

## RULES FOR CONDUCTING THE MID-TERM ASSESSMENT (EVALUATION) OF DOCTORAL STUDENTS

1. The Mid-Term Assessment shall be carried out on the basis of the doctoral student's report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan (IRP), approved by the supervisor(s), as well as the periodic achievement cards.
2. The report shall include, in particular:
  - 1) conclusions of the literature analysis with a full literature list,
  - 2) a detailed description of progress and results of research carried out for the purposes of the dissertation to date,
  - 3) outline (plan) of the planned doctoral dissertation,
  - 4) information on the submission of a scientific publication to a publisher<sup>1</sup>, certified e.g. by electronic proof of submission,
  - 5) a description of the fulfilment of the other requirements of the Individual Research Plan, in particular participation in a conference (date and place of the presentation, certificate of participation, text of the paper and, if it has not already taken place, presentation of the paper of at least 5,000 characters) and submission of an application for an externally funded grant (date of submission, name of the competition and printout of the submitted application).

In order to ensure the quality of the report, the Director of the Doctoral School may determine the necessary elements or the template of the report.

3. Each member of the Committee set up under Article 13 of the Rules and Regulations of the Doctoral School shall draw up a written opinion on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan, concluding with a request for a positive or negative Mid-Term Assessment.
4. The Committee shall, on the basis of the members' opinions, draw up a Mid-Term Assessment (positive or negative) accompanied by a statement of reasons, no later than 30 September. A negative evaluation shall be formulated in particular when:
  - 1) the doctoral student has failed to complete the tasks provided for in the Individual Research Plan for the first to second year of study without indicating a significant reason,

---

<sup>1</sup> A scientific article for publication in a scientific journal or in peer-reviewed materials from an international conference, which, in the year of publication of the article in its final form, were included in the list drawn up in accordance with the regulations issued pursuant to Article 267(2)(2)(b) of the Act on Higher Education and Science of 20 July 2018, or one scientific monograph published by a publishing house, which, in the year of publication of the monograph in its final form, were included in the list drawn up in accordance with the regulations issued pursuant to Article (2)(2)(a) of the Act, or a chapter in such monograph.

- 2) the doctoral student has not submitted a scientific publication to a publisher,
  - 3) the doctoral student's report did not receive a favourable opinion from the supervisor(s),
  - 4) current progress of research does not indicate that doctoral studies will commence within 48 months of the start of training.
5. The Committee may invite the doctoral student to provide oral or written explanations.
6. In the event of an appeal by a doctoral student against the result of their Mid-Term Assessment to the Scientific Council of the Doctoral School, the Director reviewing the doctoral student's appeal may request the Committee to supplement the substantive reasons for the negative evaluation or to re-evaluate, taking into account the circumstances indicated in the doctoral student's appeal. In such a case, the Committee shall take appropriate action within 14 days.

The deciding of the Scientific Council of the Doctoral School shall be final.