

Detailed rules for the conduct of the mid-term evaluation in the Doctoral School of Quantitative and Natural Sciences

§ 1

1. 1. The Director of the Doctoral School of Quantitative and Natural Sciences (hereinafter referred to as: "SDNŚiP") appoints members of the 3-person Committee for the mid-term evaluation (hereinafter referred to as: "the Committee").
For this purpose:
 - a) The Director of SDNŚiP asks the Doctoral School Council to indicate at least two people with the habilitation degree or the title of the professor in the discipline in which the doctoral dissertation is being prepared, employed outside the entities running the SDNŚiP, from which a member of the Commission will be appointed, after obtaining a positive opinion of the Doctoral School Council.
 - b) The Director of SDNŚiP asks the competent authorities of the entities running the SDNŚiP to indicate two people for the Committee with the degree of habilitated doctor or the title of professor in the discipline in which the doctoral dissertation is being prepared, employed in the entities running the SDNŚiP.
 - c) The co-author of the publication of the doctoral student under assessment, or the supervisor of his master's or bachelor's thesis, cannot be a member of the mid-term evaluation committee.
 - d) Members sign a declaration that they meet the criteria of § 15 point 2 and 3 (Regulations of the Doctoral School of Quantitative and Natural Sciences).
2. The SDNŚiP Director or a member of the Doctoral School Council appointed by the Director is responsible for the organization of the Committee's work.
3. The Director or a member of the Doctoral School Council appointed by the Director establishes the work schedule of the Mid-term Evaluation Committee and notify the Members of the Committee and the Doctoral Student of the date of the Committee's meeting.
4. The commission appoints a chairman of the commission from among its members.
5. Twenty one days before the scheduled date of the Committee's meeting, the PhD student is obliged to submit paper and electronic documentation on the progress of the research and the implementation of the Individual Research Plan (Individual Research Plan – IRP – implementation report) and to indicate a maximum of five most important documented scientific achievements. An integral part of the documentation is the supervisor's opinion, containing a statement that the materials prepared by the doctoral student have been read and accepted. In strictly justified cases, the documentation referred to above may be submitted by the PhD student exceeding the time limit specified in the first sentence.
6. Subject to sec. 5 sentence 3 above, the Director or a member of the Doctoral School Council indicated by the Director shall submit to the Members of the Committee the documentation prepared by the Doctoral student at least two weeks before the scheduled date of the Committee meeting.
7. During the Committee meeting, the PhD student presents a maximum of twenty minutes multimedia presentation in pdf or power point format on the research results obtained.
8. During the meeting, the members of the Committee are provided with the documentation of the Doctoral student from the Doctoral School.

9. After the evaluation, the Committee presents the results to the Director of the Doctoral School together with the justification and recommendation for further implementation of the individual research plan or, in the event of a negative assessment, deleting from the list of doctoral students.
10. The Chairperson of the Committee informs the PhD student about the result of the mid-term evaluation. A negative result of the mid-term evaluation results in removal from the list of doctoral students. The decision on removal issued by the Director may be applied for reconsideration.
11. It is possible to conduct a mid-term evaluation with the use of technical devices enabling remote transmission with simultaneous direct image and sound transmission in real time or in a hybrid mode.
12. The evaluation will be conducted by the end of the fourth semester.

§ 2

The mid-term evaluation in SDNŚiP includes:

1. Assessment of the advancement level in the implementation of the Individual Research Plan and evaluation of the PhD student's most important scientific achievements related to the implementation of IRP. A doctoral student may present up to five of the most important (documented) achievements related to the implementation of the Individual Research Plan. The candidate may provide the following achievements: scientific articles published in journals included in the current list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, reviewed scientific articles published in journals not included in the current list of journals of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, monographs and chapters in monographs published in publications included in the current list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education along with the assigned number of points, participation in an international or national research project, participation in an international or national research internship, presentation by a Candidate of a paper at an international or national scientific conference, authorship or co-authorship of a poster at a scientific international or national conference, active participation or co-organization of events popularizing science, submission and / or acquisition of a grant application financed from external sources, patent application.
2. The maximum number of points that can be obtained by a PhD student during the mid-term evaluation is 100. This includes:
 - a) Assessment of the implementation degree of IRP:
 - I - information on the progress in the implementation of the Individual Research Plan - maximum 60 points.
 - II - oral presentation and discussion of the achieved results - maximum 10 points.
 - b) Scientific activity:
 - I. Up to five most important achievements – **maximum** 25 points, including:
 - a. authorship or co-authorship of a scientific article accepted for publication, related to the doctoral thesis being carried out, in a journal included in the current list of journals of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, including the PhD student receives:
 - i. 20 points for a publication with a score of 200 points on the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education
 - ii. 14 points for a publication with a score of 140 points on the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education

- iii. 10 points for a publication with a score of 100 points on the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education
 - iv. 7 points for a publication with a score of 70 points on the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education
 - v. 4 points for a publication with a score of 40 points on the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education
 - vi. 2 points for a publication with a score of 20 points on the list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education
-
- b. peer-reviewed scientific articles published in journals not included in the current list of journals of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education - 1 point;
 - c. monographs and chapters in monographs published in publications included in the currently valid list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education - 8 points;
 - d. chapters in monographs published in publications included in the current list of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education - 3 points;
 - e. participation in an international research project - 5 points;
 - f. participation in a national research project - 4 points,
 - g. participation in an international research fellowship - less than 30 days - 3 points, 30 days and more - 5 points;
 - h. participation in the national research fellowship - less than 30 days - 1 point, 30 days and more - 2 points;
 - i. delivering a paper by the candidate at an international scientific conference - 5 points
 - j. delivering a paper by the candidate at a national scientific conference - 3 points (plus 1 point for the featured presentation);
 - k. authorship or co-authorship of a poster at an international scientific conference - 3 points
 - l. authorship or co-authorship of a poster at a national scientific conference - 2 points
 - m. submitting a grant application financed from external sources - 2 points
 - n. obtaining a grant financed from external sources - 5 points.
 - o. co-organization of events popularizing science - 2 points
 - p. patent application - 7 points
 - q. The committee has the right to award points for documented achievements not listed above - no more than 10 points.
- II. Documentation of the PhD student from the Doctoral School - maximum 5 points.
- 3. For a positive assessment, it is required to obtain a total of at least 60 points.
 - 4. The committee in an open vote adopts the assessment by a simple majority of votes, in the presence of at least half of the members of the Commission.