

The Principles of the 'Archaeology' Commission for the Evaluation of the Dissertations and Persons of the Applicants for the 'DSc.' Degree

The work of the commissions proceeds from the Rules for the Granting of the 'Doctor of Sciences' Degree in the ASCR issued as the Guidelines of the Academic Council of the ASCR No. 5/2014, from the General Principles for the Evaluation of Dissertations and Persons of an Applicant binding for all commissions issued by the Panel for the Granting of a Scientific Title of 'Doctor of Sciences', and governed by the Regulatory Procedure to the Rules for the Granting of the 'Doctor of Sciences' Degree.

1. General Criteria for the Evaluation of the Dissertations and Persons of the Applicants

1. **The applicant** for acquiring the scientific degree of 'DSc.' must be a distinctive person, respected by the domestic and foreign scientific communities, who is a model both in scientific features and in moral aspects.

2. The condition for the granting of the scientific degree of 'DSc.', is the successful defence of the **dissertation** in the proceedings for the granting of this degree. The dissertation is understood to be:

a) **original published scientific monograph**, which solves a serious scientific problem and brings a fundamentally new significant scientific discovery, or exceptionally:

b) a weighty and precisely specified co-authorial share in extensive scientific collective monographs, possibly entirely exceptionally:

c) a collection of published scientific works complemented by a commentary.

The dissertation may not be works which have already been used in the defence of other academic or pedagogical scientific degrees. Works of the type of archaeological fontes, catalogues, textbooks etc. may not be considered as the dissertation.

3. The expectation for the **commencement of the proceedings** is:

- at least one already published scientific monograph besides the one defended

- at least forty (40) significant treatises published in scientific, if possible reviewed journals and anthologies, of which a part published abroad, with positive reviews and if possible recorded citation responses at home and abroad.

- for the evaluation of the responses to the existing scientific work by the applicant, the use of scientometric criteria is not ruled out.

4. The **bibliography** of the applicant must be structured in the following way:

A Scientific monographs

B Chapters in scientific monographs

C Articles in important professional journals issued abroad

D Articles in important professional journals issued in the CR

E Articles in important professional anthologies issued abroad

F Articles in important professional anthologies issued in the CR

G Other specialised works (e.g. dissertations, contributions in other journals and anthologies, editorial and popularisation work, textbooks etc. – structure the list)

H Review and according to possibilities also recorded citation responses to the applicant's work

5. A structured **curriculum vitae** includes scientific work, grants issued, foreign internships and journeys, awards, and particularly also the applicant's pedagogical activity including the guidance of doctoral candidates, lecture activity etc.

2. Materials Required for the Defence:

Materials listed in the 'Rules':

- a) certified proof of the successful completion of university education (diploma);
- b) certified proof of the granting of the academic Ph.D. degree position or proof of the granting of the scientific degree of Candidate of Sciences or proof of the granting of a title of the same standing;
- c) a curriculum vitae with an overview of the scientific work so far;
- d) the list of publications that form the background materials of the dissertation (according to the requirements defined in the 'Rules');
- e) the theses of the dissertation in ten (10) copies,
- f) the dissertation in five (5) copies,
- g) a statement of in what labour relation the dissertation was created,
- h) an expression of your own scientific contribution and share of the work if the scientific results listed in the dissertation were acquired with co-authors,
- i) written opinions of two Doctors of Sciences or Professors (See Art. III, Sect. 4),
- j) if the applicant presents a new dissertation in the same field in a new proceedings for the granting of a scientific title, a statement of who issued the denial decision, the title of the original dissertation and the definition of the differences between.

29 January 2014

PhDr. Martin Kuna, CSc., DSc.
Chairperson of the Commission

Discussed and approved on 5 July 2014 by the Panel for the 'Doctor of Sciences' Degree.

prof. Ing. Karel Ulbrich, DrSc.
Chairperson of the Panel for the 'Doctor of Sciences' Degree