

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

§ 1

1. No later than 6 weeks before the mid-term evaluation date, 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:

- 1) 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.
 - 2) 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 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 SDNŚiP.
 - 3) 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.
 - 4) 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).
 - 5) The Director shall appoint the Chairperson of the Committee.
 - 6) For each doctoral student, the composition of the committee shall be determined individually.
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 mid-term evaluation shall be conducted in the last month before the statutory deadline for its conduct. The date of the evaluation, consistent with the individual research program of the Doctoral Student, is determined by the Director of the SDNŚiP. In exceptional cases, upon the request of a Doctoral Student, the Director may decide to evaluate up to 10 weeks before the statutory deadline.
 4. The Director, or a member of the Doctoral School Council appointed by the Director shall schedule the mid-term evaluation of Doctoral Students and notify each Doctoral Student via email of the date of the Committee meeting. Technical support for the process of notifying Committee members and sending the necessary materials is provided by the Doctoral Schools' Office.
 5. Twenty-one days before the scheduled date of the Committee's meeting, the Ph.D. student is obliged to submit the 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 5 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 Ph.D. student exceeding the time limit specified in the first sentence. A template form from the implementation of the individual research plan is attached as Appendix 1 to this resolution.

6. The Doctoral Schools' Office 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. The deliberations of the Committee shall be held in closed session, with the participation of the doctoral student only during the first part of the evaluation procedure, with no third parties present.
8. During the Committee meeting, the Doctoral Student is required to present a presentation prepared in pdf or PowerPoint format on the research results obtained, lasting a maximum of 20 minutes.
9. During the meeting, the members of the Committee are provided with the documentation of the Doctoral Student from the Doctoral School.
10. The protocol of mid-term evaluation shall be signed by all members of the Committee. If a member or members of the Committee are unable to sign the protocol, only the Chairperson of the Committee shall sign it, at the same time indicating the reasons why the other members are unable to sign it. A template of the protocol is attached as Appendix No. 2 to this Resolution.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. The recommended form of conducting the Evaluation is a face-to-face meeting of the Committee. 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.
15. The evaluation is conducted by the end of the fourth semester.
16. The primary way of providing information in the evaluation process is through email and the SDNŚiP website.

§ 2

The mid-term evaluation in SDNŚiP includes:

1. Assessment of the advanced level in the implementation of the Individual Research Plan and evaluation of the Ph.D. student's most important scientific achievements related to the implementation of IRP. A doctoral student may present up to 5 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 (MNiSW) reviewed scientific articles published in journals not included in the current list of journals of the MNiSW, monographs and chapters in monographs published in publications included in the current list of the MNiSW 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 Ph.D. student during the mid-term evaluation is 100. This includes:
 - 1) Assessment of the implementation degree of IRP:
 - a) Information on the progress in the implementation of the Individual Research Plan - maximum 60 points.
 - b) Oral presentation and discussion of the achieved results - maximum 15 points.
 - 2) Scientific activity:

Up to five the 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 the journals of the MNiSW, including the Ph.D. student receives:
 - 20 points for a publication with a score of 200 points on the list of the MNiSW
 - 14 points for a publication with a score of 140 points on the list of the MNiSW
 - 10 points for a publication with a score of 100 points on the list of the MNiSW
 - 7 points for a publication with a score of 70 points on the list of the MNiSW
 - 4 points for a publication with a score of 40 points on the list of the MNiSW
 - 2 points for a publication with a score of 20 points on the list of the MNiSW
 - b) peer-reviewed scientific articles published in journals not included in the current list of the journals of the MNiSW - 1 point;
 - c) monographs and chapters in monographs published in publications included in the currently valid list of the MNiSW - 8 points;
 - d) chapters in monographs published in publications not included in the current list of the MNiSW - 3 points;
 - e) participation in an externally funded research project - 4 points (plus 4 pts. for project management);
 - f) participation in a research project funded by internal funds of the entities running the doctoral school - 2 points (plus 2 pts. for project management);
 - 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 Doctoral Student at an international scientific conference - 5 points (plus 1 point for a distinguished speech);
 - j) delivering a paper by the Doctoral Student at a national scientific conference - 3 points (plus 1 point for the distinguished presentation);
 - k) presenting a poster at an international scientific conference - 3 points (plus 1 point for a distinguished poster);
 - l) presenting a poster at a national scientific conference - 2 points (plus 1 point for a distinguished poster);
 - 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.

At the end of the interview, the Chairperson of the Commission informs the Doctoral Student of the points awarded for the indicated scientific achievements.

3. A total of at least 60 points is required for a positive evaluation.
4. The Committee, in an open vote, shall adopt a resolution on the pass/fail result of the evaluation by a simple majority of votes, in the presence of at least half of the members of the Committee. The result of the evaluation, together with the reasons, shall be made public. The number of points obtained as a result of the mid-term evaluation is made public only to the Doctoral Student and Supervisor(s).