

Kraków, April 15, 2021

**Regulations of the mid-term evaluation  
in the Doctoral School of Exact and Natural Sciences at Jagiellonian University**

The Regulations determine the organization and manner of conducting the mid-term evaluation (hereinafter referred to as: the Evaluation) of doctoral students at the Doctoral School of Exact and Natural Sciences (hereinafter referred to as: the School).

1. Responsibility for the preparation and conducting of the Evaluation in a given PhD study programme in the scope not regulated by the Regulations rests with the head of the PhD study programme offered at the School (hereinafter referred to as: the Head). The Head shall take into account the statutory requirements and the internal legal acts in force at the Jagiellonian University, listed below in point 8. It is recommended that, in an advisory capacity, the Head should include the representatives of doctoral students from a given PhD study programmes in the preparation of the Evaluation.
2. At each stage of the preparation and conduct of the mid-term evaluation procedure, doctoral students have the right to express their opinions and share them with both the Head and the Director.
3. Detailed procedure for conducting the Evaluation for a given doctoral student (hereinafter referred to as: the Doctoral student) shall be as follows:
  - a) It is recommended that documents addressed to the school secretariat and to the Director in the procedures described in the Regulations shall be submitted no later than one week before the date specified in the Regulations for a given procedure or on a date settled with the Director. The dates chosen for informing doctoral students about procedures related to the Evaluation shall be treated similarly.
  - b) No later than two and a half months before the statutory deadline for the Evaluation expires, the Head provides the Director with a detailed plan regarding the place and form, and the exact date of the Evaluation.
  - c) The mid-term evaluation is conducted in the last month, before the statutory deadline for its completion. The date of the Evaluation, consistent with the individual research plan of the Doctoral Student, is set by the Head. As an exception, the Head may decide to conduct the Evaluation up to 4 weeks in advance.
  - d) Not later than 6 weeks before the evaluation date, the Head shall request the Director to appoint a 3-person evaluation committee, presenting the candidates for the members of this committee, indicating the candidate for the chairman. The Head may be a member or the chairman of the committee. The Head shall inform the Chairman of the relevant

Discipline Council in advance about the members of the proposed committee and the selection of its chairman and ask for an opinion. If the proposal submitted by the Head is not accepted, the Director shall appoint different members of the committee, in consultation with the Head.

- e) Based on the submitted proposal, the Director appoints a committee. On behalf of the Director, the School Secretariat sends out invitations and other required documents in an electronic form to the appointed members of the committee. At the same time, immediately after approval of the members of the committee, the information on the date of the Evaluation and the appointed members of the committee is sent to the e-mail address of the evaluated Doctoral student, and the information on the date of the Evaluation is published on the School's website, in the part accessible to Heads, secretariat employees and evaluated Doctoral students.
- f) At the latest 30 days before the scheduled meeting of the committee, the Doctoral student presents to the Head a detailed written report on the implementation of the individual research plan, confirmed by the supervisor or supervisors. In particular, the report may, inter alia, contain a description of the scientific results obtained by the Doctoral student, a presentation of the state of advancement of the construction of experimental equipment or other projects in which the student participates, a presentation of the progress of ongoing experiments and projects in which the student participates, a list of published research works, information on grants obtained by the student and other data that characterize the activity and results of the doctoral student in the implementation of his individual research plan and in the preparation of a doctoral thesis.
- g) On the same date as indicated in point f) supervisor/s (hereinafter referred to as: the Supervisor) is obliged to provide the Head with his written opinion on the implementation of an individual research plan by the Doctoral student.
- h) The Head, in consultation with the Chairman of the committee (or independently, if the Head was appointed chairman of the committee) supervises the preparations for the committee meeting and the timely conduct of the Evaluation. In particular, the Head provides the members of the committee with copies of documents necessary for the Evaluation, including the individual research plan, the Doctoral student's written report and the Supervisor's opinion.
- i) In justified cases, at the request of the Chairman of the committee agreed with the Doctoral student, the Head may postpone the date of the Evaluation, in compliance with the statutory requirements. The Director shall be informed about such a change.
- j) The recommended form of conducting the Evaluation is a direct meeting of the Committee with a Doctoral student. In justified situations, the Committee may deliberate and adopt resolutions using the remote communication system and remote voting, ensuring appropriate authorization of the persons authorized to vote.

- k) The evaluation is conducted by the committee secretly, with the participation of the doctoral student only in part of the evaluation procedure, but without the presence of any third parties. In the first phase of the Evaluation, the Committee invites a Doctoral student to a meeting, who is obliged to present the information required by the Committee related to the implementation of the student's individual research plan and the education process at the doctoral school. The doctoral student shall be prepared to present their results in the form of a short multimedia presentation.
- l) In the second phase, the Committee meets the requirement of secrecy and determines the result of the Evaluation and agrees the entries in the individual Evaluation report (a template of the report is included in Annex 2.) The committee performs the mid-term evaluation in the form of a resolution (the resolution template is included in Annex 1). The evaluation committee adopts a resolution by a majority of votes in an open vote. A member of the evaluation committee may not abstain from voting. A member of the evaluation committee may present a dissenting opinion. After the end of the committee's deliberations, the evaluated Doctoral student has the right to obtain information about the result of the Evaluation.
- m) The Committee shall list in the report the main elements on which the evaluation is based. In the event of a negative evaluation, the Committee is required to provide a detailed explanation of the reasons for such evaluation in the protocol and provide detailed information on the conducted evaluation.
- n) The evaluation report shall be signed by the Chairman of the committee.
- o) A copy of the evaluation report is submitted by the Chairman of the committee to the Director without undue delay, no later than within 7 days, and the original of the report is submitted by the Head to the Doctoral student's documentation. The Director also has the right to access - in electronic form - copies of the individual research plan and other documentation used in the Evaluation.
- p) After receiving a copy of the report by the Director, the school secretariat shall, without undue delay, no later than within 7 days, send the Doctoral student electronically information on the result of the Evaluation. At the doctoral student's request, the secretariat shall provide the student with a copy of the Evaluation report.
- r) Based on the protocols submitted, the Director submits to the Human Resources Department a list of Doctoral students who obtained a positive result of the mid-term evaluation and in the month following the month in which the evaluation was conducted, are entitled to receive a scholarship in the amount specified in Art. 209 paragraph 4 point 2 of the Law on Higher Education and Science.
- s) In the event of a negative evaluation, the Director shall cross the Doctoral student off the list of doctoral students, which is also reported to the relevant department of the Jagiellonian University. The Director shall cross the student off the list in the month following the month in which the Evaluation was made.

- t) The mid-term evaluation of the Doctoral student conducted by the Committee is final and cannot be appealed against.
4. Information on the procedure and dates of the mid-term evaluation is posted on the School's website (with limited access to interested persons specified in point 7) on the dates specified in the Regulations. At the same time, the school secretariat provides information about the Evaluation procedure via e-mail to all doctoral students it applies to.
  5. As an exception preventing the implementation of the above procedure, the Director, in consultation with the Head and Doctoral student concerned, may agree to individually regulate the evaluation in accordance with the statutory principles and rules specified in the regulations. In particular, it concerns the possibility of changing the date of the evaluation or changing the members of the committee.
  6. Doctoral students with disabilities who would like to apply for individual regulation of the Evaluation may apply to the Director in a timely manner, taking into account the compliance with the statutory rules.
  7. The primary way of providing information in the evaluation process is via e-mail and the School's website, in the part to which Heads, secretariat employees and evaluated Doctoral students have access.
  8. Legal framework:
    - [Act of 20 July 2018](#) Law on higher education and science (Dziennik Ustaw [Journal of Laws] 2021 item 478)
    - [Statute of the Jagiellonian University of May 29, 2019 \(including later amendments\)](#)
    - [Regulations](#) of the Doctoral School of Exact and Natural Sciences of the Jagiellonian University
    - [Resolution of the Jagiellonian University Senate No. 43/V/2019 of 29 May 2019](#) on education programmes at the Doctoral School of Exact and Natural Sciences

**Appendix No. 1**

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE MID-TERM EVALUATION OF THE  
IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL RESEARCH PLAN AT THE DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF  
EXACT AND NATURAL SCIENCES OF THE JAGIELLONIAN UNIVERSITY

Acting pursuant to: Article 202 para. 2-5 of the Act of 20 July 2018 Law on Higher Education and Science (Dziennik Ustaw [Journal of Laws] 2021 item 478) and §8 of the Regulations of the Doctoral School of Exact and Natural Sciences of the Jagiellonian University, the committee appointed to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the implementation of the Individual Research Plan by Ms/Mr. .... student number ..... ..

consisting of:

1. .... - Chairman of the committee
2. .... - member of the committee
3. .... - member of the committee

after reading the report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan presented by Ms/Mr ....., listening to the presentation and conducting discussions at the meeting on ..... decides to adopt by a majority of votes/unanimously\* a resolution positively/negatively\* evaluating the implementation of the Individual Research Plan by Ms/Mr .....

JUSTIFICATION

.....  
.....  
.....

.....  
Chairman of the Committee

**Annex No. 2** (can be modified depending on the needs)

Kraków, .....

---

***Individual report of the meeting of the mid-term evaluation committee  
at the Doctoral School of Exact and Natural Sciences***

---

Acting pursuant to Art. 202 of the Law on higher education and science and § 8 of the School Regulations, the mid-term Evaluation Committee composed of:

Name and surname	Position

appointed by the Director of the Doctoral School of Exact and Natural Sciences of the Jagiellonian University on ....., as part of the PhD study programme ..... mid-term evaluation of the doctoral student:

.....  
(name and surname, student number)

whose supervisor is ....., and the auxiliary supervisor is .....

Committee unanimously/by majority vote

**positively/negatively**

evaluated the implementation of the individual research plan by the doctoral student.

Justification of the evaluation:

.....  
.....  
.....

Detailed information about the evaluation performed and detailed justification of the evaluation (fill in only in the case of a negative evaluation)

.....

Signature of the chairman of the committee

.....