according to the achievement of the objective or the task:

1.1.3.1. "*not commenced*" – the activity has not yet been commenced;

1.1.3.2. "*commenced*" – the activity has been commenced and performed in the amount of approximately 30%;

1.1.3.3. "*partially performed*" – the activity has been commenced, the objective or task has been partially fulfilled (in the amount of approximately 70%);

1.1.3.4. "*fulfilled*" – the objective or task has been fully fulfilled (in the amount of 100%);

1.1.3.5. "*exceeded*" – the fulfilment of the objective or task exceeds 100% of the amount;

1.1.3.6. "*transferred to the next period*" – the objective or task has been transferred to the next period;

1.1.3.7. "*not relevant*" – the objective or task has lost its topicality;

1.1.4. For each objective or task, its relative importance (weight) shall be determined as a percentage in relation to the total individual objectives and tasks of 100%. The proportion fixed for a single objective or task shall not be less than 10%.

1.1.5. In the "Employee's comment" section, the employee describes in more detail the objective or task achieved.

1.1.6. In the "Superior's comment" section, the superior shall provide a precise, exhaustive and factual justification. The assessment shall also be justified in the event that the employee and the superior are unable to agree on the assessment.

1.1.7. The performance of the work of an employee shall be assessed

1.1.7.1. *excellent* – exceeds the requirements – the performance of the work exceeds the requirements throughout the assessment period;

1.1.7.2. *very good* – partially exceeds the requirements - the performance of the work exceeds the requirements at certain stages of the assessment period or in certain aspects of the criterion for the performance of work;

1.1.7.3. *good* – conforms to the requirements - the performance of the work fully complies with the requirements throughout the assessment period;

1.1.7.4. *it is necessary to improve* - partially conform to the requirements - the performance of the work does not conform to part of the requirements throughout the assessment period;

1.1.7.5. *unsatisfactory* - does not conform to the requirements - the performance of the work does not conform to most of the requirements throughout the assessment period;

1.1.8. The assessment of the achievement of objectives and fulfilment of tasks shall be obtained by multiplying the assessment of each objective or task (excellent = 5, very good = 4, good = 3, must be improved = 2, unsatisfactory = 1) by the coefficient of the objective or task (relative significance of the objective or task specified in Paragraph 1.1.4. of this Regulation). The sum of the coefficients in total is 1.

Superior

Name, surname, signature *date*

I approve the results of the work performance assessment

NDAL Vice-Rector

Name, surname, signature *date*

2. Training and development needs

2.1. Previous period

Knowledge, skills or competences to be developed	Type of development activities	Name of development activities	Other development activities	Performance	Comment

2.2. Next period

Knowledge, skills or competences to be developed	Type of development activities	Name of development activities	Other development activities	End date	Employee's comment	Superior's comment

3. Professional development planning

	Employee's preferred changes	Superior's view of the employee's career development potential
How do you see your future in the Latvian state administration in 1-2 years?		
How do you see your future in the Latvian state administration in 3-5 years?		

4. Changes in job description

Necessary changes to the job description	
--	--

5. Summary of the assessment

Assessment of objectives and tasks	
Assessment of the performance of the duties of the position	
Assessment of professional qualification	
Calculated assessment of competences	
Final assessment of competences	
Assessment of the result criteria	
Assessment of the investment criteria	
Overall rating	
Employee's final comment	
Superior's final comment	

Employee

Name, surname, signature

date

Work Performance Assessment Report

Employee _____

Name, surname

Position _____

Assessment period _____

Immediate superior _____

Name, surname

1. Work performance assessment

1.1. Assessment of performance of objectives and tasks

Name	Result	Performance status	Significance (weight)	Employee's comment	Superior's comment	Assessment

1.2. Assessment of the performance of the duties of the position

Employee's comment	Superior's comment	Assessment

1.3. Assessment of competences

Name	Employee's comment	Superior's comment	Assessment
Teamwork			
Planning and organizing			
Achieving of results			
Ethicality			

1.4. Assessment of professional qualification

	Employee's comment	Superior's comment	Assessment
Education			
Professional experience			
Professional knowledge and skills			
General knowledge and skills			

publications or participation in their activities			
3.4. Management of university department/teaching staff group			
3.5. Management of scientific and academic associations or participation in their activities			
3.6. Officially approved consultant to the state, municipalities and other companies established or natural persons			
<i>4. Other formal criteria</i>			
4.1. Doctoral/habilitated doctoral degree			
4.2. Academic and scientific seniority or length of service:			
as an assistant at university			
as a lecturer			
as an assistant professor			
as an associate professor			
as a professor			
<i>5. Summary of the assessment</i>			
Pedagogical qualification			
Scientific qualification			
Organizational competence			
Other criteria			
Overall assessment			
Lecturer's final comment			
Immediate superior's final comment			

Lecturer

Name, surname, signature

date

Immediate superior

Name, surname, signature

date

I approve the results of the work performance assessment

NDAL Vice-Rector

Name, surname, signature

date

Self-assessment form _____ division

position, name, surname

Criteria	Quantitative assessment (filled in by applicant)	Comment (filled in by applicant)	Quantitative assessment (with distinction, good, good, satisfactory or unsatisfactory) (filled in by head of division)
<i>1. Pedagogical qualification</i>			
1.1. Conduction of lectures/seminars (number of courses)			
1.2. Study course program development/revising			
1.3. Development and management of study programs			
1.4. Supervision of doctoral thesis			
1.5. Supervision of master thesis			
1.6. Supervision of bachelor's thesis/diploma papers			
1.7. Participation in academic conferences/meetings, publishing papers			
1.8. Preparation of textbooks and teaching aids, publication or published works			
1.9. Lecturing in foreign institution of higher education			
1.10. Lecturing in other Latvian institution of higher education			
1.11. Upgrading qualifications at foreign and Latvian higher education institutions or scientific research institutions			
<i>2. Scientific qualification</i>			
2.1. Scientific publications in peer-reviewed scientific journals and editions			
2.2. Participation in international scientific conferences (with paper)			
2.3. Management or participation in implementation of research projects/programs of Latvian Council of Science and other countries			
2.4. Management or participation in implementation of internationally funded research projects/programs			
2.5. Management or participation in the implementation of scientific contractual works			
2.6. Expert activities both in the Latvian Council of Science and international projects and programs			
2.7. Received patents and licences			
2.8. Research work at a foreign higher education institution or research institute			
2.9. Publications in quotable or peer-reviewed scientific journals on progress made during this period			
<i>3. Organizational competence</i>			
3.1. Management of scientific and academic commissions or collegiate institutions and participation in their activities			
3.2. Chairmanship of commission for organization of international conferences or participation in their activities			
3.3. Management of the editorial board of scientific journals			

National Defence Academy of Latvia

_____ meeting

Minutes of the Counting Commission

On election at NDAL _____ position

The Counting Commission is composed of _____ members. At the Commission meeting of _____ were present _____ members.

The Commission distributed _____ ballot papers to its members for each position. _____ ballot papers remained undistributed.

Election data:

Candidates' name, surname	Number of ballot papers found in the ballot box	Number of void ballot papers found in the ballot box	Number of votes	
			To elect	Not to elect

Election results:

The Commission determines that _____

(name, surname)

Is elected into the position of _____ for the period of 6 years

Because the candidate _____ has acquired the required () number of votes,

(name, surname)

which is the greater of than half of the voting members present.

Not elected to position ():

Because the candidate (name, surname) has not obtained the required number () of votes.

Chair of the Commission:

(signature)

(name, surname)

Ballot paper

for election _____

name of division

_____ position

National Defence Academy of Latvia _____

_____” _____.

No.	Candidate's name, surname	Voting	
		Elect	Not elect
1.		Elect	Not elect
2.		Elect	Not elect
3.		Elect	Not elect
4.		Elect	Not elect

The voter expresses their attitude towards the candidate as follows:

- 1) Elected – cross out "not elect";
- 2) Not elect – cross out "elect".

VI. Appeal procedure

49. Appeals for irregularities in the election procedure and assessment may be submitted to the NDAL Rector no later than 5 (five) working days after receipt of the results.

50. The appeal shall be examined within one month by a commission of at least 3 members established by order of the Rector of the NDAL. If necessary, experts may be called in to give a written opinion.

51. The Commission's conclusions are final. The Rector's decision shall be notified in writing to the appellant no later than 3 (three) working days after the conclusion of the commission.

VII. Final provisions

52. With the coming into force of these regulations, the regulations referred to below are considered invalid - "Regulations on Academic Positions at the National Defence Academy of Latvia", approved pursuant to the decision No. 1 of the Minutes on No. 3/2020 of NDAL Senate sitting 08 June 2020 and is effective according to NDAL Rector's order No.56 12 June 2020 "On approval of the Senate decisions of the National Defence Academy of Latvia".

42. The head of the division or department concerned shall carry out the assessment of the academic staff and general staff (division head in the field of education, educational methodologist, head of library and librarian) under his/her authority.

43. Assessment of the professor, associate professor, assistant professor, senior researcher, researcher, lecturer and assistant takes place in two stages. In the first stage, the person to be assessed fills in the self-assessment form (Annex 3) and submits it to the immediate superior by 31 August each year. Only those sections of the self-assessment that were carried out in accordance with the approved workload are filled in. If work was carried out outside the approved workload, this should be recorded in the commentary.

44. The immediate superior checks the accuracy and completeness of the material submitted and fills in his/her own section. The immediate superior (according to workload) assesses only completed sections. Sections that were not filled in are not taken into account in the assessment.

45. In the second stage, the immediate superior conducts discussions with the appraisee to analyse progress made in the previous academic year and to discuss the assessments. If adjustments to the assessment are necessary, the immediate superior shall make them.

46. The self-assessment is signed by the lecturer and the immediate superior. NDAL Vice-Rector approves the self-assessment.

47. The head of division in the field of education, the head of library, the education methodologist and the librarian complete the Work Performance Assessment Report (Annex 4) in accordance with the methodology (Annex 5) and submit it to the immediate superior. The immediate superior organises a discussion during which the achievement of the objectives and targets set for the previous period, the employee's performance against the competence activity indicators and professional qualifications are analysed, with arguments on both sides to justify the assessment. During the discussions the effectiveness of the learning and development activities identified in the previous period will be analysed, the employee's learning and development needs for the next period, possible professional development and necessary changes to the job description will be identified and, if possible, the aims and objectives for the next assessment period.

48. After or during the discussions, the immediate superior and the employee, if necessary, update or clarify the content of the report by completing the fields "Employee's final comment" and "Immediate superior's final comment". The report is signed by the employee and the immediate superior, the results of the assessment are approved by the NDAL Vice-Rector.

visiting professor, visiting lecturer or visiting assistant for a period of up to two years.

34. A senior researcher or a visiting researcher may be recruited for a period not exceeding two years.

35. The documents of applicants for the positions of visiting professor and associate visiting professor are forwarded to the Chairman of the NDAL Senate to convene a meeting of the NDAL Senate. The Senate will examine the applicants' documents and, if necessary, may invite the applicant for an interview.

36. The voting procedure of the Senate for the positions of visiting professor and associate visiting professor shall be in accordance with the Regulation of the Senate of the NDAL. The personnel department prepares the contract of employment in accordance with the Senate decision.

37. The workload of a senior visiting researcher, visiting researcher, visiting assistant professor, visiting lecturer and visiting assistant shall be drawn up and approved by the NDAL SC for each academic year in accordance with the procedure approved by order of the Rector of the NDAL "Procedure for accounting workload of academic staff at National Defence Academy of Latvia".

38. The Rector of the NDAL shall conclude with senior visiting researcher, visiting researcher, visiting assistant professor, visiting lecturer and visiting assistant an employment contract for the period of the appointment. The personnel department prepares the contract of employment in accordance with the results of the appointment.

39. In the event of similar assessment result, preference shall be given to the soldier or retired soldier, as well as to visiting lecturers and visiting researchers.

V. Assessment procedure

40. NDAL permanent academic staff are assessed once a year:

40.1. The assessment of assistant professor, lecturer/senior lecturer, assistant shall be carried out by 31 December of each calendar year for the current year.

40.2. The assessment of senior researcher and researcher shall be carried out by 31 December of each calendar year for the current year.

41. The assessment of general staff – division head in the field of education, educational methodologist, head of library and librarian shall be carried out by 31 January of each calendar year for the previous year.

24. The candidate may consult the job description and other conditions in the personnel department.

25. The documents submitted shall be registered by the Personnel department and, on expiry of the deadline for submission, shall be forwarded to the head of the relevant division in which the vacancy was advertised.

26. If no suitable candidate is found for the vacant post, a new competition is launched.

IV. Election or appointment of professors, associate professors, assistant professors, senior researchers, researchers, lecturers and assistants

27. Candidates for professorships and associate professorships are elected by the respective Professors' Council.

28. NDAL Vice-Rector sets up a selection commission for candidates for academic posts. The selection commission is composed of at least 3 members and takes part in the assessment of the documents and interviews of the candidates. The proceedings of the commission shall be minuted.

29. The decision of the selection commission on the admission to the competition, on the forwarding of the documents to the NDAL Council of Studies and the Senate, shall be taken by a simple majority, in open ballot (Annex No. 1 and 2).

30. The documents of candidates for the academic posts of Assistant Professor, Lecturer, Assistant, Senior Researcher and Researcher and the decision of the selection commission are forwarded to the Chairman of the NDAL Senate for convening a sitting of the NDAL Senate.

31. Senate voting procedure for academic posts shall be held in accordance with the Regulation of the Senate of the NDAL.

32. The Rector of the NDAL shall conclude with the person elected to the academic post an employment contract for the period of the election. The personnel department prepares the contract of employment in accordance with the result of the election.

33. If an academic post is vacant or temporarily vacant at the NDAL, the Senate, on the proposal of the NDAL Council of Studies (hereinafter referred to as the SC), may decide not to open a competition. In this case, the Rector of the NDAL may recruit a visiting professor, associate visiting professor, assistant

- 19.2.3.2. chairmanship of commission for organization of international conferences or participation in their activities,
- 19.2.3.3. management of the editorial board of scientific publications or participation in their activities,
- 19.2.3.4. management of university department/teaching staff group,
- 19.2.3.5. management of international associations in the science, academic or arts field or participation in their activities,
- 19.2.3.6. officially approved consultant to the state, municipalities and other companies established by legal or natural persons,
- 19.2.4. Other criteria:
 - 19.2.4.1. doctoral/habilitated doctoral degree,
 - 19.2.4.2. academic and scientific seniority or length of service.

III. The application procedure for academic positions

20. On a proposal from the Rector of the NDAL, accompanied by the requirements and tasks of the position, the personnel department announces the competition for vacant position via the State Employment Agency (<http://www.nva.gov.lv>). The advertisement must include: the educational establishment, the requirements for applicants, the documents to be submitted, as well as the closing date, place and contact phone.

21. The persons, who wish to apply for academic positions, must submit the following documents to personnel department:

- 21.1. application to the Rector, stating the position for which the person is applying;
- 21.2. copies of documents certifying higher education, academic or scientific degrees;
- 21.3. if the higher education, academic or scientific degree was obtained abroad, the candidate also submits a statement from the Academic Information Centre on the conformity of the academic degree or diploma awarded in Latvia with the diploma obtained abroad;
- 21.4. curriculum vitae (CV);
- 21.5. the official language proficiency certificate (if necessary);
- 21.6. any other documents required or which the candidate wishes to attach to the application in order to better describe his/her qualifications.

22. The application period may not exceed 30 calendar days from the date of publication of the advertisement. If the candidate does not submit all the documents required by the deadline, or if the candidate's education and experience do not meet the requirements set out in the advertisement, the application will not be considered.

23. If no candidate has submitted a document within the time limit, a new invitation to competition will be issued.

18. A person who has Doctoral or Master's degree, scientific publications and is capable of carrying out scientific work in the relevant field is eligible for the position of a **researcher**.

9 Eligibility criteria for the position of an **associate visiting professor** and a **visiting professor**:

19.1. for a soldier or a soldier retired from the active service:

19.1.1. at least Master's degree and not less than 12 years' military service experience as an officer for associate visiting professor position,

19.1.2. at least a Doctoral degree and not less than 15 years' military service experience as an officer for a visiting professor position,

19.2. for a civilian employee:

19.2.1. pedagogical qualification and competence (in the past 6 years):

19.2.1.1. delivering of lectures/conduction of seminars,

19.2.1.2. advising of Doctoral thesis,

19.2.1.3. advising of Master's thesis,

19.2.1.4. development/revision of the study course programme,

19.2.1.5. development and management of a study programme,

19.2.1.6. papers presented at academic conferences/meetings,

19.2.1.7. preparing and submitting textbooks and teaching aids for publication or published works,

19.2.1.8. improving of qualifications at Latvian and foreign institutions of higher education, scientific research institutions and professional institutions,

19.2.1.9. lectures at higher education institution abroad,

19.2.2. scientific qualification (in the past 6 years),

19.2.2.1. scientific publications in peer-reviewed scientific publications,

19.2.2.2. Participation in international scientific conferences abroad (with paper),

19.2.2.3. management or participation in implementation of research projects/programmes of the Latvian Council of Science and other national research projects/programmes,

19.2.2.4. management or participation in the implementation of internationally funded research projects/programmes,

19.2.2.5. expert's activities in projects/programmes of the Latvian Council of Science and international projects/programs,

19.2.2.6. patents and licences obtained,

19.2.2.7. research at foreign institution of higher education or research institute,

19.2.2.8. publications in quotable or peer-reviewed editions on progress made during this period,

19.2.3. Organizational competence:

19.2.3.1. management of scientific and academic commissions or collegiate institutions and participation in their activities,