

Detailed rules for the conduct of the mid-term evaluation in the Doctoral School of Social Sciences

§ 1

1. The Director of the Doctoral School of Social Sciences (hereinafter referred to as "SDNS") 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 SDNS 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 SDNS, from which a member of the Commission will be appointed, after obtaining a favorable opinion of the Doctoral School Council.

b) The Director of SDNS asks the competent authorities of the entities running the SDNS to indicate two people for the Committee with the degree of a habilitated doctor or the title of professor in the discipline in which the doctoral dissertation is being prepared, employed in the entities running the SDNS.

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 points 2 and 3 (Regulations of the Doctoral School of Social Sciences).

2. The SDNS 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. Twenty-one days before the scheduled date of the Committee's meeting, the Ph.D. student is obliged to submit a 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 scholarly 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 Ph.D. student exceeding the time limit specified in the first sentence.

5. The Director or a member of the Doctoral School Council appointed by the Director shall submit the documentation prepared by the Doctoral Student to the Committee members no later than two weeks before the scheduled date of the Committee meeting.

6. During the Committee meeting, the Doctoral Student, presents a maximum of twenty minutes on the research results obtained.

7. 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.

8. The Chairperson of the Committee informs the Ph.D. student about the result of the mid-term evaluation.
9. After the mid-term evaluation is completed, the results will be published on the website of the Doctoral Schools.
10. It is possible to conduct a mid-term evaluation using technical devices enabling remote transmission with simultaneous direct image and sound transmission in real-time or in a hybrid model.
11. The evaluation will be conducted by the end of the fourth semester.

§ 2

The mid-term evaluation in SDNS includes:

1. Assessment of the advancement level in the implementation of the Individual Research Plan and evaluation of the Ph.D. student's most important scientific achievements related to IRP implementation. 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, 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.
2. The maximum number of points that a Ph.D. student can obtain during the mid-term evaluation is 100. This includes:
 - a) Assessment of the implementation degree of IRP. The doctoral student presents in writing and reports, with the possible use of multimedia, the degree of progress of IRP implementation – maximum 60 points, including:
 - I. complete, according to the schedule, implementation of IRP for the 1st and 2nd year of studies: more than 50 points;
 - II. partial implementation of IPB: 40-50 points;
 - III. unsatisfactory implementation of IRP less than 40 points which results in a final negative assessment.
 - b) Scholarly activity – maximum 20 points, including:
 - I. authorship of at least one scientific article published or accepted for publication in a journal included in the current list of journals of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education (co-authorship of a scientific article is also allowed, confirmed by the co-authors' statements, and individual contribution was at least 30%) or a monograph published from level I or a chapter in a monograph published from level II – 15 points;
 - II. delivering a paper or a poster by the candidate at an international scientific conference or a national scientific conference – 5 points.
 - c) information about submitting or obtaining a research grant - maximum 20 points, including:

I. submitting a grant application - 10 points;

II. obtaining a grant - 20 points.

3. For a positive assessment, it is required to obtain a total of at least 70 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.