

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

§ 1

1. No later than 6 weeks before the mid-term evaluation date, the Director of the Doctoral School of Social Sciences (hereinafter referred to as "SDNS") appoints members of the 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 persons 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 Council of the Scientific Institute to indicate two persons 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) Members of the Committee sign a declaration that they meet the criteria of § 15 points 2 of the Regulations of the Doctoral School of Social Sciences.

2. The Director of SDNS 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 designates the Chairperson of the Committee from among the designated members.

4. For each doctoral student, the composition of the Committee shall be determined individually.

5. 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 via e-mail.
6. Technical support for notifying Committee members and sending necessary materials is provided by the Doctoral Schools' Office.
7. The mid-term evaluation is conducted three months before the statutory deadline for the evaluation. The date of the evaluation, consistent with the Doctoral Student's Individual Research Plan, is determined by the Director of SDNS. In exceptional cases, at the request of the Doctoral Student, the Director may decide to conduct the evaluation in the last month before the statutory deadline for conducting the evaluation.
8. By June 30, the Doctoral Student is obliged to submit documentation on the progress of research and implementation of the Individual Research Plan (including in particular a report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan, documentation confirming the scientific and grant activity and excerpts from the dissertation under preparation). An integral part of the documentation is a short opinion of the supervisor, containing information on familiarization and acceptance of the materials prepared by the doctoral student.
9. A template of the report on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan is attached as Appendix 1 to this resolution.
10. No later than two weeks before the date set for the meeting of the Committee, the Doctoral Schools' Office School sends electronically to the members of the Committee the documentation prepared by the Doctoral Student and referred to in point 8 above.
11. The deliberations of the Committee is held in closed session, without the presence of third parties, with the participation of the Doctoral Student only in the first part of the procedure.
12. The members of the Committee prepare a written opinion on the implementation of the Individual Research Plan of the Doctoral Student.
13. During the meeting, the members of the Committee are provided with the documentation of the Doctoral Student from the Doctoral School.

14. During the meeting of the Committee, the Doctoral Student presents the status of the implementation of the Individual Research Plan with possible use of multimedia (max. 20 minutes).
15. In justified situation 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.
16. A template of the protocol is attached as Appendix No. 2 to this Resolution.
17. The protocol of mid-term evaluation shall be signed by all members of the Committee. If the meeting is held remotely or hybrid, the evaluation protocol shall be signed by the Chairperson of the Committee.
18. After the evaluation, the Chairperson of the Committee submits to the Director of the Doctoral School no later than within 14 days, the original of the protocol, which is placed in the documentation of the Doctoral Student. The protocol contains the result of the mid-term evaluation along with the justification and recommendation for further implementation of the Individual Research Plan or, in the case of a negative evaluation, removal from the list of doctoral students.
19. The Director of the School shall inform the Doctoral Student of the result of the mid-term evaluation immediately upon receipt of the original protocol.
20. 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.
21. Upon completion of the mid-term evaluation, the results are made public on the Doctoral School website.
22. The mid-term evaluation is conducted by the end of the fourth semester.
23. The primary tool for providing information during the mid-term evaluation process is e-mail and the SDNS website.

§ 2

The mid-term evaluation in SDNS includes:

1. An evaluation of the Doctoral Student's major accomplishments.



The Doctoral Student presents the level of progress and achievements related to the implementation of the Individual Research Plan. The Doctoral Student may provide the following achievements: scientific articles published in journals included in the current list of the Ministry of National Education (formerly: 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 National Education (formerly: the Ministry of Science and Higher Education), monographs and chapters in monographs published in publications included in the current list of the Ministry of National Education (formerly: the Ministry of Science and Higher Education) along with the assigned number of points, presentation of a paper at a scientific international or national 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:

1) 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.

2) Scholarly (scientific) activity – **maximum 20 points**, including:

I. a Doctoral Student receives:

a) **15 points** for publishing or acceptance into print an article in a journal with 70 or more points included in the current list of journals of the Ministry of National Education (formerly: the Ministry of Science and Higher Education)¹ (co-authorship of a scientific article is also allowed, confirmed by the co-authors' statements, and individual contribution was at least 30%).

¹ an article of which a Doctoral Student is a co-author and the individual contribution, confirmed by statements of the co-authors, amounted to at least 30% can also be demonstrated

b) **10 points** for publishing or acceptance into print of at least one article in a journal with 40 points ².

c) **8 points** for publishing or acceptance into print of at least one article in a journal with 20 points or a monograph chapter from the Level I list of Publishers of the Ministry of National Education (formerly: the Ministry of Science and Higher Education) ³.

d) **15 points** for publishing a monograph from the Level I list of Publishers or a chapter in a monograph from the Level II list of Publishers of the Ministry of National Education (formerly: the Ministry of Science and Higher Education)⁴.

II. participation in at least one international or national conference with paper or poster - **5 points**.

3) information about submitting or obtaining a research grant, participation in a research project, research internship - **maximum 20 points**, including:

I. submitting a grant application - **10 points**.

II. obtaining a grant - **20 points**.

III. participation in a research project financed from external funds - **5 points**.

IV. participation in at least one month international research internship - **5 points - 9 points**.

V. participation in at least one month of domestic research internship - **3 points - 5 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 Committee.

² an article of which a Doctoral Student is a co-author and the individual contribution, confirmed by statements of the co-authors, amounted to at least 30% can also be demonstrated

³ an article of which a Doctoral Student is a co-author and the individual contribution, confirmed by statements of the co-authors, amounted to at least 30% can also be demonstrated

⁴ an article of which a Doctoral Student is a co-author and the individual contribution, confirmed by statements of the co-authors, amounted to at least 30% can also be demonstrated